

- Blomquist, William. 1992. *Dividing the Waters: Governing Groundwater in Southern California*. San Francisco, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies Press.
- Bromley, Daniel W., ed. 1992. *Making the Commons Work: Theory, Practice, and Policy*. San Francisco, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies Press.
- Crozier, Michel. 1984. *The Trouble with America: Why the System is Breaking Down*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Elshtain, Jean. 1995. *Democracy on Trial*. New York: Basic Books.
- Feeny, David, Fikret Berkes, Bonnie J. McCay, and James M. Acheson. 1990. "The Tragedy of the Commons: Twenty-Two Years Later." *Human Ecology* 18(1):1–19.
- Fortmann, Louise, and John W. Bruce, eds. 1988. *Whose Trees? Proprietary Dimensions of Forestry*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Haas, Peter, Robert O. Keohane, and Marc A. Levy. 1993. *Institutions for the Earth. Sources of Effective International Environmental Protection*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hardin, Garrett. 1968. "The Tragedy of the Commons." *Science* 162:1243–48.
- Hardin, Russell. 1982. *Collective Action*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Keohane, Robert O., and E. Ostrom, eds. 1995. *Local Commons and Global Interdependence: Heterogeneity and Cooperation in Two Domains*. Sage Publications.
- MacManus, Susan A. 1996. *Young v. Old Generational Combat in the 21st Century*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- McCay, Bonnie J. and James M. Acheson. 1987. *The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Merriam, Charles E. 1931. *The Making of Citizens*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Merriam, Charles E. 1934. *Civic Education in the United States*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action. Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1992. *Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems*. ICS Press.
- Ostrom, Elinor, Roy Gardner, and James Walker. 1994. *Rules, Games, and Common-Pool Resources*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ostrom, Elinor, James Walker, and Roy Gardner. 1992. "Covenants With and Without a Sword: Self-Governance Is Possible." *American Political Science Review* 86(2) (June): 404–17.
- Ostrom, Vincent. 1991. *The Meaning of American Federalism: Constituting a Self-Governing Society*. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies Press.
- Ostrom, Vincent. (Forthcoming) *The Meaning of Democracy. The Vulnerability of Democracies*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ostrom, Vincent, David Feeny, and Hartmut
- Picht, eds. 1993. *Rethinking Institutional Analysis and Development: Issues, Alternatives, and Choices*. 2d ed. San Francisco, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies Press.
- Pinkerton, E. 1989. *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries. New Directions for Improved Management and Community Development*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1994. "Bowling Alone: Democracy in America at the End of the Twentieth Century." Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, manuscript.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1995. "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America." *PS: Political Science & Politics* xx(1) (Dec.): 664–83.
- Sandel, Michael J. 1996. *Democracy's Discontent. America in Search of a Public Philosophy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sandler, Todd. 1992. *Collective Action*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Sengupta, Nirmal. 1991. *Managing Common Property: Irrigation in India and the Philippines*. London: Sage.
- Tang, Shui Yan. 1992. *Institutions and Collective Action: Self-Governance in Irrigation*. San Francisco, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies Press.
- Thomson, James T. 1992. *A Framework for Analyzing Institutional Incentives in Community Forestry*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de. [1835 and 1840] 1945. *Democracy in America*. 2 vols., ed. Phillips Bradley, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Wade, Robert. 1988. *Village Republics: Economic Conditions for Collective Action in South India*. Cambridge University Press.
- Walzer, Michael. 1994. "Multiculturalism and Individualism." *Dissent* (Spring).

### Report of the Editor of the *American Political Science Review*, 1995–96

Ada W. Finifter,  
Michigan State University

The first year of my term as Editor of the *American Political Science Review* has been enormously exciting, challenging, and stimulating. Above all, it has been very busy! More manuscripts were submitted than in any of the previous ten years. Editorially, the *Review* continues to have the same goals it has always had: to publish the best original research in the discipline, demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship and having the potential to contribute to the development of general theory in political science. While dealing with the continual

heavy flow of papers to be reviewed, we were, at the same time, developing new procedures, new ways of serving and communicating with authors, reviewers, and readers, and making some changes in the physical appearance of the journal.

Although the colors have been freshened, and numerous small changes (detailed below) have been made, the *Review* looks much the same as it has since its size was enlarged four years ago. The former Controversy section of the *Review* has been renamed Forum and given a broader definition, to include not only critiques and commentary on previously published articles but also other articles that discuss research issues in the discipline. A few articles along those lines have already been published; readers are invited to submit others, including analytic literature reviews and discussions of research problems. I have also instituted a procedure of forwarding critiques of previously published articles to the authors being critiqued as soon as they are received so that critiqued authors will be alerted to the possibility of their publication and can begin to think at the earliest possible date about how they might reply. Critiques and commentaries on previously published articles go through the regular review process with a normal complement of reviewers, but, in addition, critiqued authors are invited to send comments to the Editor. Given its importance to most readers, the Book Review section has been given some increased attention in our formatting and page count.

In the report that follows I will provide some details on all these activities.

### Submissions

Table 1 demonstrates that the number of submissions (and therefore the workload of the editorial office) has increased dramatically over the last decade. We received 25% more manuscripts this past year than the average number received during the last five years of the Patterson editorship, 10% more than the average annual number received during the four-year Powell editorship, and 8% more than received

**TABLE 1**  
**APSR Submissions (Total Manuscripts Received)**

1995–96	533
1991–95 (average)	485
1986–91 (average)	426
1994–95	495
1993–94	480
1992–93	487
1991–92	479
1990–91	438
1989–90	428
1988–89	447
1987–88	391
1986–87	427

Sources: Data for 1991–95, and average for 1985–91 are taken from Powell 1995, Table 1. Average for 1991–95 is calculated from same source. Individual year data for 1986–87 to 1990–91 are taken from Patterson, Bruce, and Crone 1991, Table 1.

during the last year of the Powell editorship.

In addition to the 533 manuscripts sent to Michigan State University (MSU) during this year, I also finished reviewing and made editorial decisions on 129 papers that were in various stages of the review process on the editorial transition date. Files for all those papers were shipped to MSU, and we received reviews that had been commissioned by the previous Editor, chose new reviewers when necessary, and made all final decisions. Therefore, a total of 662 papers passed over my desk at some stage of the process during this past year. As of the date we closed the books for preparation of this report (August 16, 1996), I had made 536 editorial decisions since the previous August 15th, and 126 manuscripts were in process. Thus, had a hypothetical new Editor come on board at the same time in 1996 as I had in 1995, s/he, too, would have received approximately the same number of manuscripts in process as I had received from Rochester. Small wonder that new editors do a lot of sitting in their first year.

To minimize any potential disadvantages to authors as a result of the editorial transition, for all manuscripts received in process from Rochester, the choices of reviewers made by former Editor Powell were respected and, in the case of papers that were revisions that he had invited, I attempted to apply the crite-

ria that he had given to authors in his letters asking them to “revise and resubmit.” I continue to be guided by the previous Editor’s revise and resubmit letters with the current trickle of revisions of Rochester manuscripts that continue to come in. Obviously, this does not mean that every decision would have been the same had Powell followed the papers to their final decisions, but the decisions were surely not markedly different.

If authors vote with their word processors, it is certainly a mark of distinction for the *Review* that so many scholars wish to publish in it. The other side of this coin is that despite these increases in workload, the office is run basically as it has been for many years, with only one full-time staff member as an assistant to the Editor (now Harriett Posner, the Director of Manuscript Processing and Production) and some student clerical help to assist with the management activities and paperwork, of which there is a very great deal. (I mention here only staff supported by the Association; the role of graduate student interns, whose support is contributed by MSU, is discussed below.) Even though the published *Review* remains a similar size as in previous years, the increased submission rate creates a very heavy workload that makes it difficult to keep turnaround time as rapid as we all would like. We have worked assiduously to prevent the workload from affecting service to authors, but the *Review* clearly needs a larger office staff. (In addition, if the submission rate continues at more than 500 manuscripts per year, it will also be prudent for the Council [and potential editors] to consider whether the next editor should actually be the next Co-editors, as has been done from time to time with some of the regional journals. Other models also exist among the scholarly journals, including other forms of shared editorship or a full-time editorship that rotates on a basis similar to that of National Science Foundation program officers or other foundation officials.)

Of the 533 manuscripts received, 455 were “original” manuscripts and 78 were “revisions” invited by the previous or current Editor. Of the

455 new manuscripts, 35 were rejected for being incorrectly submitted. An “incorrect submission” is defined as one that will involve at least some rewriting to comply with editorial requirements for submission, such that any new paper will be different from the one that is being rejected (for example, an over-long paper that needs to be shortened). For submissions that are flawed in some minor sense (no abstract, only one copy, pages missing or illegible), the author is contacted to correct the problem, but the manuscript is held for review and is still counted as only one “original” submission. Therefore, 420 manuscripts were started through the review process. Of these, 12 were rejected in-house as inappropriate for the *APSR* rather than being sent out for review.

#### Field Classification of Submitted Manuscripts

Editors’ reports for the last several years have classified manuscripts into five subfields: American Politics and Public Policy, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Normative Political Theory, and Formal Theory. In his last editor’s report, Powell (1995, 766) remarked on the difficulties of making coding decisions involving formal theory papers since an increasing number of manuscripts were using formal tools in combination with other methodologies. As it was explained to me, the original coding rule was to classify all formal theory papers into the Formal Theory field regardless of their substantive orientation. As an increasing number of papers using formal theory also provided empirical tests, however, questions arose about their field placement. When a paper using formal theory also used American voting data, for example, it seemed equally reasonable to code it as in the American field.

Given these difficulties, the time seemed appropriate to revise the coding scheme somewhat. I have done this by coding on two dimensions: *general substantive field* and *analytic method*. For substantive fields, we retain the traditional American Politics and Public Policy, Comparative Politics, Normative Po-

litical Theory, and International Relations. To these, we have added Methodology and Formal Theory of General Political Processes. The former is new to *APSR* coding schemes but seems required for the papers putting forth a new statistical method or correcting previous uses of an established method. We also use Methodology as the field for papers offering conceptual analyses of research methods or advocate methodologies that do not focus specifically on one of the first four substantive fields.

The field we call Formal Theory of General Political Processes (but abbreviate in some tables below as Formal Theory) is used differently than the Formal Theory category of previous editorial reports. In the new Formal Theory category, we code only those formal papers that consist *entirely* of formal analysis and that focus on some *general* political process that cannot be classified as American, Comparative, or International Relations, e.g., a general model of legislative decision making that does not focus in any detail on any particular country. In essence, we have reversed the coding rule for formal theory papers: Whereas the previous default decision for manuscripts that used formal theory was to code them in that category, we recognize the increasing use of formal theory in all subfields of the discipline by attempting to code papers using formal theory by substantive subfield wherever possible. The change in coding rule has implications for trend analyses of the field distributions of manuscripts received that will be explained below.

For analytic method, we have used four categories: Quantitative, Formal, Both Quantitative and Formal, and Conceptual or Interpretive.<sup>1</sup> The latter refers to textual analyses using no quantitative data or formal analysis. The fields of American Politics and Public Policy, Comparative Politics, and International Relations use all four analytic method codes. Methodology can theoretically use all four as well, although in practice, the ones we have received so far have all been coded as Quantitative or Conceptual. Normative theory papers generally use conceptual or interpretive (including textual) analy-

**TABLE 2**  
Distribution of All Manuscripts and of Original Manuscripts Submitted to the *APSR*, August 17, 1995–August 16, 1996, by Subfield and Type of Analysis

Subfield and Type of Analysis	All Manuscripts		Original Manuscripts <sup>a</sup>	
<b>American Politics</b>				
Formal and Quantitative	19	3.56%	18	4.29%
Formal Analysis	16	3.00	12	2.86
Interpretive, Conceptual	16	3.00	14	3.33
Quantitative Analysis	148	27.77	112	26.67
<i>Subfield total</i>	199	37.34%	156	37.14%
<b>Comparative Politics</b>				
Formal and Quantitative	6	1.13%	4	0.95%
Formal Analysis	25	4.69	18	4.29
Interpretive, Conceptual	33	6.19	26	6.19
Quantitative Analysis	59	11.07	49	11.67
<i>Subfield total</i>	123	23.08%	97	23.10%
<b>International Relations</b>				
Formal and Quantitative	4	0.75%	2	0.48%
Formal Analysis	21	3.94	15	3.57
Interpretive, Conceptual	17	3.19	12	2.86
Quantitative Analysis	27	5.07	22	5.24
<i>Subfield total</i>	69	12.95%	51	12.14%
<b>Normative Theory</b>				
Interpretive, Conceptual	103	19.32%	82	19.52%
<i>Subfield total</i>	103	19.32%	82	19.52%
<b>Formal Theory of General Political Processes</b>				
Formal Analysis	29	5.44%	24	5.71%
<i>Subfield total</i>	29	5.44%	24	5.71%
<b>Methodology</b>				
Interpretive, Conceptual	5	.94%	5	1.19%
Quantitative Analysis	5	.94	5	1.19
<i>Subfield total</i>	10	1.88%	10	2.38%
	533	100.00%	420	100.00%

<sup>a</sup> These columns omit revised manuscripts and “incorrect submissions” so as to avoid differential double-counting in any categories.

sis only. All Formal Theory of General Political Processes papers are classified as using formal theory as their analytic method. By definition, these papers are not quantitative; if they used data they would be classified as American, Comparative, or International Relations depending on the data source.

Coding papers received this year for both substantive field and analytic method produces a classification of 16 article types (four each in American, Comparative, and International Relations; two in Methodology; and one each in Normative Theory and Formal Theory). The use of two codes for each paper has the added advantage of permitting reporting on the basis of analytic method as well as substantive area, which has not been possible before.

Table 2 shows the distribution of manuscripts received by both subfield and analytic method, for all

manuscripts and for original manuscripts (i.e., omitting revised papers).<sup>2</sup> I show all manuscripts received in order to be as comparable as possible with previous editorial reports (despite the coding changes). However, since those figures do include *all* manuscripts submitted, including invited revisions of previously submitted manuscripts, there is a certain amount of double counting. This is appropriate for workload accounts, since revisions generate reviewer selection, correspondence, etc. just as original submissions do, but if the field distribution of invited revisions differed substantially from that of new manuscripts, it would distort the distribution when *all* papers are considered. Since a description of the *new* manuscript pool is of some interest in assessing the attractiveness of the *Review* to scholars in the various fields, it is also appropriate to present analogous data only

for original manuscripts (i.e., omitting revisions), and these figures are shown in the last two columns of Table 2. Since “incorrect” submissions subsequently rewritten and re-submitted also are counted again, those papers are also omitted from the last two columns (i.e., only correct new submissions that will be reviewed are included).

Among those manuscripts submitted to the *Review*, American Politics papers are still largely quantitative. In Comparative Politics, quantitative analyses also dominate, but both interpretive and formal papers are relatively more important than in American Politics. International Relations papers are more heterogeneous in terms of analytic method than papers in other fields but, at least among those submitted to the *Review*, formal theory is more heavily used than in other fields.

I make no attempt to establish quotas or goals by either subfield or analytic method. Nevertheless, the very close similarity of the distributions for subfields of all manuscripts received compared to the distributions for original manuscripts only (i.e., omitting revisions), suggests that papers in all fields fare remarkably similarly. Given that the Editor's decisions are guided very heavily by the reviewers' evaluations, this also suggests that reviewers in all fields use similar or comparable standards of evaluation. (Alternatively, papers might vary in some measure of “quality” by subfield but this could be compensated for by differentially rigorous evaluations. A more courageous editor than I might want to explore this alternative hypothesis).

Has the subfield distribution of submitted manuscripts changed over the tenures of the last three editors of the *Review*? These data are shown in Table 3, which presents data for 1995–96 using both the old and new coding rules for formal theory. The column headed “1995–96(A)” uses the old coding rules, and therefore the three leftmost columns are comparable. The last column presents the coding for the new method that allocates formal theory papers to their substantive subfields.

Note first that using the former editors' coding rule, the number of

**TABLE 3**  
**Manuscripts Received by Field, 1985–96**

	1985–91	1991–95	1995–96(A)	1995–96(B)
American Politics and Public Policy	41%	35%	34%	38%
Comparative Politics	17	22	18	23
International Relations	10	12	9	13
Normative Political Theory	19	21	19	19
Formal Theory	13	10	18	5
Methodology	—	—	2	2
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Manuscripts	426	485	533	533

Sources: Average for 1985–91 from Powell 1995, Table 1. Average for 1991–95 calculated from same source.

Notes: 1995–96 (A) allocates formal theory papers in all fields to “Formal Theory” category for consistency with previous editorial reports. 1995–96 (B) allocates formal theory papers to American Politics, Comparative Politics, or International Relations whenever possible.

formal theory papers submitted to the *Review* last year increased sharply over previous years, to the point of being as plentiful as normative theory papers, part of the bedrock of our discipline. This relatively large increase creates compensating percentage declines in all other field categories used consistently across these years (a comparison for the Methodology field is not possible since it was created in 1995), but this may be a temporary anomaly. Comparisons among the years do not suggest any other marked change, although it does appear that American politics is less dominant than it was in the late 1980s.

In my judgment, while it is not comparable across editorships, the data in the last column, using the new coding rule for formal theory papers, gives a better picture of current subfield distribution of manuscripts. The *APSR* is still dominated by “American” papers but perhaps somewhat less so than it was ten years ago. Almost a quarter of our submissions are now in comparative politics, and more than an eighth in international relations. These are welcome trends that increased global communication can only strengthen in the future and that will increase the attractiveness of the *Review* as a useful source and outlet of scholarship to scholars both in and outside the United States. Normative theory has held steady at about a fifth of papers submitted. The number of submissions in pure formal theory is certainly noticeable, but the shifts in distributions between the A and B columns of 1995–96 indicate that

approximately two-thirds of formal theory papers also provide empirical tests that enable their placement in one of the substantive subfields, and that these are divided relatively equally among the three substantive fields, each one gaining either four or five percentage points. All in all, both the discipline and the journal appear to be slowly getting more diverse.

### Manuscripts Published

Table 4 shows field distributions for manuscripts published since 1985. Since the data for 1996 include articles accepted by two different editors (the lag of accepted articles to publication meant that all March articles and a couple of those published in June were accepted by the prior Editor), trend analysis is complicated. As Powell pointed out in his last editorial report, some year-to-year variation is random and the small numbers mean that a yearly difference of only a few papers published in a field can lead to apparently larger percentage point differences. The relatively large number of international relations papers published in 1996 seems to balance their small numbers in the previous two years. Normative theory is strong but not more so than in 1992. Consistent with previous analyses, the decreasing dominance of American politics papers appears confirmed. But the random and small number effects mean that future years may reverse some of these trends. Indeed, of the articles I ac-

**TABLE 4**  
**Manuscripts Published by the *APSR*, by Subfield, 1985–96**

Field	1985–91	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
American Politics and Public Policy	42%	34%	39%	36%	38%	30%
Comparative Politics	16	17	19	23	18	20
Normative Political Theory	20	24	18	21	20	25
International Relations	10	13	14	9	6	16
Formal Theory*	13	11	11	11	18	9*
TOTAL	100%	99%	101%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Manuscripts	49	53	57	53	49	44

\* 1996 data are coded with new system for formal theory, in which formal theory manuscripts that also use empirical data are distributed into their substantive subfields (American Politics, Comparative, or International Relations). See text for further discussion of this change.

cepted during this past year, some of which will be published in the 1997 volume, 39% were in American politics.

Somewhat fewer articles were published in 1996 than in recent years, but this was a temporary anomaly caused by the editorial transition and somewhat more space being given to the Book Review section. Twenty extra reviews were published in the September issue and two major book review essays were published in December. A relatively large number of articles are now in the “revise and resubmit” process and a larger number of accepted articles are expected for the 1997 volume.

### The Review Process

My procedures for selecting manuscript reviewers involve extensive consultation with members of the Editorial Board in which I receive indispensable assistance from the graduate students who serve as *APSR* interns. The goal of our process is to present to selected members of the Board sufficient information about each paper to enable them to play a major role in the selection of reviewers.

Incoming papers are divided among interns according to their major fields of study. Since authors’ abstracts are often not very informative about their analyses, the interns’ work is critically important in familiarizing Editorial Board members with each paper so that they can understand and, in turn, inform me about the issues that will be involved in the review of the paper and the

skills and other qualifications that reviewers should possess. Over the course of the year, we have discovered that we also need to check papers systematically for their readiness to be reviewed (as I discussed in some detail in the Editor’s Notes in the September 1996 issue).

To accomplish these goals, the interns: (1) review papers for readiness for review (inclusion of all pages, tables, figures, and bibliography) and conformity with *APSR* submission policies (e.g., length, anonymity, nonduplication of other papers or books); (2) prepare an analysis of each manuscript to serve as a supplement to the author’s abstract, focusing on findings, data, hypotheses, and methods, where applicable, major theoretical issues addressed, relationship of the paper to other scholarship, and obvious skills or interests that reviewers should have; and (3) prepare a list of potential reviewers, based on extensive in-house research using a variety of computerized academic citation databases, the university’s on-line card catalog, and a large database of more than 16,000 political scientists and other scholars maintained in the *APSR* office, as well as the author’s own indication of relevant research and bibliography. I review all of the interns’ work and may omit from or add to the list of potential reviewers, or add material that I want the Editorial Board member(s) to know, and then confirm to which member(s) of the Board, based on their research areas and interests, the report should be sent. The intern then (4) sends to the selected members of the Editorial Board, by e-mail, the

author’s abstract, the analysis, and the list of potential reviewers. Sometimes that same day and almost always within two-three days, we will have a response from the Board member(s). These responses take the form of discussion of the major issues that should be considered in the review of this manuscript, commentary on the appropriateness of each suggested reviewer for this manuscript, suggestions for other reviewers, information about related publications of potential reviewers, and suggestions for “balanced packages” of reviewers for the manuscript. The entire package then comes to me, and based on the interns’ research and the advice of the Editorial Board, I make all the final decisions about who will be asked to review each paper.

We seek as reviewers scholars who are writing in similar areas as the manuscript under review, and who therefore have the expertise to review the manuscript, and, to the extent that we can judge, those who can be expected to provide a fair and impartial review that neither favors nor disadvantages the author (or if circumstances dictate, at least a reviewer package that will balance these). We avoid the author’s departmental colleagues or previous co-authors, those who may be particularly hostile to the author’s approach, and those who for whatever other reason we think may be unlikely to be able to provide an impartial, objective, and knowledgeable review. We usually ignore authors’ suggestions for “good reviewers,” preferring to rely on our own research process and the expertise of the Editorial Board for choices that are likely to be more impartial.

Approximately 1,000 reviewers devoted their time and intellectual energies to the *APSR*’s peer review process this year. It would be hard to overstate the debt of gratitude that we collectively owe these vital but largely unsung contributors. As a small measure of recognition, I devoted the Editor’s Notes column and six pages in the December issue to thank by name all of the scholars who reviewed manuscripts (many more than one) for the *APSR* during this past year.

I daresay that no editor working

**TABLE 5**  
**Elapsed Time in the APSR Review Process, for Manuscripts Received August 17, 1996–August 16, 1996, and Decided by August 16, 1996**

	A. Full Year		B. First Six Months (Manuscripts Received 8/17/95–2/16/96)		C. Second Six Months (Manuscripts Received 2/17/96–8/16/96)	
	Median number of workdays	Number of manuscripts	Median number of workdays	Number of manuscripts	Median number of workdays	Number of manuscripts
From receipt to referee assignment	12	349	13	220	9	129
From assignment to last review before decision	48	349	52	220	41	129
From last review to decision	13	349	16	220	7	129
From receipt to final decision	59	407	68	251	45	156

Note: Includes only manuscripts originally received at MSU on which a final decision had been made as of the date indicated. Statistics on time in review process are not provided for 129 manuscripts originally received at Rochester but finished processing at MSU.

alone, and certainly not I, could come up with so many knowledgeable and generous scholars in such diverse fields as those in which the *Review* receives manuscripts. As the description of our reviewer selection process makes clear, the Editorial Board plays a decisive role in reviewer selection and to the (obviously very large) extent that reviewer selection determines outcomes, the editorial process is truly collective. I have a cooperative and incredibly knowledgeable Board. Nevertheless, the large number and extraordinary diversity of manuscripts that we receive leads me to think about increasing the size of the Board somewhat in the near future to reduce members' workloads and to increase our depth in certain areas in which we have begun to receive more manuscripts than anticipated.

#### "Turnaround" Time

We are trying to reduce the turnaround time to the extent possible so that authors are not held up in publication of their research. We have made great strides over this first year as we have learned where the bottlenecks tend to be and how to deal with them. Table 5 shows four measures of time spent in various stages of the *Review* editorial process. In all cases, we use median number of workdays to be comparable with the reports of the last two editors.

The first measure is "*from receipt to referee assignment.*" As a measure of how quickly we get manuscripts out to reviewers once they arrive in

our office, this measure indicates the efficiency of all parts of our operation. This process starts the day the manuscript appears in our mailbox and includes initial processing and logging in of the manuscript, interns' reading and preparation of the manuscript analysis and preliminary short list of potential reviewers, the Editor's review of interns' written package, consultation with the Editorial Board about appropriate reviewers for each paper, decision by the Editor of the reviewer panel, and preparation and mailing of manuscripts to reviewers.

The second measure is "*from assignment to last review before decision.*" As a measure of the difference between the date the papers are sent out to the first chosen reviewers and the date the last review before decision comes in, this indicator primarily measures how quickly reviewers respond but also reflects the persistence of our reminder process.

In the case of papers that receive poor reviews from the first two reviewers, this may represent the time it takes for only these two reviews to come in, since reviews are monitored as they arrive and papers will be rejected if both of the first two reviewers clearly so advise.<sup>3</sup> In the case of papers with more promising first or second reviews, this time will represent the period until the third review comes in.

This measure can be very low when our initial two or three reviewers respond within our suggested review time of one month, but it can be dramatically increased by review-

ers who consistently promise but fail to send a review in or by those who never tell us that they will not be able to provide a review. In both of these types of cases, papers may not go out to substitute reviewers until many weeks into the process. Subfields in which many scholars travel for field research are particularly prone to reviewer delays.

We have attempted to reduce the time papers spend in this process by a very active reviewer reminder process. We have instituted a new reminder of a postcard that goes out approximately ten days before the due date of a review, reminding the reviewer that the review will be due in a week and asking for cooperation in getting the review in on time. If a review is still not received three-four weeks later, a faxed or e-mailed reminder is sent. If a review has still not arrived three weeks after that, generally a new reviewer will be chosen. Occasionally, where a particular reviewer's judgment was thought to be extremely important, I have sent personal e-mail reminders or telephoned the reviewer, but this has been done rarely. The reminder system has proven extremely effective and numerous reviewers have complimented us on its efficiency in coaxing late reviews out of them. Reviewers seem especially to like the early postcard reminder which prods them along before the review is actually late. Despite our efforts, this stage in the process is to a great extent out of our control, and we are very dependent on the good will of reviewers and their willingness and

ability to provide timely reviews. Most reviewers are very cooperative and generous of their time and advice. Others limit their reviewing because of great demands for their expertise by many different journals. Some scholars are unwilling to review at all or for extended periods while working on their own projects. It is always disappointing when we are informed of this, but it is even more frustrating when it is very hard to coax a review out of a reviewer who has one or two papers under review at the same time.

Apart from its other obvious advantages, using as large a reviewer pool as we do lessens the burden on any given potential reviewer. After sending in a review, regardless of whether it is early, on time, or late, reviewers are given a “resting time” of at least six weeks before we ask them to review again so that even the most active reviewers will generally review no more than four manuscripts per year for the *Review*. (Some colleagues will recognize that I occasionally break the “one at a time” and “six week rest” rules, and I hope they realize it is a compliment! In some cases, Editorial Board members are insistent that I try to get a particular scholar as a reviewer even though we have told them that that individual is unavailable because currently reviewing or “resting”).

The third measure, “*from last review to decision*,” indicates the time the Editor takes to make decisions after the final review has arrived (either two, where both indicate rejection, or three, with more positive reviews). This includes study of the reviews and of the paper if warranted by the reviews, making an editorial decision, and composing and mailing a letter to the author.

Papers for which reviewers are unanimous in their advice to reject take little time since normally the Editor does not do more than skim such papers if the reviews seem reasonable. Because we want authors of such papers to be able to move on to revision and/or submission of their papers elsewhere as quickly as possible, these decisions are normally handled first. Papers with three positive reviews are also handled relatively quickly so that revi-



APSR Staff: Standing, from left: Interns B. Jeff Reno, Brandon Prins, Chris Butler; Director of Manuscript Processing and Production, Harriett Posner; Ada Finifter; Interns Matthew Kleiman, Elizabeth Kaufer. Seated: Interns Kathleen Dowley and Mark Hurwitz. Lying down in front row: Interns-in-training Benjamin Dowley and Rachel Hurwitz. Reno and Kaufer specialize in Normative Theory, Prins and Butler in Formal Theory, Methodology, and International Relations, Kleiman in Policy Analysis and Comparative Politics, K. Dowley in Comparative Politics, M. Hurwitz in American Politics. Interns-in-training B. Dowley and R. Hurwitz are assigned manuscripts that are non-anonymous, more than 50 pages, duplicate chapters in forthcoming or published books, or otherwise conflict with submission guidelines, for their advice on whether exceptions to APSR norms are warranted. Due to their early status in the training program, turnaround time is expected to be somewhat longer than usual for these manuscripts. Intern Sara Benesh (American Politics) and 1995–96 Interns Scott Truelove (American Politics) and Damon Linker (Normative Theory) were unavailable for the photo.

sions of papers that are likely to be accepted can get under way quickly and papers ready for acceptance can be put into production. Nevertheless, these papers frequently take substantial time for editorial review because they require not only study of the reviews but also a reading and evaluation by the Editor, who will sometimes provide additional substantive advice and always provides editorial suggestions.

The papers that take the longest in this stage of the process are those that have conflicting reviews, usually various combinations of “accept” and “reject” recommendations. More papers than I would have imagined produce a “triple-header” result: judgments calling papers important or outstanding, marginally publishable, and suitable only for unqualified rejection. Occasionally, these result from a process in which we have anticipated that a paper will be controversial and have tried to select a “balanced panel,” but very frequently they arise from three reviewers that we had no previous reason to think would differ significantly in their reviews. These kinds of manuscripts can be very time-con-

suming to bring to completion because they usually require an independent editorial judgment about which reviews are most useful and which of the conflicting pieces of advice should be followed and sometimes lead to further consultation with other reviewers or members of the Editorial Board.

The final measure, “*from receipt to final decision*,” is an average of the number of days in the process for all manuscripts received. This figure is smaller than the sum of the previous measures because it also includes papers that do not go through the normal review process and hence are decided upon relatively quickly. The latter includes papers that are judged to be inappropriate for the *Review* or of such poor quality that they are rejected without review for substantive reasons. While these papers do not go through the normal review process, they nevertheless take substantial editorial time because I review all of them and frequently prepare an individualized letter for the author. “Incorrect submissions” that are substantially longer than our guidelines or that are discovered in the initial review

by an intern to be nonanonymous can be handled more expeditiously. Papers rejected or questioned for reasons of potential duplicate or overlapping submission, whether this question is raised prior to review, or called to our attention by a reviewer, are extraordinarily time-consuming to handle as they may involve substantial extra correspondence with the author and comparison of the submitted manuscript with other publications.

Table 5, column A, provides statistics on each of these four measures for all manuscripts originally received at Michigan State University during the entire year (August 17, 1995, to August 16, 1996) and decided by August 16, 1996 (we did not have sufficient data in computerized form to calculate comparable figures for the 129 manuscripts in process received from Rochester). Table 5, column B, includes only those manuscripts received during the first six months (August 17, 1995, to February 16, 1996) and Table 5, column C, those received during the second six months (February 17–August 16, 1996). The figures in column C indicate dramatic reductions over time in all of the measures as we have learned how to deal with the variety of bottlenecks that can arise at each stage. Of course, many more manuscripts received during the second six months than the first six are still in process, so these figures have more room to rise.

Currently (Table 5, column C), it takes less than two weeks from receipt for us to send manuscripts out to reviewers, our reminder system has succeeded in getting reviewers to return reviews in an average of about eight weeks (41 working days, but only counting the first two reviews for many rejected papers), the Editor takes an average of a little over a week to deal with papers once the reviews are in. For papers received during the last six months and already decided upon, the average time in the process is now only 9 weeks (45 working days); for papers that go through the entire normal review process, the average is around 11 weeks. Of course, the figures for the year as a whole and especially for papers received during

the first six months are not as favorable. This was the time when we were getting organized and figuring out how to do things, coping with a deluge of manuscripts received after the 1995 Annual Meeting, and dealing with the Rochester manuscripts that our reminder system and reviewers' return to work in the fall very quickly moved from "in process" to "ready for decision." All of this created a backlog that had flow-through effects throughout the year. But we continue to work assiduously to keep turnaround figures as low as possible. Total turnaround time for the full year is lower than reported for any of the previous four years, and data for the most recent six months are slightly better than were reported during the legendary Patterson years, despite the fact that we received 107 more manuscripts than the average for his editorship, a 25% higher submission rate.

#### Acceptance Rates

The calculation of journal acceptance rates is somewhat akin to the calculation of response rates in surveys: The numerators are clear—respondents actually interviewed and manuscripts actually published—but the devil is in the denominators. It is the received wisdom that the *Review* publishes only about 10% of papers received.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, the editor's letter for papers rejected attempts to console authors with this dismal acceptance rate. However, decomposition of the statistics suggests that while getting a paper accepted in the *Review* is no mean feat, the picture may not be quite as bleak as it appears.

Calculations of acceptance "ratios" typically use a denominator of all manuscripts received, as given, for example, in the total submissions numbers reported in Table 1 of this report (Powell 1995, Table 3, note\*\*). For example, over the entire term of the previous Editor, a total of 422 manuscripts in *Comparative Politics* were received and 41 appeared in the 4 volumes published during 1992–95, yielding an acceptance ratio of 9.7%. But, as discussed above, the "manuscripts received" figures are really "workload" figures since they include not only

new manuscripts but also *invited revisions of manuscripts previously counted as new submissions*. This means a manuscript that is first given a "revise and resubmit" decision, and is later resubmitted, has been entered into the denominator twice.

Imagine one journal whose editor doesn't "do" "revise and resubmits" but either accepts or rejects on the first round. The journal receives 500 new manuscripts per year and accepts 50 for an acceptance ratio of 10%. Now imagine the same journal with a less decisive editor and a new policy. This editor has the same amount of room and is also going to publish only 50 papers, but is more lenient in giving authors an opportunity to revise and, hypothetically, gives all 500 submissions a "revise and resubmit." All the hopeful authors send in revisions so the editor now reports 1,000 manuscripts received, but since s/he can still accept only 50, the calculated acceptance ratio drops to 5%. In some sense, these really are different. At the least, the editor has made twice as much work for her/himself and the reviewers and has in some sense considered 1,000 different manuscripts. But it is hard to ignore that we started with 500 authors who have made smaller or larger changes in their manuscripts, and 50 of them are being published. On a common-sense basis, this appears to be a 10% acceptance ratio. Notice also that the larger the number of revise and resubmits offered, the farther the calculated acceptance ratio departs from the common-sense one; had the editor offered opportunities to revise and resubmit to only 250 manuscripts, the total manuscripts received would have been 750 and the calculated acceptance ratio, 6.7%. This leads to a strange paradox: As long as the total number of submissions is used for the denominator, the editor who is willing to put more of her/his (and the reviewers') time into manuscripts so as to give each one the greatest potential chance of being published, and therefore offers more opportunities to revise and resubmit, winds up with the lower acceptance ratio for the total group.

Acceptance "rates" for individual



years may also be given; Powell calculated this as “acceptances divided by acceptances plus rejections plus revise/resubmit, for manuscripts received from July 1 to June 30. Pending manuscripts are not included” (Powell 1995, Table 3, note\*). The example is given of 495 manuscripts received in 1994–95. With decisions having been made on 378 of them by the end of the period and 97 pending, 378 is used as the denominator. Given 33 acceptances among those manuscripts, the acceptance rate for 1994–95 is given as 8.6%, contributing to the “not quite 10%” common wisdom of *APSR* acceptances.

Actually, it is difficult to interpret the acceptance “rate” for any given year since the decisions on many revise and resubmits are not yet made; while they are counted in the denominator, the ultimate decision will also surely place many of them in the numerator as well. Thus, the numerator seems too small or the denominator seems too large, or both. While an argument can therefore be made to exclude “revise and resubmits” from the calculations until final decisions are made, this line of thought, too, is confounded, because some of these papers will never actually be returned. That suggests that they do belong in the denominator and not in the numerator because they were submitted and will never be accepted, but they have really been effectively withdrawn by their authors rather than rejected by the editor. Nevertheless, the formula effectively turns them into rejects.

Calculations to present one “acceptance rate” for the *APSR* get very complicated because so few manuscripts are accepted on the first round and therefore there are relatively many “revise and resubmits” inflating the denominator, further complicated by the fact that not all manuscripts invited for revision actually come back. But the prospect of a serious article being published in the *Review* if an author takes advantage of the opportunity to revise and resubmit is probably at least somewhat larger than the ratios and rates usually given suggest.

It may be useful to think of “rounds” of manuscripts and to present breakdowns of results by

round: The first round is composed of new manuscripts on their initial submissions, the second of first revisions, and the third of the less frequent, but not exactly rare, second revisions. Of *first-round* (i.e., “new”) papers received this year, I accepted only 1% without any revision, but I offered opportunities to revise to 28%. Of *second-round* (i.e., first revision) papers I reviewed this year, 29% were accepted and 45% were offered opportunities to revise a second time (26% were rejected). Of the small number of *third-round* papers submitted, 63% were accepted. Of course, these particular second-round papers are not all drawn from this year’s first round (in fact, most were not), and there are fewer second-round papers than opportunities to resubmit were offered to the current crop of first-round papers; similarly, the third-round papers are not all drawn from this year’s second round, and there are fewer third-round papers than opportunities offered this year to second-round papers. Obviously, the different numbers on each round reflect the different populations involved but that, inevitably, some authors invited to resubmit will not, also complicates the acceptance rate for a journal that almost never accepts without revision.

That there are two editors involved, and that their criteria for revise and resubmits may have been different, and the fact that the figures presented do not track individual manuscripts through the various rounds, suggests that it is probably prudent to avoid trying to calculate the current (i.e., this year’s) acceptance rate. Even taking into account all of these complications, the number of articles I have accepted in this first year is still too small to provide a reliable estimate by extrapolation to the future. Moreover, large numbers of papers are in the potential revise and resubmit stage (i.e., revisions have been invited but not yet received). Authors may be better advised to consider the round-by-round figures presented above and to follow through with revisions when the Editor is encouraging than to base their decisions on the legendary 10% and become excessively

discouraged when a paper is not accepted on the first round.

### Formatting and Physical Appearance of the *Review*

We have made numerous small changes in the formatting and physical appearance of the *Review* that we hope will make it more convenient to read. To increase space for articles and book reviews, blank pages between sections have been eliminated. In Volume 90, this space has been allocated to more information about the methodology of the articles, technical appendices, and additional book reviews. The importance of the Book Review section is recognized by giving its contents more prominence through placement with the regular article Table of Contents rather than in the inner pages of the journal and listing the names and affiliations of book review authors at the beginning rather than the end of each review. Forthcoming articles are now listed at the end of the Table of Contents, rather than in an editor’s note on an inner page following the articles, and the Editor’s Notes have been moved to the beginning of the journal with other front matter and Instructions to Contributors, to which they frequently relate.

We have switched to a more open type font (“Dutch”) that makes the appearance of the printed page somewhat less dense and more readable than the font formerly used (“Palatino”). We now place notes at the bottom of the pages rather than at the end of articles, give authors’ affiliations and addresses in a note on the first page of each article, provide issue identification in citations to periodicals, provide page numbers for each issue on the spine of the journal, and, on the pages of the *Review*, have moved page numbers from the bottom center to the bottom outside edges of pages to facilitate location of particular pages. We have also made some minor changes to the formatting and appearance of tables and figures to improve readability and aesthetics.<sup>5</sup> We hope the experience of reading the *Review* has become somewhat more convenient as a result of these changes.

**TABLE 6**  
**Books Received, September 1995–July 1996**

Subfield	Books Received	Books Reviewed or Scheduled for Review	
		N	%
American Politics and Public Policy	637	196	30.9%
Comparative Politics	641	184	34.8%
Political Theory	326	140	42.9%
International Relations	357	100	28.0%
TOTAL	1961	620	31.6%

### Communication with Readers, Authors, and Reviewers

The *APSR*'s procedures should not be a "black box;" we have attempted to increase communications with all of our constituencies—authors, reviewers, and readers—to the extent possible consistent with the main task of providing timely editorial decisions for the very large number of manuscripts we receive.

We engage in extensive communications with authors and reviewers by e-mail and are frequently able to resolve problems in submissions very quickly in this manner. I have also acted as an e-mail go-between when a reviewer wants more specific information from an author; this has enabled very quick resolution of some problems that might otherwise have required additional "revise and resubmit" stages. I intend to increase communication with all of our constituencies through the Editor's Notes section, which has been given more prominence by its move to the front of the journal. In each issue, these notes have focused on some topic of potential interest to authors, reviewers, or readers in general. In my first issue, March 1996, I discussed what is probably on everyone's mind with a new editor: what would be the continuities and/or changes in editorial policy and in the format of the *Review*. In June, I provided an overview of the review process and announced our new web site. In September, I discussed some problems that arise with submissions and clarified our policy on "duplicate or overlapping submissions." In December, I focused on the tremendous service provided by reviewers and thanked by name the approximately 1,000 scholars who reviewed

manuscripts during the first year of my editorship. As time permits and issues arise, I hope to continue these mini-reports to our readers.

The *APSR* home page on the web is <http://www.ssc.msu.edu/~apsr/>. Our goal is to provide the complete table of contents, including book reviews, of each issue as soon as the galleys have been proofread (approximately six to eight weeks before the printed version appears in readers' mailboxes). For each issue, at this same time, we also give the complete text of the Editor's Notes, the abstracts for each article and, for those articles containing them, a complete list of tables and figures. We also provide biographical and other information about our Editorial Board and staff, and our review procedures. We have just posted there the list of approximately 1,000 scholars who reviewed for us during this past year.

The web page is an extremely important means of communication to our readers and potential readers on a worldwide basis, and I am very interested in expanding it in ways that will be attractive and useful. For example, I expect to provide the full contents of the *APSR Style Manual* when the revision we are working on right now is finished. One of the most interesting possibilities is to publish on the web page material that *APSR* authors wish to include in articles, such as data, supplementary analyses, extensive technical proofs, and so forth but which are too lengthy to include in the printed *Review*. At present, however, we have no extra personnel or budget to devote to the web page and given the press of regular business and the record number of manuscripts we have been receiving, it has been im-

possible to give it all the attention it merits. If members find this service useful, we would hope that additional resources can be found to improve and expand upon it.

### Book Review

Mark Lichbach of the University of Colorado was appointed as Book Review Editor for a one-year term during the last year of the editorship of Bing Powell. This seemed an excellent choice, and I was pleased that he accepted my invitation to remain as Book Review Editor. As well as producing a large number of individual book reviews, Professor Lichbach has commissioned a number of very interesting and exciting review symposia. Two major review essays appear in the December 1996 issue. One reviews research on black politics and the other on social movements, and each essay covers six books. Both essays are extremely interesting, and we expect them to generate a great deal of attention.

The Book Review office continues to receive an enormous number of books. In recent years, approximately 2,000 books per year have been received by the Book Review Editor and the trend continued this year with 1,961. Table 6 shows the books received from September 1995 to July 1996 by field. Repeating past patterns, nearly twice as many books are received in American Politics/Policy and in Comparative Politics than in either Political Theory or International Relations, and a somewhat higher percentage of books are reviewed in Political Theory than in any other field.

Because of the great interest in the book review section of the journal, a higher percentage of invitations were extended than in previous years. This is also helpful in creating a small backlog that enables us to allocate a larger number of reviews to particular issues when space is available. Even so, because of the limitations on printed pages in the *Review*, determined by the Council budget for the *Review*, we can only issue invitations for fewer than one-third of the books received. Inevitably, given our size limitation, many

**TABLE 7**  
**Books Reviewed, by Issue and Field, September 1995–September 1996**

Issue	American	Comparative	Theory	IR
September 1995	21.5% (17)	26.6 (21)	22.8 (18)	29.1 (23)
December 1995	30.7% (23)	30.7 (23)	21.3 (16)	17.3 (13)
March 1996	36% (27)	30.7 (23)	22.7 (17)	10.7 (8)
June 1996	37.5% (30)	28.8 (23)	22.5 (18)	11.3 (9)
September 1996	25.0% (25)	26.0 (26)	25.0 (25)	24.0 (24)

Note: Ns include books reviewed in review essays and both multiple and single book reviews. Percentages across; rows sum to 100%.

books written by members cannot be reviewed.

Table 7 provides data for books reviewed in the fields of American politics, comparative politics, political theory, and international relations in the five issues from September 1995 through September 1996. While there are fluctuations from issue to issue, of the approximately 400 books that were reviewed, 30% of the reviews were in American politics, 28% in comparative politics, 23% in theory, and 19% in international relations.

The major goal of the Book Review Editor is to review books that make significant contributions to scholarship in their respective fields in political science. Obviously, he is unable to read each of the 2,000 books that are received each year and logistical problems of sending out 2,000 books and expecting them to be repackaged and sent back makes submission of books to an external editorial committee for advice impractical. Therefore, the Book Review Editor uses a variety of indicators to judge a book's potential value and the ability of a reviewer to produce a review that will be informative and useful. These indicators, of course, have many exceptions.

The five basic criteria give priority to: (1) books by political scientists rather than non-political scientists because they more directly address

questions in our discipline; (2) singly or co-authored books rather than edited collections because they are usually more thematic and easier to review; (3) original research rather than textbooks because the Book Review has traditionally been most concerned with original contributions to scholarship; (4) books with mostly original material rather than books that contain many reprinted journal articles and book chapters; and (5) university press books over non-university press books.

These are not absolute criteria. There are books that are important for us to review that are written by sociologists, economists, and philosophers because they directly engage the literature in political science. An edited collection might have a strong theme and set a standard for a field. Texts in areas of emerging interest to the discipline might be of broad interest to political scientists in general. Prominent researchers sometimes publish books that represent an accumulation of their work and that allow a review of the wider implications of their research. Finally, non-university presses publish many fine books. Judgment, as always, is indispensable. The Book Review Editor is assisted in his decisions about which books to review by the *APSR* Book Review interns and by colleagues in his department.

I concur with former editor Powell in his assessment that “being editor

of the *APSR* is . . . the best job in the world—except that there's just a bit too much of it!” (Powell, 1995, 764). While following more or less the format of previous editors' reports here, and presenting mainly “just the facts,” I hope some of the challenge and fascination of the job comes through—if not here, then perhaps in the Editor's Notes in the *Review*. It is surely one of the most interesting things I have ever done. That, as Bing Powell says, I do more of it than I might sometimes choose, seems to go with the territory.

I welcome any reader comments on this report, on our editorial procedures, or on any other aspect of the *APSR* itself.

## Notes

1. Beginning with papers received in academic year 1996–97, we have added the new analytic method category of “small N, hypothesis testing.” These are not quantitative papers but neither are they properly classified as interpretive. In general, their authors compare a small number of units (e.g., several urban areas or countries) with theory testing or development rather than description as the goal. Some of these can also be thought of as “case studies.”

2. Thanks to Paul Wolberg for database programming to produce Tables 2, 3 and 5 of this report.

3. Since the figure omits date calculations for the third review in the case of manuscripts rejected on the basis of the first two reviews, this measure actually underestimates average reviewer response time.

4. Actually, the previous two editors have both reported overall acceptance rates of 11% (Powell, 1995, Table 3).

5. Special thanks are due Harriett Posner for her numerous suggestions and valuable advice on these changes.

## References

- Patterson, Samuel C., John M. Bruce, and Martha Ellis Crone. 1991. “The Impact of the *American Political Science Review*.” *PS: Political Science & Politics*. 24(4):765–74.
- Powell, G. Bingham, Jr. 1995. “Report of the Managing Editor of the *American Political Science Review*, August 30, 1995.” *PS: Political Science & Politics*. 28(4):764–69.