



**Announcing the APSA**

**1999 Call for Papers**

The 95<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting will convene September 2-5, 1999 in Atlanta, GA at the Atlanta Hilton and Towers and the Atlanta Marriott Marquis.

**Don't Delay!**

**The deadline is Monday, November 16, 1998.**

Turn the page for submission procedures and applications.

Questions? Call APSA at 202-483-2512 or email [meeting@apsanet.org](mailto:meeting@apsanet.org).

# 1999 Program Call for Papers

## *Political Science and the World of Politics and Policy: Contribution and Impact*

Program Chairs:

John A. Garcia, Department of Political Science, 315  
Social Sciences Building, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ  
85721, p: 520-621-7095, f: 520-621-5051,  
jag@u.arizona.edu

Alberta Sbragia, Department of Political Science, 4E23  
Forbes Quadrangle, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh,  
PA 15260, p: 412-648-7405, f: 412-648-2199,  
sbragia+@pitt.edu

Should political science be interested in the world outside academe-what some consider the "real" world? Policy-makers and activists often view the other social sciences as critical to the policy debate whereas political science is frequently treated as a marginal discipline. Should we care? Do we want to make a claim that our cumulative knowledge is as significant as that of any other social science discipline? Do we fear being viewed as policy advocates rather than as detached scholars?

Political Scientists have, in fact, varied their concern with the "real" world. Some, focused on theory and its development, have stressed the elegance of models, the development of methodological sophistication, and the notion of political science as contributing to what is viewed as basic research. Others have been involved in (controversial) policy discussions about appropriate institutions and policies in a variety of countries around the world. Some have argued that political science debates should be at least comprehensible to practitioners and policy-makers, and have been skeptical about the formulation of elegant models not grounded in empirical research and/or field work. Still others maintain that the world of politics needs to be understood as a form of social construction. Debates center around the worth of contextual knowledge, the utility of mathematical models based on assumptions about individualistic behavior in a world which other political scientists view as largely constrained by structural forces, and the utility of theory-building which makes universalist claims. Historically, political scientists made a direct contribution to constitutional and public policy debates in many parts of the world while more recently a disjuncture between models and empirical reality has become more common.

We hope to encourage a self-conscious discussion about the extent to which the "real" world (however defined) should be of concern to political scientists, what political science can authoritatively say about that world, and whether we can claim cumulative knowledge in any

subfield or thematic arena. We are particularly interested in thinking about these issues from a historical perspective. Given that the 1999 conference will be the last of this century, it seems appropriate to think about where the discipline has been and where it might go. Given that it will be in Atlanta, a city associated with both the American Civil War and the "New South", it is also appropriate to consider whether the new issues of race and gender, which many in the discipline find important, should be treated as "new" or rather as reflecting a historic concern in the discipline with issues of new claimants, political reform, and political participation. Thinking about the debates in which political scientists engaged before World War II gives one a different sense of the discipline from that which is projected by the post-WWII discipline of political science. We wish to encourage a historical sensitivity which takes into account the political science work of this century in its entirety rather than merely its post-WWII variant.

Finally, this conference will take place a decade after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the ending of the Cold War. The changed international context has affected a wide range of topics studied by political scientists - ranging from public finance to regional integration to globalization - and it would be useful to think anew about how the "external" and the "internal" are entangled across the world. That entanglement has certainly been of concern throughout this century, as students of both comparative politics and international relations are perhaps the most acutely aware, and we encourage panels in those subfields to consider the intersection between the two and the way the discipline historically has thought about that entanglement.

☆ denotes APSA Organized Section

**Division 1 Political Thought and Philosophy: Historical Approaches.** Richard Tuck, Harvard University and Edwina Barvosa-Carter, University of California, Santa Barbara

As political theorists and philosophers, we are arguably the political scientists most frequently charged with neglecting the politics and policies of the "real world." Such claims should give us pause, and cause us to ask how our scholarship can influence policy discussions among other political scientists, political leaders, activists, and the citizenry at large. In the past, political theorists were usually engaged in direct political action, either as "advisers to princes" or as spokesmen or women for political movements; by studying the history of the subject, we might learn how theorists can engage with politics today. In line with the 1999 conference theme therefore,

we hope to feature this politically engaged dimension of the current research in our field.

The Political Thought and Philosophy Division follows tradition in inviting paper and panel proposals in Ancient, Medieval, Early Modern and Modern political thought and philosophy. In particular, however, we welcome proposals that generate an opportunity for participants and audience members to reflect on particular topics in intellectual history and political philosophy, and which simultaneously encourage consideration of how those topics can inform our thinking on various contemporary concerns. Such proposals might focus on sovereignty, political foundings and refoundings, statecraft, citizenship, political institution building, regime transformation, property rights, social welfare, morality, political community, law, religion, constitutionalism, military alliances, and republicanism. Other proposals might highlight democratic thought by drawing out theoretical and philosophical insights that speak to modern democratic practices, contemporary democratic theory, or the quality of existing democracies.

In addition, the 1999 conference has special significance as a transition point between the old millennium and the new. We therefore encourage proposals that take a retrospective and/or forward looking approach to developments in the field, and to particular topics in political thought and philosophy. Such proposals might examine the transformation of our thinking on various issues, such as the possibility of a scientific approach to politics, the interaction of economics and politics, and other distinctive features of the present epoch.

**Division 2** ☆ **Foundations of Political Theory.** Bonnie Honig, Northwestern University

The 1999 convention theme raises several issues of particular import to political theorists. The profession's twin anxieties about its "objectivity" as a social science and its "relevance" to the world of practical politics call to mind recent work on the relationship between knowledge and power. If political science, as a profession, involves the development of expertise for use in the "real" world, what should the role of theory be in relation to that project? What is the political role or responsibility of the theorist, the intellectual, the expert, the scholar, the academic, the professional, the political scientist? I welcome proposals for panels and papers that explore--whether by way of biographical cases and/or theoretical work--the workings of power/knowledge in professional and political life.

Underlying the profession's concerns about relevance are deeper, disciplinary concerns about the status of the "real." Historically, political theorists have interrogated the category of the real from various approaches, ranging from the skeptical to the perspectivist to the

psychoanalytic. What kind of challenge is posed by these and other approaches to the political project of addressing, contesting and building a world in common? How have recent political developments helped to put the politics of the "real" at the center of political theory's agenda? The development of internet cultures and the condition called globalization both seem to make present the limits of representation while stretching the boundaries of the "real." If, as Benedict Anderson argues, it was difficult to make an entity the size of the large modern state into an object of representation, then how can that be achieved at the level of the globe?

What does it mean to try to make the global, or globalization, into an object of representation—to make it real and (in)contestable? How might such research be informed by work in feminist theory that seeks to loosen the hold of established, unequal sex difference on our collective imagination by calling into question the accepted "reality" and materiality of sexual difference? What are the class, gender, race, and (hetero)sexual implications of the politics of globalization and representation?

Talk of globalization brings to mind a whole set of terms: Diaspora, nomadism, hybridity, transnationalism, multiculturalism, foreignness, immigration, migrancy, cosmopolitanism, exile. These terms are often used as if they were synonyms. Is it possible or desirable to theorize these terms rigorously? What political or theoretical problems are obscured by the easy linking of these concepts? How might greater specificity regarding these concepts advance and perhaps pluralize our understandings of democracy and its 21st century futures?

Finally, it is 1999 and so I also welcome proposals to examine the politics, psychology and culture of the *fin de siècle* and especially comparative *fins-de-siècles* research.

Proposals that exceed, contest, or ignore the above suggestions are also welcome. The Foundations of Political Theory Section encourages a wide array of voices, approaches and interests in political thought.

**Division 3** **Normative Political Theory.** David T. Abalos, Seton Hall University and Manfred Halpern, Princeton University

How can normative political theory help us to understand the situation in which we live, and to practice for the better what we can and need to do together to nurture the personal and the political faces of our and everyone else's being? What underlying patterning forces shape our past and currently present concrete problems and how can we fundamentally come to grips with them by reuniting theory and practice? Who are the past and present theorists who can - or cannot - help us to achieve a reconstruction of

normative theory? How and why - or why not?

How can we critically compare and contrast our past and present normative understanding and evaluation of problems of the differences between and within races, ethnic groups, genders and cultures? What questions do we need to ask regarding the critical and creative foundations that we need to deepen in order to fundamentally change our capacity to deal justly with issues? For example, how does a re-visioning of the relationship between the personal and the political help us to rediscover the sources of a fundamentally more just and compassionate society?

In regards to international politics and its growing interconnections (and disconnections) with domestic politics and the lives of individuals, how can we explain these changes between the personal and the political aspects of our being on a local, regional and world-wide scale in such a way that will enable us to discover strategies of transformation, creating the fundamentally new and better in all aspects of our life leading up toward peace, cooperation and overcoming poverty?

The contribution and impact of political science on the world of politics and policy is the theme of our annual conference. Papers opposing such a reaching out beyond scholarly detachment are also invited. So also are papers on other questions concerning this theme. Papers that address issues of normative theory that help us to see this aspect of political science in a new way are especially encouraged. Members are welcome to offer particular papers or to propose round tables on topics about which they care.

**Division 4** **Formal Political Theory.** Richard McKelvey, California Institute of Technology

The Formal Political Theory section invites proposals for papers or panels for the 1999 meeting. The theme of this year's conference is the contribution and impact of political science to the world of politics and policy. In accordance with this year's theme, special consideration will be given to papers or panels which address the impact and importance of their analysis, or of formal theory in general, to the "real world". Also, papers or panels on the issues of empirical or experimental testability of formal models, or retrospective reviews of areas of formal theory that assess what we have really learned that is useful would be appropriate for inclusion.

While papers with an emphasis on policy implications and testing are solicited, formal theory by its very nature deals in abstractions. So more theoretical papers that do not fit the conference theme are also welcome. Formal theory is interpreted broadly to include (but not be limited to) rational choice and game theoretic approaches, axiomatic

approaches, evolutionary models, and simulation methods.

Paper proposals should include an abstract; panel proposals should include paper titles and abstracts, and a list of participants.

**Division 5** **☆Political Psychology.** Stanley Feldman, SUNY, Stony Brook

The best work in political psychology has always shown how attention to psychological processes can help to understand the behavior of people in political settings. Although political psychology may appear to encourage a focus on the individual political actor, it is in fact the interaction of the actor with the environment that we study. Political psychology has also made contributions to politics, for example, through studies of leadership. I would like to receive paper and panel proposals on a range of topics that have been central to political psychology and that address new concerns in the field. Proposals on the following issues are encouraged:

(1) Studies of racism, prejudice, and attitudes toward minority groups have been prominent in political psychology in recent years. With the increased salience of immigration in recent years there has been greater attention to the sources and dynamics of attitudes toward immigrant groups and related issues (bilingual education, for example).

(2) Increases in inter-group tensions and conflict around the world highlight the continuing relevance of racial, ethnic, and religious identity to our understanding of politics. Political psychology should be able to make a major contribution to the study of these conflicts and the processes underlying them. A related research tradition that has long been central to political psychology is political tolerance. And the increasing presence of right-wing groups in many countries provides an opportunity to examine the dynamics of identity and intolerance and to consider the political consequences of these forces.

(3) Political psychology has made substantial progress in recent years in our understanding of information flows in society and the ways in which people deal with this information. New models of candidate evaluation and the dynamics of issue preferences have been developed and tested. Further work in these areas are welcome.

(4) With these models have come innovative methods for studying these processes. I would also like to see papers that use or discuss new methodological approaches in political psychology.

**Division 6** ☆**Political Economy.** Sharyn O'Halloran, Columbia University

Broadly speaking, political economy is the study of the real world interaction between political and economic processes. Scholars have approached this topic in two ways: first, by applying economic tools to the study of politics, and second, by analyzing the political bases of economic policy. Accordingly, the political economy section solicits three types of proposals.

(1) Studies that adapt formal and quantitative methods to analyze political institutions. Papers and panels that combine both of these approaches to derive and test hypotheses are particularly encouraged.

(2) In the past, scholars adopting a political economy framework have examined U.S. political institutions almost exclusively. This year the political economy section seeks to broaden its scope to the study of comparative institutions as well, including such topics as electoral and legislative systems, bureaucracy and delegation, the courts, corruption, and federalism.

(3) In keeping with the theme of this year's conference, of particular relevance are papers that address the impact of political institutions on specific policy areas, including the political economy of economic growth and development, trade, financial institutions and corporate governance, social policies, health and safety regulations, and environmental law, to name but a few.

**Division 7** ☆**Politics and History.** Andrew Polsky, Hunter College, CUNY and Gretchen Ritter, University of Texas, Austin

The Atlanta conference theme—the contribution of political science to the world of politics—presents several issues for scholars in the discipline who pursue historical approaches. Does historically informed work have anything distinctive and significant to say about politics to which policy makers, opinion shapers, and the public ought to pay attention? What contributions can a historical perspective offer on contemporary political issues? Does the desire to speak to current concerns distort or corrupt historical research? We welcome panel (including roundtable) and paper proposals that address such questions and/or that seek to identify historical lessons for current policy debates.

We also invite reflections on what the history of political science as a discipline can tell us about the relationship between scholarship and politics. Some argue that contemporary scholarship has become more remote and less relevant to actual politics. Others contend that scholarly work today is more objective and less beholden to particular political figures or persuasions. What

contribution has political science offered to policy makers and political practitioners in times past compared with today?

Efforts by political scientists and scholars in related disciplines to influence politics and policy are not new. We invite examinations of past attempts to shape the political world. For example, 1999 marks the sixtieth anniversary of the 1939 Executive Reorganization Act, which was itself shaped by the Brownlow Committee and its political science members. Political scientists have also been active in the foreign policy arena during the "American Century," especially since the Second World War. We encourage panels that might be co-sponsored by other organized sections that focus on foreign policy, international relations, and public administration.

Many supposedly "new" political issues might also be illuminated through historical scholarship. These include controversies over identity politics, the reemergence of right wing nationalist movements, and the significance of civil society and citizenship. New political issues lend themselves to examination from a variety of perspectives, and co-sponsorship with organized sections on gender, race, and law is welcomed.

In suggesting these possibilities, we do not mean to preclude others. In developing proposals, please note: (1) Due to constraints on available panel slots, the section will limit each person's participation to one panel sponsored or co-sponsored by the section. APSA rules permit participation in a second panel. (2) Panels that generate creative tension tend to be the most productive and most discussed. Accordingly, we will favor proposals that represent a variety of approaches and scholarly backgrounds. (3) We need to assure opportunities for scholars at all levels, including graduate students. We hope to integrate them into panels with more established scholars and ask you to incorporate scholars at different levels in panel proposals. (4) We welcome paper and panel proposals in comparative politics, including those that seek to compare the United States with other nations.

**Division 8** ☆**Political Methodology.** Nancy Burns, University of Michigan

I welcome proposals from scholars who are applying and developing tools for analyzing quantitative and qualitative data. I especially encourage proposals that offer new tools (or improve old tools) for analyzing data.

I look forward to receiving proposals focusing on estimation, multi-method approaches, measurement, and research design. I am keen to see proposals that develop innovative linkages between theory, substance, and method and that highlight the conceptual underpinnings of particular methodological approaches. These



proposals will take advantage of the theme of this year's conference: *"Political Science and the World of Politics and Policy."* This theme provides a special opportunity for political methodologists to generate new and better ways to understand the political consequences of institutions and policies.

I encourage scholars to propose panels or roundtables. I would be particularly interested in panel or roundtable proposals addressing the linkages between theory, substance, and method that I mentioned in the previous paragraph.

**Division 9 Teaching and Learning in Political Science.** Michelle Saint-Germain, California State University, Long Beach

This section encourages innovative proposals on any theme, but especially the following:

Who is teaching? What is the makeup of the present corps of academicians? Has this changed over this century? Is there an 'old' wave, refusing to make way for the 'new'? Is there a need for retirement incentives for current faculty? Why are there 300 applicants for every tenure-track job in political science?

Who is being taught? How are student demographics changing? What are the differences between the current student body and those of the past, in terms of such things as age, gender, ethnicity, student status, work, family, etc? What will be the impact of immigration, creeping credentialism, and other trends? Do we succumb to pressures to raise student enrollments, even though we know there are no jobs for graduates?

What is being taught? What about the 'politics' in political science? What about the 'public' in public policy? What has been the legacy of 60's advocacy and activism? What new programs are being offered, e.g., a masters in political campaign management? What can political science majors do, besides teach?

Are we learning? Education does not stop when the Ph.D. hood goes on. How can faculty prepare today's students to be 'lifelong learners' if they do not practice lifelong learning themselves? How can teaching-and-learning communities be fostered? How can we distinguish between important advances and fanciful fads? Who has time to become an expert in teaching and learning, besides keeping up in traditional fields of specialization?

How do we learn? What models of learning do we employ? What are the theories of learning underlying current practices, from Socratic dialogues to Distance Education? What advances in cognitive theory underlie learning with computers, multi-media, and the Internet?

What have we learned? Has the field reflected on its teaching and learning? What programs or processes have been put in place to measure outputs, outcomes, and impacts? How does political science fare in outcome-oriented assessment? What has been the role of *PS: Political Science and Politics* in fostering reflection in teaching and learning in the field? How can the discipline become more self-conscious about teaching and learning?

**Division 10 ☆Undergraduate Education.** Craig A. Rimmerman, Hobart and William Smith Colleges

As we head into the 21st century, it seems appropriate for the Organized Section on Undergraduate Education to consider how well political science has prepared our students for the "real" world of politics and public policy. As we examine the contributions of our discipline over time, we might find that we have much more work to do at both the normative and empirical levels of analysis. Political scientists are uniquely situated to address issues of power, political participation, democracy, citizenship, inequality, and difference as a part of our undergraduate courses. A central issue for this section, then, is how we build such topics into our daily classrooms in innovative and thought provoking ways.

I am particularly interested in receiving panel and paper proposals that offer innovative approaches to linking students' political science undergraduate courses with the overall conference theme -- the connection between political science and the "real" world of politics and policy. Proposals that address a pedagogy for examining the following kinds of questions would be most welcome: What should the role of the citizenry be in a "democratic" political system? How might service learning and internships be successfully integrated into undergraduate courses in political science and public policy? How might we best teach various approaches to democracy, citizenship, and political participation and link these approaches to the "real" world of politics and public policy? How do we inspire our students to wrestle with issues of identity politics and the politics of difference in compelling ways? How do we best teach about the politics of individual and collective organizing, protest, and resistance.

**Division 11 ☆Comparative Politics.** Ellen Comisso, University of California, San Diego

Traditionally, the field of comparative politics has been driven by the study of social cleavages: how the dynamics of cooperation and conflict between distinct social groups have manifested themselves in political outcomes-from elections and policies to revolutions and regime forms-and how political outcomes have shaped the membership,

formation, and tactics of social and economic actors. Recently, however, the concern with social cleavages and substantive interests has been somewhat eclipsed by a focus on the design and structure of political institutions and formal procedures as the dominant explanatory variable of political outcomes, with preferences often viewed as exogenous to the process.

Hardly coincidental to this intellectual shift has been a decline of interest in area studies and the burgeoning of cross-regional comparative studies based heavily on deductive models. Ironically, the turn towards highly abstract forms of theorizing and the modeling of political behavior along lines drawn from economics occurs in a world in which claims of "unique" cultural attributes and understandings are increasingly heard and in which demands for practitioners with knowledge of place and particularities are growing.

In line with the general theme of this year's APSA convention, the comparative politics section encourages panels and papers oriented towards weighing the trade-off between social cleavage/interest driven analyses and institutionally based analyses of politics. Panels and papers devoted to the politics of nationalism and ethnicity, to the dynamics of democratization and economic reform, and to changing forms of political organization (parties, interest groups, and social movements) are particularly welcome. As in the past, preference will be given to proposals posing questions rather than topics, and particularly to panels that contain alternative approaches to answering a given question.

**Division 12 Comparative Politics of Developing Countries.**  
Edmond J. Keller, University of California, Los Angeles

For just over a decade so-called developing countries in all regions of the world have been witnessing dramatic and fundamental political, economic and social change. In the process new identities and cultural traditions are being formed, posing fresh challenges to state and public policymakers.

This section encourages papers and panels that promise new theoretical and empirical insights about how political change affects the processes of development and public policymaking at all levels of governance in non-western societies. Especially encouraged are papers and panels that engage in cross-cultural analysis. Within the general theme of the conference, possible panel and paper concerns might include:

(1) The process of globalization is becoming an increasingly important determinant of national and subnational politics. Papers that comparatively address

how the globalization process affects policymaking at the national and subnational levels would be appropriate here.

(2) Has globalization rendered development studies irrelevant? If not, what paradigms or approaches are most useful in explaining the processes of national and local development in developing countries?

(3) The ending of the Cold War resulted in the negation of political ideology as a driving force behind the relations of countries of the first and second worlds with countries of the third world. Today Western countries and Japan are more concerned than ever before with creating enabling environments for market capitalist development and democratic consolidation in countries to which they provide economic assistance. What impact, if any, have donor countries had on the emergence of a real commitment to market capitalism and/or the consolidation of democracy in non-western societies?

(4) Increasingly, internal civil conflicts based upon ethnic or religious consideration have spilled over borders and become transnationalized. How have national, regional and subregional political leaders responded in an effort to prevent the deadly spread of such conflict across national borders? In this regard what policies have worked or failed and why?

(5) In explaining the consolidation or reversal of development and democracy, do institutions matter? How important is institutional design in the achievement of either objective?

**Division 13 Politics of Communist and Former Communist Countries.** Valerie Bunce, Cornell University

The study of both communist and post-communist politics has come to be every bit as diverse—in topics, cases and approaches—as the discipline of political science as a whole. This reflects not just the "real world" of revolutionary change in this region (for example, the dramatic events of 1989 in eastern Europe and the virtually as dramatic changes in China since 1978), but also the infusion of a large number of new scholars into the field.

I take as my central mandate in organizing this section to give full voice to this diversity. Thus, I call for paper, roundtable, and, especially, panel proposals that range in topics from public opinion, voting behavior, protest and the design of political institutions to larger issues, such as the relationship between economic and political liberalization, nationalism and regime sustainability (democratic and authoritarian), and the origins, practice and future of democracy and dictatorship. Equally sought are proposals that diverge in the approaches taken—ranging from cultural studies and the "new

institutionalism" to quantitative studies and rational choice.

Proposals from younger scholars—who have done so much to enliven the field—are particularly welcome. In addition, I am very interested in proposals that identify new areas of study (either topical or geographical); that focus on policy, rather than politics (with the latter the more common practice); or that cross common and sometimes unhelpful divides (for example, that force a confrontation among divergent paradigms, that break out of the usual constellation of cases, or that bring the communist and precommunist past to bear in the analysis of postcommunism). In keeping with the theme of the 1999 Convention, I also solicit papers that engage the issue of academics as theorists, as policy analysts, and, so important in the postcommunist context in particular, as social engineers.

**Division 14 Comparative Politics of Advanced Industrial Societies.**  
Gary P. Freeman, University of Texas, Austin

In keeping with the conference theme, I invite submissions that address the relevance of political science research for issues of public policy and institutional design in the advanced industrial societies. These countries have taken the lead in institutionalizing the analytical enterprise in policy making. Problems are routinely identified and studied, options assessed, and decisions evaluated. Assistant secretaries for policy analysis and development, private think tanks, and entrepreneurial policy wonks litter the landscape. Has this "professionalization of reform" improved the quality of public policy? What role have political scientists played in shaping agendas and informing decisionmakers? What role should they have?

Numerous policy predicaments of the advanced societies invite study: long-term structural unemployment, rising inequality, the social dislocations brought about by globalizing economic forces, maintaining competitiveness without sacrificing the protections of a regulatory welfare state, addressing the problems of aging populations, incorporating ethnic minorities, managing international migration, and sustaining the legitimacy of representative institutions in an age of declining public trust and support. Several ideas central to our discipline are increasingly problematic in the advanced societies: the sovereign state, traditional conceptions of citizenship, democratic governance, the left-right continuum of political ideology, among others. What impact or relevance to these and other issues can be claimed for the large literatures on neo-corporatism, consociationalism, or the controversy between statist and societal models of political phenomena? How have studies of elections, parties, public opinion, and new social movements affected the practice of politics in advanced societies? The comparative evolution of the welfare state is a

longstanding concern of political science. What usable knowledge has this work produced and how can it inform national efforts to contain the costs while maintaining the quality of social provision? Do our political economy models elucidate the processes of post-industrial change?

More generally, I encourage papers that present original research and that are driven by explicit theoretical questions. In terms of geographical reach, papers that break out of the normal mold to include less-studied countries, unusual case sets, and broad comparisons are particularly welcome.

**Division 15 ☆Politics and Society in Western Europe.**  
J. Nicholas Ziegler, University of California, Berkeley

This Division welcomes proposals that are explicitly comparative in scope and attentive to different levels of political organization and jurisdiction. Europe's history of rich and sometimes dramatic institutional change offers many opportunities to bring new theoretical perspectives and evidence to bear on the general conference theme of political science's impact on political life. While papers and panels on any appropriate topic will be considered, I particularly encourage theoretically-driven proposals on the following types of questions.

- (1) European integration and domestic institutions. The enactment of monetary union has raised the issue of institutional diversity and convergence with renewed urgency. I welcome proposals that focus on enabling conditions for, domestic responses to, and policy consequences of, European integration.
- (2) Subnational identities. Some of the most interesting recent work in comparative politics has focused on subnational political arenas – whether ethnic, economic, or administrative – and their significance in political change. Proposals that examine the question of effective political scale and appropriate level of analysis are welcome.
- (3) Liberal democracy and political incorporation. Western Europe's twentieth-century history offers perhaps the world's richest field for investigation of political inclusion in systems of electoral alternation. Panels that explore the achievements and limitations of liberal institutions and party systems in Europe and other world regions are encouraged.
- (4) The changing nature of societal groups. Rapid economic change in the last two decades has prompted reassessment of categories for societal as well as institutional analysis. I hope that some proposals will address the evolving place of classes, associations, labor unions, and status groups in European politics.



Panels that focus on a single phenomenon from a range of approaches –rational-choice, historical, constructivist, behaviorist, or other – are also encouraged.

**Division 16 International Political Economy.** Simon Reich,  
University of Pittsburgh

After several false starts, such as the new world order, globalization has become the foundation for much of both American economic policy and academic inquiry in the 1990s. Although heavily invoked and yet under-specified in the field of international political economy, globalization has thus provided an intellectual linkage between the world of policy and scholarship. As chair for the IPE division of the American Political Science Association's 1999 Annual Meeting in Atlanta, I hope to relate the overall theme of the conference, "*Political Science and the World of Politics and Policy*", to that of the IPE section through the lens of globalization. This takes two alternative forms; considering the contribution of scholarship to policy making and the impact of policy on academic discourse.

Consistent with the recent dilution in traditional subdisciplinary and policy boundaries that is characteristic of globalization itself, I will attempt to construe the relationship between scholarship in IPE and policy making in broad terms. Proposals that are particularly welcome are those that address questions examining the relationship between policy and politics in four substantive areas of research: First, questions about the relationship between globalization and modernization, democratization and development. This includes papers examining the role of non-governmental organizations, such as political foundations, environmental or human rights groups, to agenda setting and policy formation.

I welcome a second set of proposals that relate scholarship to policy questions concerning regulation, regionalism and comparative capitalism in the context of globalization. Here, the focus is ideally on papers that examine questions regarding the mediating role of intergovernmental organizations (such as the IMF, World Bank, WTO, UN or regional bodies) between states that practice different forms of democracy and capitalism.

Third, I am interested in papers that examine the relationship between policy and scholarship in the areas of privatization and liberalization. Here the focus may be on the degree of shift in the authoritative boundaries between governments and transnational corporations in the context of market structures. Papers here might focus on the impact of technology in the changing dimensions of public policy in the context of IPE, whether examining—for example—financial markets or the IPE of drug interdiction.

The final substantive area might concern questions examining the relationship between globalization and redistribution. I am particularly interested in papers examining the role of globalization in policy issues concerning gender, immigration or ethnic conflict.

At this stage, this year's division has provisionally been awarded only eleven panels. The ratio of applications to accepted proposals will therefore be very small. Under these circumstances, proposals for complete panels are welcome but are not preferred, and proposed panels may have to be dismantled as circumstances dictate.

**Division 17 International Collaboration.** Edward D.  
Mansfield, Ohio State University

Both scholars and policy makers have expressed a longstanding interest in the determinants, character, and implications of international cooperation.

I invite papers, panels, and roundtables addressing these important issues. Among the particular topics that might be pursued are: the relationship between international economic relations and political cooperation, the design of international institutions, the causes and implications of regional institutions, how domestic factors influence and are affected by international cooperation, the extent and consequences of globalization, and the role of nonstate actors in the global arena.

These topics are central to the study of international relations and bear heavily on various policy debates. In keeping with the theme of this year's conference, I encourage research that addresses key policy issues, such as the future role of the United Nations, the growth of preferential trading arrangements, NATO expansion, the recent economic crisis in East Asia, managing and resolving the increasing number of regional conflicts, and the evolution of the European Union. Also encouraged are proposals that focus on how fundamental changes in international affairs, such as the end of the Cold War, have influenced research on international collaboration.

**Division 18 International Security.** Barbara F. Walter,  
University of California, San Diego

The field of international security has an admirable history of dealing with "real world" problems, maintaining strong connections with the policy world and directly contributing to foreign policy debates. As such, it is an excellent model for how academia can have a direct impact on practitioners and build bridges between theory and practice. This year's organizers ask the question: should political science be interested in the world outside academe? International security scholars would answer a resounding yes. But the field of international security has also been questioned for sometimes moving too far in one

direction; for producing work that has great public policy impact but at the expense of greater conceptual and methodological rigor. Can academic work capture the attention of the policy community and still maintain considerable influence among intellectuals? We believe it can.

This division, therefore, encourages papers that address a real-world problem, develop a strong conceptual framework, and are very self-conscious in their research design. We are open to a wide-range of topics including the causes, conduct and conclusion of interstate or civil conflict and are especially interested in the intersection of domestic and international politics. For example, why would India and then Pakistan induce the ire of the international community by testing nuclear weapons? Why was a peace treaty in Northern Ireland finally signed in 1998 after so many failed attempts? Why do so many civil war peace settlements break down into renewed violence? Why have China and Japan built stronger economic ties despite underlying security concerns? We invite papers, panels and roundtables that focus on such practical problems in ways that add to our cumulative knowledge in international relations.

**Division 19** ☆ **International Security and Arms Control.**  
Jo Husbands, National Academy of Sciences

The theme of the 1999 meeting directly addresses many of the long-standing interests, challenges, and achievements of the field of security studies. Security studies has not been marginal in its impact on policy. Perhaps the most obvious case is deterrence theory, where concepts rooted in a rich academic literature continue to have enormous impact on international politics. Arms control and international security specialists and their work do not always find easy access to policy-makers, and the question of how best to bridge the two cultures of scholarship and practice frequently arises. Even those scholars who concentrate on "pure" academic research work in a field that is more self-conscious than many about how its findings may affect policy and how policy debates may affect research priorities. The issue for security studies thus may be more how its policy relevance affects its standing within and relationship to the rest of political science, and how scholars in the field balance their commitments to academe and the realms of policy. The papers and panels for this section will thus offer a particularly good opportunity to reflect on how scholars and their research relate to the practice of policy. Roundtables or panels that engage scholars and practitioners in discussions of the substance of issues or the process of policy-making as it engages-or fails to engage-academics are welcome. Papers or panels that draw on disciplines beyond political science would be of interest, since psychology, economics, and organization studies among others have all had significant impact on

the development of the field. As for topics, the relevance of deterrence theory to post-Cold War international relations and to weapons other than nuclear is an obvious candidate with both conceptual and practical dimensions. The continuing effort to define the meaning and scope of "security" in changing international circumstances permits a broad array of topics from traditional military concerns to areas such as environment and energy or drugs and transnational crime. The challenge of proliferation, now often described as the greatest current threat to U.S. security, can be addressed in a variety of ways. The increasing roles of non-state actors of all sorts, from nongovernmental organizations to transnational business to terrorists, pose another challenge to both scholarship and policy. The continuing interaction of politics and technology in areas such as arms control or the coming "revolution in military affairs" or, more broadly, the future of arms control in both its traditional spheres and new areas, can be examined. In addition to paper, panel, and roundtable proposals, offers to serve as chairs and discussants, or requests to be considered for poster sessions, are welcome.

**Division 20** ☆ **Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy/Foreign Policy Analysis.** Andrew Z. Katz, Denison University

By bringing together political scientists of various stripes, the Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy section encourages examination of foreign policy formulation from a range of perspectives using diverse methodologies. Scholars exploring how domestic institutions, decision-making processes, and/or societal forces shape foreign policy regularly reflect on the "real world" effects of phenomena under study. Thus, students exploring the link between domestic politics and foreign policy ought to be pleased with the theme for the 1999 conference. I look toward this conference as an opportunity to examine fundamental questions about our understanding of the impact of external-internal interaction on foreign policy in varied contexts.

While proposals for individual papers or complete panels not fitting the conference theme are welcomed, I am most interested in work that addresses "real world" issues. How do domestic factors affect crisis behavior, bargaining, alliance relationships, decisions to use force, etc.? How do domestic sources influence threat perception? What does comparative research reveal about the role of domestic institutions on foreign policy? Can we ascertain if policy makers understand or even find relevant any of our findings? In light of recent research confirming the importance of domestic politics in foreign policy, we also need to revisit normative questions regarding the role of the public and elected legislatures in foreign policy formulation.

I see this conference as a platform to develop and showcase work that integrates scholarship from across the discipline. I encourage proposals that consider the evolution of our understanding of the impact of domestic politics on foreign policy. I would like to highlight the diverse methodologies used to explore domestic sources of foreign policy. Comparative work tracing how different political structures mediate domestic influences on foreign policy are welcomed. Finally, I welcome individual proposals from scholars wishing to interact with analysts from across traditional boundaries.

**Division 21** ☆**Conflict Processes.** Christian A. Davenport, University of Colorado, Boulder and Katherine Barbieri, Vanderbilt University

The conflict processes section invites submissions of proposals for papers, posters, roundtables and panels that address the causes, consequences, or dynamic processes of conflict at either the domestic or international level of analysis. We wish to highlight research that focuses on the interaction of domestic and international processes in examining conflict behavior and research that is both empirically and theoretically rich. Panel proposals that consist of scholars and research from a combination of the fields of comparative and international politics are also strongly encouraged.

In keeping with the theme of APSA 1999, we seek proposals that highlight the policy relevance of conflict research. Topics to be explored will include the ways in which the domestic and international levels of analysis are related, how theories relevant to one level of analysis are applicable to other levels of analysis, whether general theories of conflict behavior exist and their utility across levels of analysis, the similarities in issues facing comparative and international relations scholars interested in conflict research, the manner in which comparative and international politics can be integrated in studying conflict, and the future of conflict research.

**Division 22** ☆**Legislative Studies.** Peverill Squire, University of Iowa

Over the last two decades the study of legislatures has been in the vanguard of formal theory work in political science. Legislative studies has benefited enormously from this movement. But this emphasis raises two important issues that the 1999 program's theme calls for legislative scholars to address. First, more effort needs to be made to link our impressive abstract understanding of legislatures to the wide variety of legislative institutions we see operating around us. In part this suggests that we should do more to reconcile the rich behavioral and functional analyses of the sorts that dominated in the 1960s and 1970s with the more theoretical work of the 1980s and 1990s. Second, and related to the first point,

much of the work developed in the field over the last two decades is "Housecentric." Scholars in the field need to work to develop more complete understandings of other legislatures. Indeed, given the unique qualities of the U.S. House, developing more general theories of legislatures may have to be driven by work on more typical bodies. Thus, in addition to encouraging scholars to present work that reflects the area's current focal points, I hope to generate submissions that also help advance the field in several different ways. First, I invite submissions that focus on legislatures beyond the U. S. House. Second, I would like to balance papers that have a primary focus on institutional level questions with those that put the behavior of the legislator at center stage. Third, I welcome papers that seek to examine and explain how legislative institutions change over time. Fourth, in keeping with the program's theme, I encourage papers that think seriously about how what we have learned is of importance or relevance to legislators and others involved in the legislative process. The range of subjects that can be addressed is broad, among them elections, leadership, careers, committees, rules and norms, representation, voting, and coalition building.

**Division 23** ☆**Presidency Research.** Cary R. Covington, University of Iowa

This year's theme focuses on the contribution of political science to the world of politics. An interest in having a "real world" impact is particularly well-suited to the Presidency Research division. With roots that extend back to Richard Neustadt's *Presidential Power* and beyond, research on the presidency is a field of study that has long been concerned with its ability to generate useful advice and information for presidents and their administrations.

Thus, the 1999 annual meeting will be an appropriate venue for panels designed to assess and advance our accumulated knowledge on a range of topics, including (but not limited to) strategies for presidential elections and transitions between presidencies, the organization of the institutional presidency, presidential management styles, advisory systems, and appointment strategies; the efficacy of presidential rhetoric, the role that presidents play in various policy areas, and the conduct of presidents' relations with Congress, the press, the public, interest groups, and the bureaucracy.

I am especially interested in receiving proposals that explore new and innovative methods for bringing systematic thinking and rigor to our theorizing and methods of analyzing the presidency and the role it plays in the larger political system. However, these suggested topics are intended only to stimulate thinking about possibilities, not to preclude others. All proposals for individual papers, panels, and poster sessions will be welcomed.

**Division  
24**

☆**Public Administration.** Marissa Martino  
Golden, Bryn Mawr College

This year, the Public Administration Division is soliciting three types of individual paper and panel proposals. The first are papers in keeping with the Theme for the 1999 Meeting, which in a nutshell is "relevance". The theme plays nicely into public administration's strength, and thus I expect many interesting papers that speak to "real world" issues -- reinventing government, privatization, public and third-sector management, political control of the "unelected" branch, agency policy-making and implementation, etc.. In addition, papers that wrestle with the tradeoff between relevance and theory-building, the relationship between public administration scholarship and practitioners and/or that put our research tradition into historical perspective will dovetail nicely with the conference theme.

Second, are papers and panels that are methodologically diverse. Here, I hope to put together preaching to the converted. Thus, I welcome proposals from traditional public administration, new public management, rational choice, historical-institutional and post-modern perspectives. The only caveat is that both proposals and papers be written in a manner that makes them accessible to all and that thus facilitate rather than hinder the transmission and accumulation of knowledge.

Finally, submissions are encouraged on the full range of topics related to public administration that engage scholarly inquiry. There remain important empirical, theoretical and normative questions in public administration, and the Division's program will include papers and panels that address these questions. What is our current state of knowledge with respect to organization theory, public management, budgeting, personnel (ethics, leadership, merit, motivation), decision-making, political control, implementation, administrative law, comparative administration, state and local administration? What do we have to say about efficiency, responsiveness, accountability and effectiveness that can help guide policymakers, public managers and politicians in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? How does our work on these topics contribute to a theory of both politics and administration?

I look forward to working with you to put together a set of panels that both wrestle with the question of relevance and that showcase the relevance of our work for the 1999 Annual Meeting in Atlanta.

**Division  
25**

☆**Public Policy.** Peter Eisinger, Wayne State  
University

No field in the profession fits more squarely at the intersection of political science and the world of politics than public policy. The mission of many policy scholars is to bring the intellectual resources of the academy to bear on the things that government does: thus, policy design, policy advising, policy evaluation, and the training of practitioners are familiar and common aspects of the policy scholar's career. Yet for other policy scholars, as well as many political scientists outside our subfield, such a relationship between the academy and the world of politics represents a distraction from the task of building a social science of policy or at the very least an impediment to dispassionate analysis. Thus, the field of public policy is one in ferment, if not turmoil, as its members debate *their proper mission and role*.

If nothing else, this debate makes the field a lively one, diverse in its participants, its approaches, and its scope of subject matter. Thus, this section invites papers and roundtable ideas not only from policy scholars in traditional political science departments, but also from faculty and students in schools of public affairs and public policy from, all disciplines, and from practitioners in government, nonprofit organizations, foundations, and research institutes.

The public policy section invites papers and presentations from people engaged in the immediacy of the policy world—for example, those doing policy analysis and evaluation, those advising study commissions or task forces—and those engaged in more reflective or theoretical work. The section encourages submissions from people writing policy history and from those pursuing questions from an interdisciplinary perspective. At least one roundtable sponsored by this section will be devoted to the debate over the role of political science in the world of policy. Graduate students are strongly invited to submit paper proposals.

**Division  
26**

☆**Law and Courts.** Lettie McSpadden, Northern  
Illinois University

Do courts make policy? Should they? Political scientists long debated these questions. Most of us would now agree that courts are often involved in major policy changes, whether at the trial or appellate; state or federal levels. Additional questions remain. Do courts make different kinds of decisions from other political institutions? If there were less judicial oversight of administrative decision, would there be a different balance between the "haves" and "have-nots" of society? Are judges more concerned about individual rights and specialists in particular policies more attentive to community interests?



Perhaps the answers to these questions depend upon the substantive policies under study.

Questions such as these logically link to macro theory about the importance of political institutions and frameworks of government in policy making. Scholars who are intrigued by questions of culture may also be inspired by this year's meeting theme. Is there a legal culture that is substantively different from the political one, and how can we demonstrate such differences? Perhaps there are multiple legal cultures located in different regions of the country and types of court.

To answer the question--do courts make a difference?--we need to consider whether lower courts follow the lead of their appellate superiors. Do administrative officials acknowledge and use appropriate legal precedents? How has the image of the legal system influenced other political actors in the system? What have these other official decision makers done to bolster or curb judicial policy making?

Panels and papers on substantive public policies from civil rights, criminal rights, property rights, abortion rights, to judicial oversight of economic regulation, affirmative action, anti-trust and environmental law are encouraged. Whatever questions the political system has addressed--all are fair game to dissatisfied groups to make their appeals to the judicial system.

Please think creatively about ways to graphically demonstrate your research findings by using, for example, videos, pictures, charts and models. Poster sessions where you may meet and discuss your work one on one with other scholars may prove more successful than the traditional paper format. All subjects of research and forms of presentation are invited in order to make the program truly diverse and imaginative.

**Division 27** **Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence.** H. W. Perry, Jr., University of Texas, Austin

The theme for the 1999 meeting is *"Political Science and the World of Politics and Policy: Contribution and Impact"*. The relevance of constitutional law and jurisprudence to the theme of the 1999 program is obvious. What is perhaps less obvious is the contribution of political science to constitutional law and jurisprudence. Papers that demonstrate or address this nexus are especially encouraged. That said, I am happy to entertain a broad array of proposals. Scholars from all areas of public law and indeed the discipline are welcome to send proposals. Comparative perspectives are especially encouraged. There will be efforts to coordinate this division with the Law and Courts division so as to provide a wide and balanced collection of public law offerings for the convention. Proposals for entire panels will be considered, but there is

a predisposition to accept individual papers rather than entire panels. Likewise, there is a predisposition to favor panels with papers over round tables, though particularly interesting roundtables will be considered. Proposals for poster sessions are also welcome.

**Division 28** **☆Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations.** Timothy Conlan, George Mason University

One aim of this year's conference is to promote reflection and dialogue about the "real world" significance of contemporary political science and its historical evolution over the past century. Implicitly, this dialogue is already well underway within the subfield of Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations. The section's very title evokes the discipline's evolution from structurally and historically grounded research on the institution of federalism and towards the behaviorist perspective implied by the nomenclature of intergovernmental relations (and now perhaps back again).

In keeping with the conference theme, I invite panel and/or paper proposals that address the evolution of scholarship in this subfield, assess the achievements and limitations of contemporary research, and identify promising approaches and avenues of investigation for the future. I also encourage proposals that continue the section's attention to "real world" issues of contemporary governance and intergovernmental policy. Such topics can draw upon the full range of contemporary federal and intergovernmental issues, such as state and local adaptations to federal welfare, regulatory, and tax reform, evolving judicial doctrines of federalism in the U.S. and elsewhere, and the implications of global political and economic change for federalism worldwide. "Real world" does not imply a theoretical, however. Such proposals should draw or build upon models and theories that enhance our understanding of contemporary politics, administration, and governance.

Finally, I would like to encourage proposals that are comparative across time, space, or function. Multi-national, multi-state, or other multi-jurisdictional comparisons are all appropriate, depending on context, as are those that compare across policy instruments or policy domains. Optimally, proposals will also address core normative issues at the intersection of federalism and governance, including equity, democracy, efficiency, and accountability.

**Division 29** **☆State Politics and Policy.** Susan B. Hansen, University of Pittsburgh

As devolution and decentralization proceed apace, the states in the American federal system have come more sharply into focus as templates for policy innovation and institutional reform. With the effects of devolution

becoming more apparent, it is appropriate to reconsider the adequacy of state political incentives and the institutional capacity to respond to the challenges of governance in the next millennium. State experiences in areas as diverse as education, welfare reform, divided government, campaign finance, direct democracy, women and minority office-holders, privatization, term limits, juvenile justice, gay rights, and hazardous waste disposal can also contribute to national debates on these topics. The state's role in the international arena is also expanding, further blurring the boundary between internal and external politics.

Polls have consistently shown Americans to be supportive of devolution. The states have long been viewed as more trustworthy, accountable, and better guardians of taxpayers monies. But if the states (as some fear) prove inadequate to the enormous policy challenges now facing us, particularly those involving the environment, race or ethnicity, and the global economy, the consequences could be a further increase in skepticism and withdrawal from political involvement. A panel or roundtable discussion of John Donahoe's recent book *The Disunited States* could provide a useful opportunity to consider the costs as well as the benefits of devolution.

The states, as "laboratories of democracy", provide an ideal setting for the concatenation of political theory and modeling with rigorous empirical work. I welcome systematic comparative analyses of these topics, whether based on case studies of one or more states or quantitative assessments of the politics state subfield over recent decades: have our increasingly sophisticated tools, measures, and models given us a better handle on real-world political issues? Theoretical or empirical comparisons with states or provinces in other federal systems are also encouraged.

**Division 30** ☆ **Urban Politics.** Arnold Fleischmann, University of Georgia

For most political scientists, the theme of the annual meeting makes no difference in their research agenda or the proposals they submit for the conference. This year's theme emphasizes the links between the discipline and the "real" world. This may be a stretch for many subfields, but urbanists in many ways have been preoccupied with the real world. The "glory years" of the field were heavily devoted to the problems of cities. Much of our literature in recent years has examined urban development. There are concerns, however, that the field may move from one issue of the day to the next. Therefore, in assembling panels for the 1999 meeting, I will attempt to include research that addresses theoretical and empirical gaps in our literature.

It has been ten years since Clarence Stone's award-winning work on urban regimes. How far have we come, however, with theories about the making, and impacts, of policies at the local level? How well have we addressed the issues on local political agendas? How well do we understand political and policy variations among places, including areas outside older central cities?

Beyond these intellectual guideposts, I hope to provide balance to the program. This includes a conscientious effort to include young scholars, who can offer fresh insights, but also whose careers depend on the ability to get exposure and feedback at conferences.

**Division 31** ☆ **Women and Politics.** Eileen McDonagh, Northeastern University

The theme of the 1999 Program, "*Political Science and the World of Politics and Policy*", provides an opportunity to present a wide variety of approaches and topics in the field of women and politics. Papers, panels, and roundtables on all topics addressing politics and policies from contemporary, historical and methodological perspectives are welcome. Topics are encouraged that explore how policies are defined and implemented in the context of the intersection between academia, interest groups, social movements, and public opinion. To what degree is academic scholarship relevant to the definition of policy problems and the operation of political processes? Have the definitions of policy problems changed over time in relation to academic research and political activism?

Papers addressing political and policy concerns from historical perspectives also are very welcome. Of particular interest are topics that focus on historical institutionalism and the intersection between the study of the history of women's rights and political participation and historical analyses focusing on processes of political change, including modernization, globalization, and democratization. These studies can ask questions about the relative significance of race, class, and gender in the formation, operation, and change in political systems; the way instruments of governance, such as legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government respond to or inhibit inclusivity in the polity; and assess the relationship between economic opportunities and civil liberties and civil rights as cornerstones of a political system. In particular, how do the politics and policies associated with state-building set the parameters for the incorporation of women as equal citizens in the political system and how do class and race mediate that incorporation? Cross-national perspectives also are encouraged.

A legacy of the research on women and politics is a sophisticated appreciation of methodology and the way methodologies intersect with subjects of study. Another theme encouraged as a topic for papers, panels, and roundtables is the examination of methodological issues in relation to feminist scholarship. How does scholarship on women and politics advance with the use of rational choice models, quantitative methods, and qualitative research, including case studies and discourse analysis? What has been the impact of post-modernism on the study of women and politics? What are the range of causal models that explain patterns of political participation, public policy formation, and institutions over historical time? When identifying gender as a category of analysis, what is the research implication of locating gender as the explanatory variable accounting for change in political participation, public policies, governmental structures, or historical analyses of institutions versus locating gender as the category that results from particular political participation norms, public policies, governmental arrangements, and the particular cast of institutional structures over historical time? That is, what is the research significance of gender as the independent or dependent variable of analysis?

Finally, topics are welcome that focus on the relationship between ideas, institutions, and policies. To what degree are defining concepts and principles connected to the operation of formal and informal political processes and patterns of policy outputs? To what degree does the institutionalization of cultural norms liberate or limit women's positions within political systems?

**Division 32** ☆**Race, Ethnicity, and Politics.** Andrew Aoki, Augsburg College and Valerie Martinez-Ebers, Texas Christian University

Researchers in the area of Race, Ethnicity and Politics (REP) have tended to be very concerned about on-going public policy debates; in fact, the REP section was formed in part out of a desire to provide more opportunities for the examination of policy questions relevant to the area.

Accordingly, we presume that many of those interested in REP probably come down strongly in favor of a political science deeply engaged in actual politics which makes this year's conference theme particularly challenging for our section. To what extent are deeply held political commitments in tension with widely accepted scholarly standards in the profession? Can such standards (emphasizing, for instance, methods which are assumed to limit research bias) coexist easily with scholarship motivated by a desire for political change? Are these standards a social construction which works as a conservative force in the discipline?

We welcome proposals which address these questions, as well as proposals which contribute to our knowledge of specific political issues, such as affirmative action; immigration; the English Only movement; the political interaction between different racial and ethnic groups; and the changing political influence of different racial and ethnic groups, including but not limited to the changes in the political engagement of these groups.

In addition, we encourage proposals relevant to other aspects of the conference theme, such as papers which examine the centrality of race and gender in politics, and the interaction between them (and class as well). We also invite proposals that examine the extent to which issues of race and ethnicity span political boundaries, and must be seen in a larger, and possibly even global, setting.

Proposals are welcome from a broad range of scholars and methodologies.

**Division 33** ☆**Religion and Politics.** Corwin Smidt, Calvin College

Scholars of religion and politics will find many arenas within which they may engage the theme of the 1999 conference: *"Political Science and the World of Politics and Policy: Contribution and Impact."* From constitutional issues related to religious establishment and religious liberty to legislative proposals linking American foreign policy to a country's treatment of religious minorities, from philosophical debates related to the appropriateness of the state to regulate what is deemed to be immoral behavior to empirical assessments of the consequences of particular statutes related to religious issues (e.g., abortion, state lotteries, school vouchers, welfare reform), scholars of religion and politics are well positioned to engage in a reflective discussion of whether and to what extent the "real" world should be of concern to political scientists. And, in keeping with the fact that the 1999 meeting will be the last of this century, scholars of religion and politics are also invited to propose papers that focus upon where the discipline has been and where it might go, particularly as it relates to the subfield of religion and politics.

Papers need not, however, fall within the conference theme in order to be considered; any proposal related to the general topic of religion and politics will be given due consideration. And, in keeping with the broad representations of fields within the religion and politics, proposals are welcome from all scholarly subfields regardless of methodological approach.

**Division  
34**

☆ **Representation and Electoral Systems.** Shaheen Mozaffar, Bridgewater State College

The substantive concerns of our Division speak directly to the 1999 APSA Conference theme. Theoretically informed research clarifying how different electoral systems shape political representation produces usable knowledge about institutional choice and institutional designs that may help sustain established democracies and consolidate new ones. Today, political scientists participate in designing electoral systems in both new and established democracies.

I invite both panel and individual paper proposals that continue this dialogue and/or present new analyses and findings in the field of representation and electoral systems. The following interrelated themes constitute a suggestive framework for submissions:

**"Real" World Implications:** Electoral systems are highly susceptible to political engineering. Politically charged debates over appropriate electoral systems, minority representation, and constituency boundaries resonate in both new and established democracies today. Submissions can focus on, *inter alia*, the choice of electoral systems as settlements to political conflicts, how electoral systems mitigate/aggravate political conflicts, the potential lessons of the American experience in dealing with conflicts over minority representation and constituency boundaries for other multiethnic societies, and the potential lessons from these societies for the United States.

**Democracy and Constitutionalism:** The current global resurgence of democracy involves the simultaneous emergence of new democracies and the spread of identity politics in both new and established democracies. These developments echo earlier debates over "majoritarian" and "consensus" visions of democracy, challenge liberal orthodoxy about procedural democracy based on individual rights, and resurrect concerns about the tensions inherent in the very logic of constitutional democracy. Submissions can focus on, *inter alia*, the role of electoral systems in peacefully accommodating these tensions and the potential role of electoral systems in either creating and sustaining "constitutionalized tyrannies" or enhancing the survival of constitutional democracy in the next century.

**Theoretical Developments:** Electoral systems research contributes directly to theorizing about the choice and consequences of political institutions. The global resurgence of democracy offers a unique opportunity to expand the empirical base of theory building. Submissions can focus on *inter alia*, comparing electoral systems choice in first and third wave democracies and among third wave democracies, the interactive effect of

structure and agency on electoral systems design, the role of contextual variables (e.g. institutional legacies, ethnic fragmentation/concentration, constituency size, etc.) in mitigating the direct effect of electoral systems on patterns of political representation, the structure of emergent party systems and the formation of durable governments and new methodologies (e.g. GIS technology) for measuring the design and consequences of electoral systems.

**Division  
35** ☆ **Political Organizations and Parties.** Candice J. Nelson, The American University

Papers are encouraged in the areas of political parties, interest groups, and social movements, broadly defined. A variety of approaches are welcome. In keeping with the 1999 Annual Meeting theme of political science's contribution to and impact on the real world of politics, I am particularly interested in paper proposals which link political parties, interest groups and social movements with real world experiences, problems, and solutions. For example, what can we as political scientists contribute to an understanding of political parties' use of independent expenditures in elections and the consequences for election outcomes? These are suggestions in one very specific area; proposals are encouraged which reflect the diverse research interests of this section. Papers can address empirical examinations of political science's contributions to understanding these organizations and movements. Alternatively, they can address the normative question of whether political scientists have a responsibility to become involved in policy debates, proposals and solutions in these areas.

Since this is the last annual meeting of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, I also encourage papers which can take an historical perspective and look at the contributions political science has made in understanding interest groups, political parties and social movements during the entire century.

Paper abstracts should offer a clear explanation of the theoretical issues to be addressed, the methodological approach to be used, and the nature of the data to be analyzed.

**Division  
36** ☆ **Elections and Voting Behavior.** Janet Box-Steffensmeier, Ohio State University

The theme of the 1999 American Political Science Association Conference revolves around the linkages between political science as a discipline and the "real" world of politics and public policy. I am seeking papers that provide an overview of the subfield, evaluate where political scientists have made a contribution, and discuss what questions loom large for future research in elections and electoral behavior. Papers exploring the connections between political behavior and public policy or institutional arrangements are also encouraged. The



theme specifically touches upon issues of race and gender and the historical treatment of these issues. More generally, a concern for historical connections to the examination of issues relating to elections and electoral behavior is encouraged.

Political behavior has been characterized as showing trends towards the "individualization of politics" (Dalton and Wattenberg). I encourage papers analyzing such trends as party detachment, lack of political realignment, less reliance on social groups, low voter turnout, the rise of single issue interests among voters, or split-ticket voting. Furthermore, what are the implications for campaigns, elections, and democratic systems of a more inwardly oriented style of decision making? Papers placing the individualization of political choice into the context of institutions and for different levels (such as president versus congress or national versus local) would be very helpful.

Of course, proposals for papers on American or comparative elections are welcome, as are all methodological approaches to the study of elections and electoral behavior.

**Division 37** ☆**Public Opinion and Participation.** John Zaller, University of California, Los Angeles

Studies of public opinion and participation intersect the "real world" of politics at certain points. Some research aims at reforming the electoral process or enhancing citizens' participation in it. Other studies aim at refinements in the measurement of opinion that may be of practical value to policy makers. In keeping with the theme of the 1999 annual meeting, papers that emphasize these or related topics will be given special consideration. Papers need not, however, fall within the theme of real world relevance in order to be considered. Any paper relevant to the traditional research program of the field of public opinion and participation will be given due consideration. Proposals to investigate novel topics, attempts to get beyond existing paradigms, and review essays are also welcome. Proposals that offer detailed arguments, outlines or descriptions of findings may be favored over proposals that make only general statements of what the paper will accomplish.

**Division 38** ☆**Political Communication.** Steven Livingston, George Washington University

What is the proper relationship between scholarly inquiry into political communication phenomena and the 'real world' of politics and policy? In keeping with the theme of the 1999 meeting of the American Political Science Association, the focus of the Political Communication Division centers on the role of political communication in the political and policy process. It is also a time for reflection. The 1999 meeting marks not only the last

meeting of the century and millennium, but also the tenth anniversary of the founding of the Political Communication Division of the APSA.

What is the proper role of political communication scholarship in the practical life of the political world? Are political communication scholars better suited to the development of communication models, media effects theories, and other pursuits in basic research without concern for more immediate issues relating to communication, politics and policy? Or is such a question not appropriately applied to political communication research in the first place, given the field's traditional concern over, among other items, the quality of democratic communication. Is such an 'either-or' formulation even necessary in political communication scholarship?

Political scientists have varying degrees of concern with the development of theory and model building, on the one hand, and with more direct and immediate participation in the concerns of politics and policy, on the other. Where along this scale should political communication scholarship find its niche? What authoritative claims about the world can political communication scholarship make? These are the sort of questions that capture the spirit of the APSA meeting in 1999.

As we recognize the tenth anniversary of our division's formation, it is perhaps appropriate that we take stock of our growing field and measure its place in the large community of political science and assess where we wish to go in the next decade (and century).

**Division 39** ☆**Science, Technology, and Environmental Politics.** Dianne Rahm, Iowa State University

Science, Technology, and Environmental Politics issues are central factors of modern life. Advances in science and changes in technology have had vast impacts on life over the last century. Changes in science and technology have fueled economic growth by raising productivity levels and along with them the standard of living for millions. The fruits of science and technology include powerful medicines to cure us of once fatal illnesses and improved foods so that we are better nourished. Changes in science and technology have brought new and easier modes of transportation and communication. The information revolution and improved transportation technology has created the infrastructure out of which a global society is emerging. The first flight to the moon returned pictures rather shocking in their lack of political borders thus giving rise to the environmental notion of Spaceship Earth.

This environmental consciousness has grown vigorously over the last several decades, drawing our attention to the negative legacy left by some science and technology

applications. The political employment of science and technology for war has produced nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons of mass destruction. Applications of science and technology have generated millions of tons of toxic waste, polluted our air, contaminated our water, put holes in the protective ozone layer, and perhaps precipitated a change in the global climate.

Government, particularly in the post-war period, has both promoted scientific research and technological development as well as reacted to their social impacts. What role has the discipline of political science played in this regard and what role can it play? With what practical and applied matters related to science, technology, and environmental policy can political scientists assist? What is the role of political science in a world where societies are increasingly defined by the level of their science and technology?

**Division 40** ☆ **Computers and Multimedia.** Kent E. Portney, Tufts University

Advances in Information Technology (IT) have begun to globalize the nature of political communications as never before. What once was thought to constitute local or national politics have now become international by virtue of increasing access to the Internet and World Wide Web (WWW). Opportunities for Political Scientists to become instantaneously connected to these real worlds of politics have never been greater. The Computers and Multimedia Section (CMS) welcomes paper, panel, roundtable, and poster-session proposals that contribute to our understanding of the role of IT in political and policy making processes, or that advance our understanding of how to use IT to connect our students to real worlds of politics. We also solicit proposals for short-course workshops on specific IT, Internet, World Wide Web, or multimedia applications.

The CMS has been aggressive in encouraging research on the impact of IT on politics and policy making, and further explorations in these issues are highly appropriate. We have begun to see a virtual explosion of analyses of the practice and potential for IT to contribute to the effective function of democracy and democratization around the world. Proposals which advance our understanding of the promise, performance, and pitfalls of IT for affecting governance are encouraged.

Also appropriate are analyses of the effects of IT on the political science profession and the scholarly community. Proposals assessing applications of IT that promise to improve the quality of scholarship in the discipline are welcome. Presentations may address new approaches to scholarly publication and communications (including Web-based publication), or the use of the WWW as a research tool for interactively collecting, archiving, making widely accessible, and displaying data.

We also anticipate a number of presentations on innovative instructional applications of IT. Although systematic analyses of the learning effects of using IT to teach political science are rare, proposals which report on such analyses are welcome, particularly proposals which seek to contribute to or extend current learning theories. Papers may also address issues of the criteria and standards for assessing effective IT applications, or that provide guidelines for the evaluation of the quality of WWW-based resources. Recently there has been much consternation associated with the increased use of the Web by students in writing course-based papers, and there are very few materials available to help us guide our students in deciding upon which WWW resources they should rely.

Demonstrations of new and innovative instructional applications on the Internet or WWW, or other instructional technologies, such as dedicated course Web sites, are generally excellent candidates for poster sessions. Hands-on workshops to demonstrate new or innovative approaches would be highly appropriate candidates for CMS short courses.

The CMS encourages presenters to make use of IT in their presentations, and to archive their papers, or to create links to their own web sites on the CMS Web site at [www.apsanet.org/~cms/](http://www.apsanet.org/~cms/) in advance of the conference.

**Division 41** ☆ **Politics and Literature.** Joseph Alulis, North Park University

Literature is by its nature in, of, and about the "real world". As such it constitutes a valuable resource for political scientists for thinking about their discipline's relation to that world. The Division welcomes proposals for papers, panels, and posters that explore what literature has to tell us about political science's understanding of the world and, more broadly, about the impact of "politics and policy" upon the world and about the world's contemporary shape and possible future.

At century's end contributors are particularly encouraged to think of the great initiatives of social transformation that have marked the last one hundred years. What can political science learn from literature about these social experiments, their causes and effects, their successes and failures? To what degree has literature been a greater catalyst for social and political change and a more accurate and sensitive register of the impact of such changes than political science? Proposals might involve utopian and dystopian literature, historical fiction and drama, and literary works, or works by literary figures, expressly intended to promote or critique social or political change or to explore generally the contribution of literature to the shaping of society.

Policies are intended to change society as a whole; success is measured in the aggregate. But policies work by the way they affect individuals and ultimately must be judged by the worth of the kinds of lives they make possible or necessary for particular human beings. Literature, while it may portray societies, classes, and nations, deals always with the daily lives of individuals, the choices they make and the myriad of factors that shape those choices. What does literature teach us about the personal dimension of social change and policy making and how does that affect the contribution that political science can make to these activities?

The post-cold war world presents an ambiguous aspect to the political scientist. Has the world become more alike, sharing a single, global culture or, in the wake of the ideological struggle of the last half century, has the non-western world reverted to older cultural traditions in search of a distinct identity? How does contemporary literature help us to answer this question? Proposals might deal with the impact of western culture in all its forms upon the non-western world, contemporary literature in different regions, and the politics of literature in the non-western world.

Proposals are particularly welcome which deal with the contribution of film, both documentary and dramatic, in all the areas of discussion outlined above.

**Division 42** ☆ **New Political Science.** Manfred B. Steger, Illinois State University

Promoting both a critical and activist approach to the discipline of political science, the New Political Science Section has persistently emphasized the connection between theory and practice. Our concern for the political, social, and economic problems of the "real world", such as existing disparities of wealth and well-being, disregard for human rights, and the workings of unaccountable power connects well to next year's conference theme, *"Political Science and the World of Politics and Policy: Contribution and Impact."* Proposals for this division, while covering a broad spectrum of the field, should therefore engage in a critical discussion of the relationship between "real-world politics" and political science as an academic field, and the responsibility of political scientists to contribute to human betterment and global social justice.

Paper proposals might reflect on the full impact of the political decisions that shaped this violent twentieth century, and/or cast a critical eye on the developments of our dawning global era. What role, if any, does political science play in the new arenas of globalization, corporate mega-mergers, cross-cultural encounters, and computerized infotainment? Do political scientists show concern for these developments that go beyond highly

specialized language games and elegant methodological designs that serve academic careers more than the real needs of ordinary people? What kinds of policy contributions that impact the world of politics can reasonably be expected from the representatives of an academic discipline?

How do the structural imperatives of global capital both enable and constrain the interactions between political scientists and politicians/policy-makers? Are there viable alternatives that could successfully challenge existing political practices, policies, and institutions? Does political science actually produce the sort of knowledge that can be used by real political movements for emancipatory purposes, or does the discipline content itself with propagation scientific models and fashionable discourses that ultimately serve the ideological interests of the political and economic status quo?

Indeed, proposals submitted to this Section might explore a host of issues at the core of the relationship between political science and the world of politics and policy. We invite critical and unconventional approaches to the study of politics which open up modes of inquiry that encourage diversity, intellectual honesty, irreverence, innovation, and tolerance. Therefore, we welcome proposals from all a wide variety of engaged perspectives, including feminisms, critical theory, marxism, ecology, postmodernism, cultural theory, hermeneutics, and political economy. We especially encourage contributions from junior colleagues and others submitting to New Political Science for the first time.

**Division 43** ☆ **Ecological and Transformational Politics.** Christa Slaton, Auburn University

The Ecological and Transformational Politics (ETP) Section seeks papers in three areas central to its substantive, methodological and practical missions:

(1) "Action experiments" on transformational concepts like "citizen and/or community empowerment," "environmental sustainability," "race, ethnicity and/or gender equality," and "collaborative problem solving or conflict resolution." An "action experiment" is one set in real life circumstances and aims to test hypotheses based on an explicitly stated value system. Since ETP believes there can be no separation between a political scientist's value system and her/his focus and method of study, papers should emphasize this connection, how the experimenter tried to manage the problems inherent in such a situation, and what the results and findings were. Papers should also try to synthesize the experimental design and findings with similar previous and parallel efforts.

(2) Theoretical/historical analyses of how ETP concepts comprise a “new, more realistic paradigm” in post-modern, post-Newtonian political science. Since it has become abundantly clear that past and current political scientific emphases on legal, structural, historical, philosophical, and positivistic approaches have not put American political scientists in leading positions in American society as analysts or advisors to political leaders or the American people, the APSA is asking for a discussion on the recent “disjuncture between models and empirical reality.” ETP will welcome papers that set forth the paradigmatic insufficiencies in establishment political science and that emphasize elements of the “new paradigm” that set forth a more holistic, transformational, ecological and/or new physics approach to the study, understanding and improvement of politics.

(3) The Globalization of ETP. This section will welcome papers by theorists and experimenters in any area of ETP which describe attempts (successful or unsuccessful) to network with like-minded theorists, academics, and activists in the United States and in other areas of the global community. These attempts may be face-to-face or electronically enhanced or a combination of both. Papers on this subject should also refer to (1) and (2) above and should, if possible, show what plans, if any, are being made to make this project viable for the future.



# 1999 Call for Papers Guidelines for Participation

When submitting panel and individual paper proposals, keep in mind the five participation rules developed by the APSA Council.

## 1. **Participation Limitation**

In the Fall of 1987, in order to provide opportunities in the Annual Meeting by the greatest number of people, the APSA Council limited participation in the Program. As a result, presenters are limited to **TWO APPEARANCES** on sessions organized by the APSA Program Committee, Organized Sections, and Related Group panels. Exception: Poster Session participation does not count toward the two-participation rule.

An appearance on the Annual Meeting Program takes the form of chair, paper or roundtable presenter, or discussant. **Note:** Appearing as a chair and a discussant on one panel counts as two participations.

## 2. **Preregistration**

The APSA Council requires all program participants to preregister by **March 12, 1999**. Participants who do not preregister by March 12 **will not** be listed in the Final Program.

## 3. **Exempt Participants**

Prospective participants may request of a division chair or panel organizer an exemption from the preregistration requirement if they are: **A) not a political scientist; B) appearing on only one panel; and C) not an exempt participant in 1998**. An exempt participant receives a badge for admission to all Annual Meeting activities but will not receive an Annual Meeting Program or the reduced hotel rate.

## 4. **Paper Delivery**

As paper presenters you have three important obligations: A) to ensure that the members of your panel, especially discussants, receive your paper in time to read it carefully prior to the meeting; B) to submit 50 copies of the paper to the panel paper room at the hotel by the first day of the Annual Meeting; and C) to submit your paper to PROceedings, APSA's online collection of Annual Meeting papers.

## 5. **Panel Schedule**

Panels are scheduled in fourteen (14) time slots beginning at 8:45 a.m. on Thursday and concluding at 12:30 p.m. on Sunday. Participants are expected to be available for any of the fourteen time slots. If your schedule is limited by a teaching or travel constraint, inform the division chair or panel organizer upon your acceptance as a participant, or by March 12, 1999.

Deadline: Monday, November 16, 1998

## 1999 Proposal Submission Process

APSA revised the proposal submission process beginning in 1996 in order to reduce the administrative burden placed on members of the Program Committee. All proposals should now be sent to APSA directly where the Annual Meeting staff will accumulate and organize submissions for each Program Division, acknowledge receipt of proposals, and forward proposals to the appropriate Division Chairs in December. Division Chairs will review proposals and organize panels in January and begin notifying individuals and panel organizers of acceptance or rejection in February. Please pay special attention to the submission instructions below.

1. It is VERY important that you indicate the Division or Divisions to which you are submitting your proposal(s). You may submit each proposal to **no more than two** Divisions.
2. You are limited to submitting **no more than two** papers or **two** organized panel proposals. Additional proposals from the same author or organizer will not be accepted. [See the previous page, **Guidelines for Participation** "Participation Limitation"]
3. All submissions must be postmarked or received electronically by **Monday, November 16, 1998**. Submissions postmarked after November 16<sup>th</sup> will be returned. No exceptions. All proposal submissions will receive a confirmation postcard from APSA via mail by December 22, 1998.
4. You will be notified of your proposal's acceptance or rejection by Program Division Chairs by February 15, 1999. If you have not received notification by February 15<sup>th</sup>, contact the Division Chairs directly. (See contact information in the December issue of *PS* and posted on the APSA web site on December 1, 1998 at <http://www.apsanet.org/99AM/chairlist.html>.)
5. **WEB SUBMISSIONS** Submissions will be accepted via interactive forms on the APSA website (<http://www.apsanet.org/>), which is the suggested method of submission.\* These forms will be available September 8, 1998. Upon submission of a web proposal, you will receive an immediate message acknowledging that your proposal was received. *Please print this page for your records.*
6. **EMAIL SUBMISSIONS** Submissions will be accepted in the following format: A) sent as a WordPerfect or ASCII text attachment to [proposals@apsanet.org](mailto:proposals@apsanet.org) or B) typed into the text of an email message.\* Include all of the information requested on the form(s), followed by the abstract. Each email submission will be acknowledged within 24 hours by return email. *Please print this page for your records.*
7. **MAIL SUBMISSIONS** Paper, panel, chair/discussant, or poster proposals must be accompanied by the appropriate form. If mailing the proposal(s), you must submit **two copies of each abstract and two copies of the appropriate form on the following pages for each division to which you are submitting**. For example, an individual submitting one paper to two divisions must send APSA four copies of the abstract and four copies of the Individual Paper Proposal form. **Proposals will NOT be accepted without two copies for each division**. Mail your proposals to, APSA 1999 Proposal, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20036-1206.\* **No faxes will be accepted.**

\*Do not send your proposal twice: by mail **and** electronic submission.

# Individual Paper Proposal

Please read the guidelines and submission requirements before completing this form.

**Type all information. Maximum - 2 proposals per person.**

1. Paper Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Name\*: \_\_\_\_\_

Co-author, if applicable: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Work Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Home Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Institutional Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Ph.D.: 19 / \_\_\_\_\_  
year institution

19 / \_\_\_\_\_  
year institution

6. Program Committee Divisions to which you are submitting (Limit 2) - Refer to "Call for Papers" on previous pages. **(This will not indicate first choice/second choice - proposals are considered equally by both divisions.)**

Division #: \_\_\_\_\_ Division Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Division #: \_\_\_\_\_ Division Title: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Audio Visual equipment needed: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Abstract - Please attach a description or abstract. Maximum length is 1 page. **Enclose 2 copies of the abstract and 2 copies of this form for each of the divisions to which you are submitting.**

\* Acknowledgments, acceptance/rejection letters will be sent **ONLY** to the first author listed.

# Organized Panel Proposal

Please read the guidelines and submission requirements before completing this form.

**Type all information. Maximum - 2 proposals per person.**

## Guidelines

- You must personally contact all proposed participants and secure their consent to participate.
- You must inform each participant of the preregistration requirement.
- You must inform each participant of the paper delivery requirement.

Proposal for: Panel \_\_\_\_\_ Roundtable \_\_\_\_\_

1. Panel/  
Roundtable  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Organizer\*: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Work Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Home Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Institutional  
Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Program Committee Divisions to which you are submitting (Limit 2) - Refer to "Call for Papers" on previous pages. **(This will not indicate first choice/second choice - proposals are considered equally by both divisions.)**

Division #: \_\_\_\_\_ Division Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Division #: \_\_\_\_\_ Division Title: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Abstract - Please attach a description or abstract of the panel/roundtable. Maximum length is 1 page. **Enclose 2 copies of the abstract and 2 copies of this form and the Panel Information form for each of the divisions to which you are submitting.**

\* Acknowledgments, acceptance/rejection letters will be sent **ONLY** to the Organizer.



# Panel Information

This form should be sent with "Organized Panel Proposal" form and a panel/roundtable abstract.

**Type all information.**

Panel Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Work Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ Home Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Institutional Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_

## Presenters (3 to 4)

Name:	_____	Co-author, if applicable:	_____
Address:	_____		_____
	_____		_____
Work Phone:	_____		_____
Fax:	_____		_____
Email:	_____		_____
Home Phone:	_____		_____
Inst. Affiliation:	_____		_____
Paper Title:	_____		_____

Name:	_____	Co-author, if applicable:	_____
Address:	_____		_____
	_____		_____
Work Phone:	_____		_____
Fax:	_____		_____
Email:	_____		_____
Home Phone:	_____		_____
Inst. Affiliation:	_____		_____
Paper Title:	_____		_____

**Panel Information continued on back.**

**Panel Information continued.**

---

	Co-author, if applicable:
Name: _____	_____
Address: _____ _____	_____
Work Phone: _____	_____
Fax: _____	_____
Email: _____	_____
Home Phone: _____	_____
Inst. Affiliation: _____	_____
Paper Title: _____	_____

---

---

	Co-author, if applicable:
Name: _____	_____
Address: _____ _____	_____
Work Phone: _____	_____
Fax: _____	_____
Email: _____	_____
Home Phone: _____	_____
Inst. Affiliation: _____	_____
Paper Title: _____	_____

---

**Discussants (1 to 2)**

---

Name: _____	_____
Address: _____ _____	_____
Work Phone: _____	_____
Fax: _____	_____
Email: _____	_____
Home Phone: _____	_____
Inst. Affiliation: _____	_____

---

# Chair and Discussant Proposal

Please read the guidelines and submission requirements before completing this form.

**Type all information.**

This form should be used by those interested in chairing a panel or roundtable, or serving as a discussant on a panel or roundtable that has been organized by someone else. Do not submit a proposal to chair a panel or roundtable or serve as a discussant if you are included in a full panel proposal for that session. We will assume, unless informed otherwise, that if you have also submitted an individual paper proposal or an organized panel proposal, those are your first choice activities. Submitting a proposal to be a chair or discussant will not affect the treatment of your other proposals. Because of APSA's rule on multiple participation on a single meeting program, you will be asked to confirm your interest in serving as a chair or discussant later in the process (late February-early March.)

**Check both if applicable: Chair \_\_\_\_\_ Discussant \_\_\_\_\_**

1. Name: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Work Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ Home Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Institutional Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Program Committee Divisions to which you are submitting (Limit 2) - Refer to "Call for Papers" on previous pages. **(This will not indicate first choice/second choice - proposals are considered equally by both divisions.)**

Division #: \_\_\_\_\_ Division Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Division #: \_\_\_\_\_ Division Title: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Ph.D.: 19 / \_\_\_\_\_  
          year                   institution

6. Please attach a brief statement of interest and experience, including the types of panels or roundtables you would be most interested and competent to serve and a curriculum vitae. **Enclose 2 copies of your statement of interest and 2 copies of this form for each of the divisions to which you are submitting.**

# Poster Session Proposal

Please read the guidelines and submission requirements before completing this form.

**Type all information. Maximum - 2 proposals per person.**

A poster session provides an opportunity for one-on-one interaction and discussion of research. Each session lasts for one hour and 45 minutes and consists of a room with 4' x 8' bulletin boards. Presenters arrange their materials - a full paper, an outline, tables, graphs, pictures, etc. - and discuss their topic with interested parties in front of their bulletin board. Poster sessions are organized by general theme and may consist of over 100 presenters. **Note: Poster Session participation is exempt from the two participation rule.**

1. Paper Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Co-author, if applicable:

2. Name\*: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Work Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Home Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Institutional Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. Ph.D.: 19 / \_\_\_\_\_  
year institution 19 / \_\_\_\_\_  
year institution

6. Program Committee Divisions to which you are submitting (Limit 2) - Refer to "Call for Papers" on previous pages. **(This will not indicate first choice/second choice - proposals are considered equally by both divisions.)**

Division #: \_\_\_\_\_ Division Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Division #: \_\_\_\_\_ Division Title: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Abstract - Please attach a description or abstract. Maximum length is 1 page. **Enclose 2 copies of the abstract and 2 copies of this form for each of the divisions to which you are submitting.**

\* Acknowledgments, acceptance/rejection letters will be sent **ONLY** to the first author listed.