

## Notes from the Editors

Issue 4 of Volume 107 closes our first full year at the helm of the Review. We are very grateful for all of the support we have received from our colleagues in the discipline, and we are particularly thankful to everyone who submitted work to the review and to those who agreed to act as referees. We are also happy to present this final issue of the year, which includes pieces that touch on the following fundamental questions facing our discipline. How does one reconcile the tension between different levels of analysis, between holism and individualism? What better explains attitudes towards gender equality: individual-level characteristics or national political contexts? Does city size translate into greater political clout? Does experience with violence shape individual attitudes toward combatants in a civil war? Do resource rents really explain the lack of democratic accountability? How do past patterns of economic interaction explain current levels of interethnic cooperation? And what is the future of multiculturalism? These questions are only some of the issues tackled by the articles in this issue. As with any good work, the pieces in this issue of the *Review* should raise even more questions—and this is exactly what we believe our discipline needs, provocative articles that stimulate exciting new lines of research.

### In this Issue

We chose the cover image is to represent the issue taken up by our lead article, “Methodological Individualism and Holism in Political Science: A Reconciliation.” When is it appropriate to examine individual phenomena in isolation, and when can they only be understood as parts of a greater whole? Social science deals regularly with level-of-analysis problems—how to determine whether to analyze phenomena at lower, “individual” levels or higher, “holistic” levels. Analyses based on lower-level constituents are sometimes branded “reductionist,” whereas higher-level analyses are accused of attributing causation to entities that have no reality. Christian List and Kai Spiekermann take these questions to the level of the philosophy of science. They contend that these disputes are often beside the point: Sometimes individual-level analysis is appropriate, sometimes holism is, sometimes both are. Drawing on insights from across the natural and social sciences, as well as philosophy, they propose a complex typology of phenomena aimed at helping us decide when to use what type of analysis, and for what purposes. Perhaps more importantly, they help us clarify our conceptualizations of the problems we study. Their article should be of interest to political scientists of all persuasions, because it addresses concerns that are foundational to any study of politics.

In “Latin American Attitudes toward Women in Politics: The Influence of Elite Cues, Female Advancement, and Individual Characteristics,” Jana Morgan and Melissa Buice evaluate competing theories re-

garding the impact of context on progress towards gender equality. Due to the traditional marginalization of women in the public sphere in Latin America, it is an especially appropriate context to investigate whether gains in descriptive representation are rooted in increasing acceptance of women as political leaders, or whether women’s gains reflect short-term frustrations and are subject to reversals. Morgan and Buice conclude that support for women in politics is indeed subject to reversals, although economic growth does facilitate the consolidation of gains toward gender equality.

Urban advocates have long argued that big cities in the United States are systematically discriminated against in their state legislatures. The historical explanation was the inherent hostility to cities on the part of over-represented rural and smaller town interests. However, electoral reforms have eliminated this over-representation. In “No Strength in Numbers: The Failure of Big-City Bills in American State Legislatures, 1880–2000,” Gerald Gamm and Thad Kousser assess the relationship between city size and power in state legislatures. Using a new historical dataset, spanning 120 years and 13 states, they demonstrate that big cities with large delegations are at a distinct disadvantage in passing their district bills because size leads to increased internal divisions. Demographic divisions also help explain the low passage rates of district bills.

In “Explaining Support for Combatants during Wartime: A Survey Experiment in Afghanistan,” Jason Lyall, Graeme Blair, and Kosuke Imai report on a survey experiment in villages located in areas sympathetic to the Taliban. They ask whether the attitudes of civilians towards combatants on either side in the conflict are shaped by experiences of harm done to them by these combatants. They find that the impact of such experiences is asymmetrical and dependent on the perpetrator of the harm. Support for the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) is reduced, and support for the Taliban strengthened, when civilians become “collateral damage.” The reverse is not true, however. When the Taliban inflicts harm, this does not result in stronger support for the ISAF. The authors conclude that this asymmetry has implications for understanding perceptions of harm as well as other aspects of the behavior of civilian populations during conflicts.

In “Keeping the Public Purse: An Experiment in Windfalls, Taxes, and the Incentives to Restrain Government” Laura Paler tackles a central issue in the literature on rentierism— that rents from windfall revenue fundamentally undermine political accountability. Indeed, it has long been argued that windfalls derived from external rents free leaders from the need to tax, hence producing a quiescent population. But how does windfall revenue affect whether citizens choose to participate politically, or to remain quiescent? Using a

novel field experiment embedded in a public awareness campaign involving 1,863 citizens in Indonesia, the author finds that when citizens believe that revenue is generated mainly by taxes, citizen monitoring and anti-incumbent political action are increased. However, when given spending information, citizens in the windfall treatment cared just as much about misused revenue as those in the tax treatment. The findings have important implications for the real impact of windfall revenues on political accountability in resource-endowed states.

In “Co-Production, Polycentricity and Value Heterogeneity: The Ostroms’ Public Choice Institutionalism Revisited,” Paul Dragos Aligica and Vlad Tarko refine aspects of the approach pioneered by Elinor and Vincent Ostrom. The refinements are designed to better understand problems of coordination in conditions of deep disagreement or “value heterogeneity.” The resulting approach, they maintain, is different from and in many respects superior to network theory. Aligica and Tarko distinguish different types of market failure that may result from value heterogeneity and argue that such failures require different solutions. Polycentricity—the dispersion of decision-making to diverse centers—is an appropriate solution to the co-production problem specifically, where a good is consumed by those who collectively produce it. This approach, they argue, has several normative consequences, beginning with our understanding of democracy itself, which may be conceived of as a grand co-production scheme. Polycentricity, Aligica and Tarko argue, would hold that decision-making in selected domains should be devolved to quasi-government, quasi-market institutions; such institutions are best suited to create public value in those domains.

How exactly does the personal appeal of a candidate in a high-profile race affect the vote outcomes for candidates in less salient races in concurrent elections? In “Exploiting Friends-and-Neighbors to Estimate Coattail Effects,” Marc Meredith convincingly answers this question using an impressive dataset of county election returns for all statewide executive office elections from 1987 to 2010. More specifically, Meredith takes advantage of the disproportionate support that candidates receive from geographically proximate voters, frequently referred to as the “friends-and-neighbors vote”, to isolate variation in the personal appeal of candidates. His estimates indicate that the increase in the personal vote received by the party’s gubernatorial candidate clearly increases the vote shares received by the same party’s secretary of state and attorney general candidates. However, increases in the personal vote received by down-ballot candidates do not affect vote shares received by gubernatorial or other down-ballot candidates from their parties.

In “Coordination, Collaboration, and the Evolution of Bilateral Cooperation Networks,” Brandon Kinne uses network analysis to test a set of hypotheses regarding how and why networks foster cooperation. He contends that bilateral cooperation agreements pro-

vide states with important information about other states and help overcome impediments to cooperation. He then empirically demonstrates that participation in bilateral agreements does indeed facilitate the formation of additional ties. Hence, such participation endogenously fosters the formation of additional ties and the creation of ever denser networks of cooperation.

In “Social Networks and the Mass Media,” David Siegel considers the complex interaction between social network and mass media influences on individual behavior. Modeling this interaction, he demonstrates that social network structure conditions media’s impact. More specifically, he theoretically shows that social network interactions can amplify media bias, leading to large swings in aggregate behavior. The presence of unified social elites and multiple biased media outlets promulgating countervailing messages may limit the effects of media bias, but media outlets promulgating anti status-quo bias are thought to have an advantage. Thus media bias is generally more effective at driving the population away from a status quo option than toward it. He identifies and discusses several testable hypotheses derived from this theory.

Saumitra Jha in “Trade, Institutions, and Ethnic Tolerance: Evidence from South Asia” uncovers the mechanism by which interethnic cooperation evolved in South Asia. He examines why cooperation between Hindus and Muslims during medieval times created a legacy of ethnic tolerance in the trading towns of South Asia. Using novel town-level data spanning South Asia’s medieval and colonial history, Jha finds that medieval ports, despite being more ethnically mixed, were five times less prone to Hindu-Muslim riots between 1850–1950 than other towns. He argues that this is because medieval Hindus and Muslims were able to provide complementary, non-replicable services and a mechanism to share the gains from exchange, which resulted in a sustained legacy of tolerance that continues to the present.

Sarah Kreps and Gustavo Flores-Macías, in their timely study “Political Parties at War: A Study of American War Finance, 1789–2010,” ask the question: What determines how a state finances war? States can choose to adopt war taxes or alternative means (such as borrowing or expanding the money supply) to obtain the resources necessary for war. Kreps and Flores-Macías argue that the choice of the means to finance a war has enduring, and often redistributive, implications for society. They show that partisan preferences affect how wars are financed, and conclude that—to the degree that certain strategies for financing war permit leaders to hide the real cost of war—the means of war financing has implications for democratic accountability.

Michael Tomz and Jessica Weeks investigate the role of public opinion in the consistent finding that democracies do not fight other democracies in their article “Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace.” This article relies on a survey experiment conducted in both the United States and the United Kingdom. Tomz and Weeks find that the public differentiates between

democratic and autocratic opponents, and is substantially less supportive of military strikes against democracies than against virtually identical autocracies. Their experiments demonstrate that this difference in tolerance for military action is based on perceptions of threat and morality, rather than on expectations regarding the costs of war or the risks of failure. In this way, public opinion in democracies helps foster and sustain the democratic peace.

We close this issue with a forum on a series of issues that agitate political theory, political science, and the political world at large in this age of multiculturalism. What counts as a cultural disruption, of the sort that multiculturalism is pledged to avoid? Alan Patten put forward a “social lineage account” of cultural transmission in these pages in 2011; William James Booth objects in the current issue that this account suffers from significant defects. This account implicitly relies on an “essentialist” notion of culture, Booth maintains, taking certain aspects of a culture to define its essence, whose loss would be the loss of that culture. At the same time, it must regard liberal and illiberal cultures as equally worthy of preservation, because all are transmitted in the same way. Patten challenges the assertion that he relies on any form of essentialism, and arguing that the social lineage account is fully able to disqualify illiberal elements of culture. We must bear in mind, he says, that even cultures with illiberal elements have other elements that are fully compatible with liberalism. The Patten-Booth discussion sheds light on the thorny questions surrounding cultural respect and preservation in the politics of today’s multicultural societies.

## INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

The *American Political Science Review* (APSR) publishes scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. A significant advance in understanding of politics—whether empirical, interpretive, or theoretical—is the criterion for publication in the *Review*. Because the APSR reaches a diverse audience, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates or answers an important research question of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must strive to be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

The APSR publishes original work. Submissions should not include tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that already have been published or are forthcoming in other places. In many cases, republication of such material would violate the copyright of the other publisher. Neither does the APSR consider submissions that are currently under review at other journals or that duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts submitted to other publishers (whether of books, printed periodicals, or online journals). If you have any questions about whether these policies apply

in your case, you should address the issues in a cover letter to the editors or as part of the author comments section during online submission. You should also notify the editors of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, during the pendency of your submission’s review at the APSR—regardless of whether they have yet been accepted. The editors may request copies of related publications.

The APSR uses a double-blind review process. You should follow the guidelines for preparing an anonymous submission in the “Specific Procedures” section that follows.

If your manuscript contains quantitative evidence and analysis, you should describe your procedures in sufficient detail to permit reviewers to understand and evaluate what has been done and—in the event the article is accepted for publication—to permit other scholars to replicate your results and to carry out similar analyses on other data sets. With surveys, for example, provide sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings; calculate response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys* (Lenexa, KS: AAPOR, 2006).<sup>1</sup> For experiments, provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, payments to subjects, debriefing procedures, and so on. In any case involving human subjects, the editors may require certification of appropriate institutional review and/or conformity with generally accepted norms.<sup>2</sup>

The strength of evidence necessary for publication of quantitative empirical findings cannot be captured by any single criterion, such as the conventional .05 level of statistical significance. The journal’s coeditors—following the evolving disciplinary standard among reviewers—will evaluate the strength of findings on a range of criteria beyond statistical significance, including substantive significance, theoretical aptness, the importance of the problem under study, and the feasibility of obtaining additional evidence.

In addition, authors of quantitative or experimental articles are expected to address the issue of data availability. You must normally indicate both where (online) you will deposit the information that is necessary to reproduce the numerical results and when that information will be posted (such as “on publication” or “by [definite date]”). You should be prepared, when posting, to provide not only the data used in the analysis but also the syntax files, specialized software, and any other information necessary to reproduce the numerical results in the manuscript. Where an exception is claimed, you should clearly explain why the data or other critical materials used in the manuscript cannot

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.aapor.org/standards.asp>

<sup>2</sup> One widely accepted guide to such norms is given by the American Anthropological Association’s Code of Ethics, particularly Section III. <http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/upload/AAA-Ethics-Code-2009.pdf>

be shared, or why they must be embargoed for a limited period beyond publication.

Similarly, authors of qualitative, observational, or textual articles, or of articles that combine such methods with quantitative analysis, should indicate their sources fully and clearly enough to permit ready verification by other scholars—including precise page references to any published material cited and clear specification (e.g., file number) of any archival sources. Wherever possible, use of interactive citations is encouraged. Where field or observational research is involved, anonymity of participants will always be respected; but the texts of interviews, group discussions, observers' notes, etc., should be made available on the same basis (and subject to the same exceptions) as with quantitative data.

For articles that include candidate gene or candidate gene-by-environment studies, *APSR* uses the same policy as the journal *Behavior Genetics*.<sup>3</sup> In relevant part, that policy states that an article will normally be considered for publication only if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- It was an exploratory study or test of a novel hypothesis, but with an adequately powered, direct replication study *reported in the same paper*.
- It was an exploratory analysis or test of a novel hypothesis in the context of an adequately powered study, and the finding meets the statistical criteria for genome wide significance—taking into account all sources of multiple testing (e.g. phenotypes, genotypes, environments, covariates, subgroups).
- It is a rigorously conducted, adequately powered, direct replication study of a previously reported result.

Articles should be self-contained; you should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of these basic research procedures.

American Political Science Review Vol. 106, No. 4

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by italicizing the entire name of the variable—the first time it is mentioned in the text—and by capitalizing its first letter in all uses. You should also use the same names for variables in text, tables, and figures. Do not use acronyms or computational abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables that appear in tables or figures should have been mentioned in the text, standard summary statistics (n, mean, median, standard deviation, range, etc.) provided, and the reason for their inclusion discussed. However, tables and figures should also be comprehensible without reference to the text (e.g., in any figures, axes should be clearly labeled). Please bear in mind also that neither the published or online versions of the *Review* normally can provide figures in color; be sure that a grayscale version will be comprehensible to referees and readers.

<sup>3</sup> *Behavior Genetics* 42 (2012): 1–2, DOI 10.1007/s10519-011-9504-zvi

You may be asked to submit additional documentation if procedures are not sufficiently clear. If you advise readers that additional information is available on request, you should submit equally anonymous copies of that information with your manuscript as “supplemental materials.” If this additional information is extensive, please inquire about alternate procedures.

Manuscripts that, in the judgment of the co-editors, are largely or entirely critiques of, or commentaries on, articles previously published in the *Review* will be reviewed for possible inclusion in a forum section, using the same general procedures as for other manuscripts. Well before any publication, however, such manuscripts will also be sent to the scholar(s) whose work is being addressed. The author(s) of the previously published article will be invited to comment to the editors and to submit a rejoinder, which also will be peer-reviewed. While the *Review* does publish forums these are published very rarely. We do not publish rejoinders to rejoinders.

The *APSR* accepts only electronic submissions (at [www.editorialmanager.com/apsr](http://www.editorialmanager.com/apsr)). The web site provides detailed information about how to submit, what formatting is required, and what type of digital files may be uploaded. Please direct any questions regarding new submissions to the journal's editorial offices at [apsr@unt.edu](mailto:apsr@unt.edu).

## Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should be no longer than 12,000 words including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices intended for publication. Font size must be at least 12 point for all parts of the submission, including notes and references, and all body text (including references) should be double-spaced. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. Explanatory footnotes may be included but should not be used for simple citations. Do not use endnotes. Observe all of the further formatting instructions given on our web site. Doing so lightens the burden on reviewers, copyeditors, and compositors. Submissions that violate our guidelines on formatting or length will be rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text, but with an in-text locator for each, in any case (e.g., [Table 3 about here]). If your submission is accepted for publication, you may also be asked to submit high resolution digital source files of graphs, charts, or other types of figures. Following acceptance, all elements within any tables submitted (text, numerals, symbols, etc.) should be accessible for editing and reformatting to meet the journal's print specifications (e.g., they should not be included as single images not subject to reformatting). If you have any doubts about how to format the required in-text citations and/or bibliographic reference sections, please consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (16th ed.; Chicago:



University of Chicago Press, 2010) and review recent issues of the *APSR*.

### Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. Before submitting any manuscript to the *APSR*, download a PDF of the Transfer of Copyright Agreement from the Editorial Manager login page at <http://www.editorialmanager.com/aprs> and be sure its terms and requirements, as well as the permissions granted to authors under its provisions, are acceptable to you. A signed agreement will be required for all work published in this journal.
2. When you submit (at [www.editorialmanager.com/aprs](http://www.editorialmanager.com/aprs)), you will be invited to provide a short list of appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. Do not include on this list anyone who has already commented on the research included in your submission. Likewise, exclude any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends. You may also “oppose” potential reviewers by name, as potentially biased or otherwise inappropriate, but you will be expected to provide specific reasons. The editors will refer to these lists in selecting reviewers, though there can be no guarantee that this will influence final reviewer selections.
3. You will also be required to upload a minimum of two separate files.
  - a) An “anonymous” digital file of your submission, which should not include any information that identifies the authors. Also excluded should be the names of any other collaborators in the work (including research assistants or creators of tables or figures). Likewise do not provide in-text links to any online databases used that are stored on any personal web sites or at institutions with which any of the co-authors are affiliated. Do not otherwise thank colleagues or include institution names, web addresses, or other potentially identifying information.
  - b) A separate title page should include the full manuscript title, plus names and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, and e-mail address) for all credited authors, in the order their names should appear, as well as each author’s academic rank and institutional affiliation. You may also include any acknowledgements or other author notes about the development of the research (e.g., previous presentations of it) as part of this separate title page. In the case of multiple authors, indicate which should receive all correspondence from the *APSR*. You may also choose to include a cover letter.
4. Please make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.
5. If your previous publications are cited, please do so in a way that does not make the authorship of the work being submitted to the *APSR* obvious. This is usually best accomplished by referring to yourself and any co-authors in the third person and including normal references to the work cited within the list of references. Your prior publications should be included in the reference section in their normal alphabetical location. Assuming that in-text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should not redact self-citations and references (possible exceptions being any work that is “forthcoming” in publication, and which may not be generally accessible to others). Manuscripts with potentially compromised anonymity may be returned, potentially delaying the review processes.

### Further questions

Do not hesitate, in any cases of doubt, to consult the *APSR* Editorial Offices with more specific questions by telephone (940–891–6803) or by sending an e-mail to: [aprs@unt.edu](mailto:aprs@unt.edu)

### ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE APSR

Back issues of the *APSR* are available in several electronic formats and through several vendors. Except for the last three years (as an annually “moving wall”), back issues of the *APSR* beginning with Volume 1, Number 1 (November 1906), are available on-line through JSTOR (<http://www.jstor.org/>). At present, JSTOR’s complete journal collection is available only via institutional subscription, e.g., through many college and university libraries. For APSA members who do not have access to an institutional subscription to JSTOR, individual subscriptions to its *APSR* content are available. Please contact Member Services at APSA for further information, including annual subscription fees.

Individual members of the American Political Science Association can access recent issues of the *APSR*, *Perspectives*, and *PS* through the APSA website ([www.apsanet.org](http://www.apsanet.org)) with their username and password. Individual nonmember access to the online edition will also be available, but only through institutions that hold either a print-plus-electronic subscription or an electronic-only subscription, provided the institution has registered and activated its online subscription.

Full text access to current issues of the *APSR*, *Perspectives*, and *PS* is also available on-line by library subscription from a number of database vendors. Currently, these include University Microfilms Inc. (UMI) (via its CD-ROMs General Periodicals Online and Social Science Index and the on-line database ProQuest Direct), Online Computer Library Center

(OCLC) (through its on-line database First Search as well as on CD-ROMs and magnetic tape), and the Information Access Company (IAC) (through its products Expanded Academic Index, InfoTrac, and several on-line services [see below]). Others may be added from time to time.

The *APSR* is also available on databases through six online services: Datastar (Datastar), Business Library (Dow Jones), Cognito (IAC), Encarta Online Library (IAC), IAC Business (Dialog), and Newsearch (Dialog).

The editorial office of the *APSR* is not involved in the subscription process to either JSTOR for back issues or the other vendors for current issues. Please contact APSA, your reference librarian, or the database vendor for further information about availability.

## OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

The American Political Science Association's address, telephone, and fax are 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 483-2512 (voice), and (202) 483-2657 (fax). E-mail: [apsa@apsanet.org](mailto:apsa@apsanet.org). Please direct correspondence as follows.

Information, including news and notes, for *PS*:

Dr. Robert J-P. Hauck, Editor, *PS*  
E-mail: [rhauck@apsanet.org](mailto:rhauck@apsanet.org)

Circulation and subscription correspondence (domestic claims for non receipt of issues must be made within four months of the month of publication; overseas claims, within eight months):

Director of Member Services  
E-mail: [membership@apsanet.org](mailto:membership@apsanet.org)  
Reprint permissions:  
E-mail: [Rights@cambridge.org](mailto:Rights@cambridge.org)

Advertising information and rates:  
Advertising Coordinator,  
Cambridge University Press  
E-mail: [journals.advertising@cambridge.org](mailto:journals.advertising@cambridge.org)

## EXPEDITING REQUESTS FOR COPYING APSR, PERSPECTIVES, AND PS ARTICLES FOR CLASS USE AND OTHER PURPOSES

### Class Use

The Comprehensive Publisher Photocopy Agreement between APSA and the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) permits bookstores and copy centers to receive expedited clearance to copy articles from the *APSR* and *PS* in compliance with the Association's policies and applicable fees. The general fee for articles is 75 cents per copy. However, current Association policy levies no fee for the first 10 copies of a printed article, whether in course packs or on reserve. Smaller classes that rely heavily on articles (i.e., upper-level undergraduate and graduate classes) can take

advantage of this provision, and faculty ordering 10 or fewer course packs should bring it to the attention of course pack providers. APSA policy also permits free use of the electronic library reserve, with no limit on the number of students who can access the electronic reserve. Both large and small classes that rely on these articles can take advantage of this provision. The CCC's address, telephone, and fax are 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400 (voice), and (978) 750-4474 (fax). This agreement pertains only to the reproduction and distribution of APSA materials as hard copies (e.g., photocopies, microfilm, and microfiche).

The Association of American Publishers (AAP) has created a standardized form for college faculty to submit to a copy center or bookstore to request copyrighted material for course packs. The form is available through the CCC, which will handle copyright permissions.

APSA also has a separate agreement pertaining to CCC's Academic E-Reserve Service. This agreement allows electronic access for students and instructors of a designated class at a designated institution for a specified article or set of articles in electronic format. Access is by password for the duration of a class.

Please contact your librarian, the CCC, or the APSA Reprints Department for further information.

## APSR Authors

If you are the author of an *APSR* article, you may use your article in course packs or other printed materials without payment of royalty fees and you may post it at personal or institutional web sites as long as the APSA copyright notice is included.

## Other Uses of APSA-Copyrighted Materials

For any further copyright issues, please contact the APSA Reprints Department.

## INDEXING

Articles appearing in the *APSR* before June 1953 were indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. Current issues are indexed in *ABC Pol Sci; America, History and Life 1954-*; Book Review Index; Current Contents: Social and Behavioral Sciences; EconLit; *Energy Information Abstracts*; Environmental Abstracts; Historical Abstracts; Index of Economic Articles; Information Service Bulletin; International Bibliography of Book Reviews of Scholarly Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; International Bibliography of Periodical Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; International Index; International Political Science Abstracts; the *Journal of Economic Literature*; Periodical Abstracts; Public Affairs; Public Affairs Information Service International Recently Published Articles; Reference Sources; Social Sciences and Humanities Index; Social Sciences

Index; Social Work Research and Abstracts; and Writings on American History. Some of these sources may be available in electronic form through local public or educational libraries. Microfilm of the *APSR*, beginning with Volume 1, and the index of the *APSR*

through 1969 are available through University Microfilms Inc., 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 ([www.umi.com](http://www.umi.com)). The Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, Volumes 63 to 89: 1969–95, is available through the APSA.