

American Political Science Review Editor's Report for 1998–99

Ada W. Finifter, Editor, *American Political Science Review*, Michigan State University

The number of submissions during 1998–99 was about the same as in the previous three years. We received 536 manuscripts, 393 of them original. The average figure for 1995–99 shows an increase of 11% as compared to the Powell editorship and 26% as compared to the Patterson editorship. The trend shown in Table 1 suggests an even heavier workload for the next editor. The selection of a new editor to begin September 1, 2001, is a propitious time to consider a shared or more decentralized editorial structure.

During August 1999, we observed the now-customary “moratorium” on new submissions, which has worked very well. Obviously, it does not decrease overall submissions, but it permits staff to take summer vacations without interfering unduly with efficient processing of new manuscripts. Our experience is that July has become an exceptionally heavy month, and we usually are processing manuscripts that arrive in late July well into August. The moratorium applies only to new manuscripts; the office remains open during August, and we continue to work on revisions, reviews, July submissions, and preparation of the December issue, which goes to press early in September.

Field Representation of Manuscripts Received and Published

Table 2 shows the distribution of substantive fields for all manuscripts received over the last 15 years, with submissions for each of the previous editorships given as totals and with yearly breakdowns given for my editorship. As explained in previous reports (e.g., Finifter 1997), the coding system for formal theory submissions has changed, and these are now coded according to substantive field whenever possible (e.g., a pa-

per about the U.S. Congress that would have been coded as formal theory through 1996 is now coded as American politics). The apparent decline in formal theory manuscripts is thus only an artifact of the coding process. Overall, the distribution is fairly stable over this relatively long period, with perhaps a small proportionate (not numerical) decline in American politics and a small increase in comparative politics.

The distribution of new manuscripts by field and method for the last three years is shown in Table 3. Generally speaking, the distribution is stable, although there may be a slight upward tendency in the number of papers in American and comparative politics that offer both formal analysis and quantitative tests. The numbers are too small to constitute a trend, but my impression is that interest is growing in empirical tests of formal theories; for example, reviewers of formal theory papers increasingly often ask for or applaud such tests. Otherwise, the distribution by field and method seems quite stable over the last three years.

Table 4 shows the breakdown by field for articles published since 1985. There is some variation by year, but the small annual differences do not seem meaningful (since one manuscript represents approximately 2% of each year's total). Any unusual year-to-year fluctuations generally result from random variation or a particular situation that produces more articles in a certain field. For example, the substantial increase in 1997 in international relations articles was due largely to publication of an exchange consisting of a critique and five responses. As compared to 1996 and 1997, the representation of American politics increased to its more usual level in 1998; it increased still more in 1999, when two forums involving that topic were published. Based on the general pattern, the diversity of

articles published indicates that the *Review* is an important outlet for most fields of political science.

Manuscripts in all fields of the discipline and using all methods of analysis are welcome at the *APSR*, and each submission is reviewed by other scholars working in the same area and using similar analytic methods. There is no filtering process to encourage or discourage any type of manuscript. The extent to which articles published in the *Review* are not totally representative of research in the discipline at large is reflective of a self-selection process by authors. The published articles are quite representative of the manuscripts received.

Turnaround Time

Prompt processing is a major goal of the editorial office, although this is difficult given the traditional structure of a single editor and the high number of submissions. Manuscripts are generally sent to three reviewers, whose selection is based on research by the *APSR* interns and advice from the editorial board on each manuscript. In order to speed the process for authors whose papers are unlikely to be accepted, rejections are based on the first two reviews received when both clearly advise against publication. In the case of mixed reviews, decisions often take considerably longer.

Table 5 shows the median amount of time for different stages of the editorial process over the last 15 years. Data for the editorships of Patterson and Powell are summarized from their reports. Data for my editorship are shown for the past year and also for the four-year total. Only manuscripts for which a decision has been reached are included, so the current year's annual data are less stable than the total figures.

“From receipt to referee assignment” reports the median number

TABLE 1
Manuscripts Received by APSR

		Number of Submissions		
		Total	Original	
A. Yearly Totals	1998–99	536	393	
	1997–98	537	411	
	1996–97	540	391	
	1995–96	533	420	
	1994–95	495		
	1993–94	480		
	1992–93	487		
	1991–92	479		
	1990–91	438		
	1989–90	428		
	1988–89	447		
	1987–88	391		
	1986–87	427		
B. Editorship Averages				
	Finifter	1995–99 (Average)	537	404
	Powell	1991–95 (Average)	485	
	Patterson	1986–91 (Average)	426	

Note: For 1995–99, annual periods range from August 15–August 14. The total column includes revisions; the breakdown between original and total submissions was not provided in previous editorial reports.

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

of days for choosing reviewers and mailing a manuscript to them.¹ “From assignment to last review” is the median number of days it takes for reviewers to respond.² “From last review to decision” indicates the time the editor takes to make deci-

sions and send a letter to the author after the final review used in the decision has arrived (that is, the second of two negative reviews or three reviews if they are mixed or positive).³ “From receipt to final decision” is the total number of days in

the process for all manuscripts received. (This last figure is not a simple addition of the previous number of days, because it also includes papers that are not sent for external review.)

The number of manuscripts received obviously affects how rapidly they can be processed. The current turnaround time is as good as or better than that of the two previous editors, despite the considerable increase in the number of manuscripts. Some outliers do wait a long time for a decision, either because of unusual reviewer problems or because conflicting reviews require the editor to take additional time to make a decision, which can sometimes involve consultation with members of the editorial board. I regret any long waits, but they are largely due to efforts to give all manuscripts a fair review and to avoid arbitrary decisions. We constantly strive to improve turnaround time.

Acceptance Rates

Acceptance Rates by Field

The page count of the *APSR* is determined by APSA Council action as part of the budgetary process. The *Review* currently is allowed the same number of pages per volume as was determined when the large-size format was adopted with the 1992 volume. Therefore, as the sub-

TABLE 2
Manuscripts Received by Field, 1985–99

	1985–91	1991–95	1995–96 ^a	1995–96 ^b	1996–97 ^b	1997–98 ^b	1998–99 ^b
American Politics and Public Policy	41%	35%	34%	38%	39%	38%	38%
Comparative Politics	17	22	18	23	25	22	24
International Relations	10	12	9	13	13	11	12
Normative Political Theory	19	21	19	19	16	17	18
Formal Theory	13	10	18	5	5	9	6
Methodology	—	—	2	2	2	3	2
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Manuscripts	426	485	533	533	540	537	536

^aAllocates formal theory papers in all fields to the formal theory category for consistency with previous editorial reports. Finifter (1997) presents more detailed discussion of field codes.

^bAllocates formal theory and methodology papers to their substantive field (American Politics, Comparative Politics, or International Relations) whenever possible (based on type of data used in analysis).

Sources: The average for 1985–91 is from Powell (1995, Table 1). The average for 1991–95 is calculated from the same source.

TABLE 3**Distribution of Manuscripts Submitted to the APSR, August 15, 1996 to August 14, 1999 by Year, Subfield, and Type of Analysis (Original Submissions Only)**

Subfield and Type of Analysis	1996-97		1997-98		1998-99	
American Politics						
Formal and Quantitative	10	2.56%	8	1.95%	17	4.33%
Formal	8	2.05	8	1.95	3	.76
Interpretive, Conceptual	9	2.30	15	3.65	10	2.54
Quantitative	125	31.97	121	29.44	112	28.50
Small N			2	.49		1.25
Subfield Total	152	38.88%	154	37.47%	143	36.39%
Comparative Politics						
Formal and Quantitative	5	1.28%	9	2.19%	12	3.05%
Formal	9	2.30	7	1.70	7	1.78
Interpretive, Conceptual	19	4.86	17	4.14	11	2.80
Quantitative	46	11.76	50	12.17	53	13.49
Small N	14	3.58	4	.97	9	2.29
Subfield Total	93	23.78%	87	21.17%	92	23.41%
International Relations						
Formal and Quantitative	3	.77%	11	2.68%	7	1.78%
Formal	10	2.56	6	1.46	13	3.31
Interpretive, Conceptual	9	2.30	6	1.46	8	2.04
Quantitative	22	5.63	21	5.11	23	5.85
Small N	1	.26	1	.24		
Subfield Total	45	11.52%	45	10.95%	51	12.98%
Normative Theory						
Formal			1	.24%	2	.51%
Interpretive, Conceptual	70	17.90%	83	20.19	74	18.83
Subfield Total	70	17.90%	84	20.44%	76	19.34
Formal Theory of General Political Processes						
Formal and Quantitative			2	.49%	2	.51%
Formal	20	5.11%	25	6.08	19	4.83
Interpretive, Conceptual			3	.73	2	.51
Quantitative					1	.25
Subfield Total	20	5.11%	30	7.30%	24	6.11%
Methodology						
Formal and Quantitative	1	.26%	2	.49%	1	.25%
Formal			1	.24		
Interpretive, Conceptual	5	1.28	3	.73	2	.51
Quantitative	5	1.28	5	1.22	4	1.04
Subfield Total	11	2.81%	11	2.68%	7	1.78%
Total Original Submissions	391	100.00%	411	100.01%	393	100.00%

mission number increases, the acceptance rate necessarily declines.

Table 6 presents acceptance rates by field for original manuscripts received in the last four years and decided by early October 1999. These calculations count manuscript "chains," that is, all original manuscripts and their revisions, if any, are

counted as one manuscript chain. Considering all original manuscripts received over the last four years, the acceptance rate is 9.2%. The rate is fairly similar across fields except for general formal theory and methodology. In these two areas, the small number of submissions means that acceptance rates can be noticeably

affected by a very small number of manuscripts.

Acceptance Rates by Round

Decision letters on revisions are categorized in the office as "invite" or "permit," depending on the amount of encouragement I give the

TABLE 4
Articles Published by the APSR by Subfield, 1985–99

	1985–91	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
American Politics and Public Policy	42%	34%	39%	36%	38%	30%	27%	35%	43%
Comparative Politics	16	17	19	23	18	20	20	22	19
Normative Political Theory	20	24	18	21	20	25	22	17	20
International Relations	10	13	14	9	6	16	25	13	8
Formal Theory ^a	13	11	11	11	18	9	6	11	8
Methodology								2	2
Total	100%	99%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Manuscripts	49	53	57	53	49	44	51	46	49

^aFor 1996–99, formal theory and methodology articles that also use empirical data are coded in their substantive subfields (American politics, comparative, or international relations).

author based primarily on my reading of the reviews. For manuscripts with reviews that are marginal but supportive enough to “permit” revision, I always suggest that authors consider carefully whether a further investment of their time in the *APSR* review process seems worthwhile, in light of their own assessments of the likelihood that they can resolve the issues raised by the re-

viewers. Authors are always advised that there are no guarantees on re-submissions, although authors who are invited to revise receive more encouragement to resubmit.⁴

Table 7 shows that the nuances of these decision letters are very clear to authors and that, in the aggregate, authors respond rationally and appropriately. At each stage, recipients of “invite” letters are signifi-

cantly more likely to resubmit than are recipients of “permit” letters. It is also interesting that the response patterns by round differ between the two groups. At each further round, those invited to revise are increasingly likely to resubmit, whereas those permitted to revise are less likely to resubmit after the first round. Thus, the likelihood of resubmission by the two groups increas-

TABLE 5
Elapsed Time in the APSR Review Process by Year of Submission

	Patterson Editorship, 1985–91	Powell Editorship, 1991–95	Finifter Editorship, Total 1995–99 ^a		Finifter Editorship, Current Year August 15, 1998–August 27, 1999 ^b	
	Number of Workdays ^c	Number of Workdays ^c	Median Number of Workdays	Number of Manuscripts	Median Number of Workdays	Number of Manuscripts
From receipt to referee assignment	9	20	9	1784	8	336
From assignment to last review	43	43	46	1784	45	336
From last review considered to decision	6	7	4	1784	2	336
From receipt to final decision	54	67	61	2007	53	395

^aIncludes only manuscripts received at MSU, not those received at Rochester but finally processed at MSU.

^bIncludes only manuscripts on which a final decision had been made as of August 27, 1999.

^cCalculated from Powell (1995, Table 4). Figures reported for Patterson and Powell are subject to error because the calculation methods used are not described in detail in the Powell report. Patterson figures are calculated by averaging figures given for 1985–88 and 1988–91; both columns are headed “Average,” but figures for 1985–88 are also identified as medians. Powell figures are calculated by averaging figures given separately for each of four academic years, 1991–92 through 1994–95, but the figures for 1992–95 are identified as medians, while the calculation method for 1991–92 figures is not specified. Powell reports in a note to the table that figures for “1992–95 are based on the months for which over half the manuscripts were completed and medians available at the time of report (9 months in 1992–93 and 11 months in 1993–95). Reported figure is the average of the monthly medians.” The number of manuscripts on which figures are based is not given in the Powell table, but the average number of manuscripts received per year during the three editorships are Patterson, 426; Powell, 485; Finifter, 537.

TABLE 6
Acceptance Rates by Field, for Original Manuscripts Submitted since August 17, 1995 and Decided by October 8, 1999

Field	Number of Original Submissions	Number Accepted	Acceptance Rate
American Politics	601	58	9.7%
Comparative Politics	364	27	7.4%
Normative Theory	311	26	8.4%
International Relations	195	21	10.8%
Formal Theory	94	14	14.9%
Methodology	46	2	5.1%
Total	1604	148	9.2%

ingly diverges as the rounds progress. This makes sense: A favorable outcome continues to seem likely for the first group, but the greater caution expressed in letters to the second group leads authors to be more likely to cut their losses after the first try.

Table 8 indicates outcomes on the original and subsequent revision rounds for all manuscripts received during my editorship and decided as of early October 1999. Given the large number of submissions, the small number we can accept, and our rigorous review procedures, very few manuscripts are accepted in the first round. Only 2% have such a swift positive outcome. Almost 40% of first revisions are rejected when resubmitted, and only 26% of first revisions are accepted. Nevertheless, of the 184 papers accepted during my editorship, 60% were accepted in the original or first-revision rounds. Another 30% were accepted after the second revision, and the remaining 10% went to a third revision before being accepted.

Second and third revisions are generally undertaken only when specific requirements or analyses are proposed to the authors, either by the reviewers or the editor, and a positive outcome appears likely. Often these revisions respond to requests for authors to include specific technical information. As Table 8 shows, approximately two-thirds of papers that go through two or more revisions are accepted.

Table 9 provides detail on the outcome of the revision process at each stage according to the decision in the previous stage. Invited resubmissions are much more likely to be accepted than are permitted resubmissions. At the same time, the data indicate that the chance of acceptance for a permitted revision is not so low that it makes no sense to try, as long as the author's personal situation allows time for a risky investment. In general, I have created a relatively permissive resubmission environment and am willing to work with authors as long as reviewers suggest reasonable prospects for

eventual publication. In this scheme of things, it is the author's responsibility to assess his or her own risk tolerance and resubmit only when a negative decision can be tolerated.

Given the relatively low acceptance rate, the *Review* does not have a large backlog for publication; in fact, it can be described as a "just-in-time" manuscript inventory. As of mid-October 1999, there was still some space in the March 2000 issue.

Book Reviews

As shown in Table 10, between September 1998 and August 1999 more than 1,800 books were received, or approximately five books a day (including Saturdays and Sundays).⁵ Each is entered into our database and considered for review. Approximately 18% of the books received (328) have been reviewed or are scheduled for review. An average of more than 80 books are reviewed in each issue of the *Review*. Three formats are used: single-book reviews of around 1,000 words; multiple-book reviews (usually two or three books) between 1,500 and 2,000 words; and review essays, which range from 5,000 to 10,000 words.

Table 10 also shows the number of books received and the percentages of books reviewed by field. The largest category is comparative politics (654), followed by American politics and policy (507), international relations (344), and political theory (270). More than 20% of the books received in the two smallest categories were reviewed, compared to slightly more than 15% for the two largest categories.

TABLE 7
Author Decisions to Resubmit by Decision and Round, for All Manuscripts Submitted and Decided between August 17, 1995 and October 8, 1999

Resubmitted to Date?	Original Submission		First Revision		Second Revision	
	Invite Revision	Permit Revision	Invite Revision	Permit Revision	Invite Revision	Permit Revision
Yes	72%	49%	74%	30%	92%	33%
No	28	51	26	70	8	67
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	(209)	(176)	(68)	(33)	(13)	(6)

TABLE 8
Decisions by Review Stage for Manuscripts Submitted since August 15, 1995 and Decided by October 8, 1999

	New Submissions		First Revision		Second Revision		Third or Later Revision	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Reject	67.5%	(1083)	39.2%	(116)	16.9%	(14)	17.2%	(5)
Permit Revise and Resubmit	11.0	(176)	11.1	(33)	6.0	(5)	3.4	(1)
Invite Revise and Resubmit	13.0	(209)	23.0	(68)	9.6	(8)	17.2	(5)
Accept	2.1	(33)	26.4	(78)	66.3	(55)	62.1%	(18)
Other	6.4	(103)	.3	(1)	1.2	(1)		
% (N)	100.0%	(1604)	100.0%	(296)	100.0%	(83)	99.9%	(29)

The books reviewed by field for the five most recent issues are given in Table 11. In September 1998, for example, 28% were in American politics, 26% in comparative politics, 27% in political theory, and 20% in international relations. In other words, there was a rough balance among the fields. Moreover, due to a small backlog of reviews, the fluctuations from issue to issue can be kept relatively small.

The book review section has historically faced two major problems. The first is that resources are barely adequate. The office has three half-time graduate students working under the book review editor. There is barely enough time to open cartons, enter books into the database, decide on which books to review, find potential reviewers, manage corre-

spondence (with reviewers, publishers, and authors), send reviews out for copy editing, prepare an issue for publication, and review page proofs (these are checked in-house and are not sent back to reviewers).

The second problem is that there is a major problem in locating reviewers. All authors want their book reviewed, but just about everyone prefers not to write reviews. The professional rewards from a review of one's book in the *APSR* are great; the professional rewards for writing a review for the *APSR* are small. The result is that it is not unusual for us to make a half dozen or even a dozen requests before locating a reviewer. This takes a lot of time, so the second problem intensifies the first.

The book review editor has histor-

ically heard two major complaints. The first is: Why was my book not reviewed? The most likely candidates for review are books authored or coauthored by political scientists, representing original research, and published by a major university press. The least likely candidates are books not by political scientists, in the form of an edited collection of reprints designed as a textbook, and not published by a university press. These long-standing criteria reflect our aim to review the most important books written in political science, just as the *APSR* aims to publish the most important articles in political science.

The second complaint is: Why did you choose that idiot who wrote a negative review of my book? The book review interns use several

TABLE 9
Outcomes for Revisions by Decision at Prior Stage for Manuscripts Submitted since August 17, 1995 and Decided by October 8, 1999

Decision on Subsequent Submission	Decision on					
	Original Submission		First Revision		Second or Later Revision	
	Invite Revision	Permit Revision	Invite Revision	Permit Revision	Invite Revision	Permit Revision
Accept or Conditionally						
Accept	40%	15%	70%	40%	67%	50%
Invite Revise and Resubmit	29	20	8	10	25	—
Permit Revise and Resubmit	9	14	4	20	0	—
Reject	22	51	18	30	8	50
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N resubmitted to date	150	86	50	10	12	2

Note: Cell entries are editor decisions in subsequent round for manuscripts invited for revision or permitted revision (not rejected, accepted, or conditionally accepted) in prior round.

databases to generate a set of potential reviewers for the book review editor, along with lists of their most recent publications in the relevant field. All potential reviewers must have published at least three articles or books in the field. If potential reviewers turn us down, we ask them for other recommendations. They usually offer several alternatives, and we again check recent publications. In addition to ensuring reviewer qualifications, we provide guidelines about conflicts of interest and appropriate criticism that all reviewers must follow.

Obviously, the first problem is related to the first complaint: With more resources, perhaps even a separate journal for book reviews, we could review more books. Obviously, the second problem is related to the second complaint: Although we think the people invited to review books are generally very well qualified, if everyone in political science who wrote a Great Book was also willing to write a Great Book Review, what a wonderful world it would be.

Planning for the Future

In order to gauge satisfaction with Association activities and services, APSA staff recently undertook a mail survey of current and former members; results were reported to the Council at its meeting in April 1999 (APSA 1999b). Unfortunately, the survey had a very low response rate (N = 103, a response rate of 10% for former members, and N = 250, a response rate of 25% for current members). The figures are probably too low to allow valid generalizations, but the survey has nevertheless been used to assess member attitudes toward APSA activities.

Responses to the *APSR* were mixed in this survey. Among current members, 47% reported being "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with *APSR*, while 43% were "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied." Among lapsed members, 51% were dissatisfied with *APSR* and 39% were satisfied (Table 5.2 in the report).

On the bright side for *APSR*, of 42 association activities asked about in the questionnaire, the *Review* had

TABLE 10
Books Received, 1997–99, and Books Reviewed, 1998–99

Field	Books Received		Books Reviewed or Scheduled for Review (of 1998–99 arrivals)	
	Sept. 1997–Aug. 1998	Sept. 1998–Aug. 1999	N	% Across
	American Politics and Public Policy	507	500	76
Comparative Politics	654	575	91	15.8%
Political Theory	270	289	67	23.1%
International Relations	344	471	94	20.0%
Total	1775	1835	328	17.9%

the twelfth highest proportion of "satisfied" or "very satisfied" responses among current members, scoring higher on this measure of satisfaction than the equity of the submission and acceptance process for papers at the Annual Meeting, the APSA awards program for papers, books, and articles, APSA's research grants program, and several other highly visible association activities.⁶ *APSR* had the tenth highest proportion of "satisfied" or "very satisfied" responses among former members (Table 5.2 in the report).

Comments written on their questionnaires by members and former members indicated a desire for the *APSR* to be more representative of research in the discipline, less quantitative and technical, and more rel-

evant to their teaching needs (Appendices A and B in the report). Some comments about *APSR* contents, however, indicated little familiarity with what has been published in recent years. Readers who want to see their kind of research appear in the *APSR* are urged to submit manuscripts for review. All are welcome and will be reviewed in a fair and impartial manner.

This annual report has commented on the scarcity of space in the *APSR* for both articles and book reviews. Since the last change in the size of the journal, which took effect with the 1992 volume, the number of regular APSA members has increased by 26%, Annual Meeting registrations have grown by 33%, the Association's operating budget

TABLE 11
Books Reviewed by Issue and Field, September 1998–September 1999

Issue	American	Comparative	Theory	International Relations
September 1998	28% (25)	26 (23)	27 (24)	20 (18)
December 1998	17% (11)	35 (23)	21 (14)	27 (18)
March 1999	27% (16)	34 (20)	17 (10)	22 (13)
June 1999	29% (22)	18 (14)	20 (15)	33 (25)
September 1999	17% (17)	23 (23)	27 (26)	33 (32)

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

income has increased by 42%, and operating budget expenditures have risen by 46%. During the last four years, the period of my editorship, membership has increased by 21%, Annual Meeting registrations have grown 19%, the operating budget income of the Association has increased by 15%, and the operating budget expenditures of the Association have risen 24%, while *APSR* expenditures have increased by 0.45%, and its budget has declined by 0.63%.⁷ While funding for the editorial and book review offices of the *Review* has grown to cover increased postage and other operating expenses including staff salaries and editors' honoraria, the total expenditures for *APSR* have remained constant due largely to lower printing costs. The result is that association resources devoted to the *APSR* have declined relative to other association activities. In FY97, *APSR*'s total budget of \$355,953 (including all printing, mailing, and editorial operations) represented 12% of the Association's operating budget; for FY2000, the budget of \$353,700 represents 10% of the Association's operating budget (APSA 1996, 1999a).

As I reported to the Council at its meeting on September 1, 1999, the publication program of the association is far too small, in my judgment, to accommodate its large and diverse membership. Certainly, the *APSR* cannot accommodate all of the demands for publication space that are placed on it. I recommended that consideration be given to (1) creating more space for articles, either through an expanded *APSR* or the creation of other publication vehicles, (2) creating a separate book review journal, (3) developing an expanded editorial structure to deal with the very large workload and diverse types of manuscripts submitted to the *Review*, and (4) beginning simultaneous print and electronic publication of the *Review*, as is being undertaken by other political science journals, including *AJPS*, *JOP*, and *Political Analysis*. Any of these activities would require funding not presently available. The question for the membership is the

desirability and relative priority of these kinds of ventures as compared to the large number of other worthwhile activities supported by the Association.

As announced on the APSA homepage, the Association has initiated a strategic planning program for the future, with initial recommendations to be made by an eleven-member committee. This is an appropriate committee to hear the views of the membership on publication issues. (See www.apsanet.org/new/planning for more details.)

I note that it is 689 days, 20 hours, 29 minutes, and 40 seconds (but who's counting?) until the end of my second term as editor of the *APSR*. The search for the new editor has begun, and the following scholars are serving on the search committee: Peter Gourevitch, University of California, San Diego, chair; Robert Jervis, Columbia University; Gary King, Harvard University; Arlene Saxonhouse, University of Michigan; and Katherine Tate, University of California, Irvine.

APSR Editorial Staff

The *APSR* editorial office has a professional staff of one full-time assistant to the editor, Melody Scofield, and one part-time director of manuscript production, Harriett Posner. We also have two part-time independent contractors: copyeditor Elizabeth Johnston and data-processing consultant Paul Wolberg.

The editorial office could not operate without the *APSR* interns. Interns read all new submissions and their in-house research on other scholars working in the area of each manuscript assists the editorial board and editor in the process of reviewer selection. During 1998–99, *APSR* interns Jamie Carson, Chuck Finocchiaro, Erik Herron, Ben Kleinerman, Michelle Kuenzi, Andrew Padon, Jeff Reno, Lisa Shoichet, Mark Souva, and Shane Szalai provided invaluable assistance to the *APSR* editor, and Book Review Editor Mark Lichbach was assisted by William Aviles, Kenneth Fernandez, and Stacey Searl-Chapin.

The peer-review process could not operate without the advice of our reviewers, all of whom are listed in the December issue of the *Review*. During 1998–99, we again used almost 1,000 different scholars as reviewers.

Each of these individuals has contributed in different ways to the quality of the *APSR*, the success of the editorial and book review operations, and the review service we provide to those who submit manuscripts to the *Review*.

Feedback and Additional Information

Comments on my report or on editorial procedures of the *APSR* are always welcome. Readers will also find additional information, including past annual reports of the editor and the editor's notes published in individual issues, at our web site (www.ssc.msu.edu/~aprs).

The *APSR* web site also includes the table of contents of each issue since March 1996, abstracts and lists of tables and figures for published articles, some supplementary information and analyses listed as "available from author" in the printed articles, a list of forthcoming articles, a comprehensive index of all articles and book reviews published since March 1996, biographical and other information about the editorial board and staff, information about our review procedures, the names of scholars who reviewed for us in each volume year, and "Instructions to Contributors" (also reprinted in the front of each issue) and "Information and Instructions for Authors," which includes formatting and policy information. We have no animation, frames, or fancy graphics, but we hope the site is increasingly useful as we add information.

For comments or questions, please contact us by email at APSR@ssc.msu.edu or by regular mail at *APSR*, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1032.

Notes

1. More detailed discussion of turnaround time categories, complications in calculating acceptance rates, and other issues discussed in this report can be found in Finifter (1997).

2. Our reminder procedures and the factors affecting reviewer turnaround time are discussed in Finifter (1996, 763–64).

3. Powell used the same procedure, but I am not certain how his figures took that into account. I cannot report on the Patterson procedures.

4. A more detailed discussion of decision letters can be found in Finifter (1998).

5. This section of the report was written by *APSR* Book Review Editor Mark Lichbach.

6. However, the *APSR* also had higher dissatisfaction scores (and many fewer neutral/no opinion responses) than these other activities. The *Review* clearly had the most bimodal response pattern of any Association service. Indeed, the modal re-

sponse for most other services is neutral/no opinion. In sharp contrast, *PS: Political Science and Politics* garners a very large majority of “satisfied” and “very satisfied” responses.

7. Changes in APSA membership, meeting registration, and operating budget figures are calculated from yearly data in Rudder (1999, tables 1, 2, and 5). Changes in budget figures for *APSR* are calculated from budgetary data in APSA (1996) and APSA (1999a).

References

- American Political Science Association. 1996. “Statement of Income and Expense, July 1, 1995–June 30, 1996, with Revised Budget for FY1997.” Distributed to members of the Council for their meeting of August 28, 1996.
- . 1999a. “APSA Summary of Revenue and Expense, FY99 Final vs. FY00 Revised Budget.” Distributed to members of the Council for their meeting of September 1, 1999.
- . 1999b. “How Are We Doing? Assessments of APSA Programs by Members and Former Members.” Typescript. Distributed to members of the Council for their meeting of April 17, 1999.
- Finifter, Ada W. 1996. “Report of the Managing Editor of the *American Political Science Review*, 1995–96.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 29(4): 758–68.
- . 1997. “Report of the Editor of the *American Political Science Review*, 1996–97.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30(4): 783–91.
- . 1998. “The 1997–98 Sail on the Flagship *American Political Science Review*.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31(4): 897–905.
- Patterson, Samuel C., John M. Bruce, and Martha Ellis Crone. 1991. “The Impact of the *American Political Science Review*.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 24(4): 765–74.
- Powell, G. Bingham Jr. 1995. “Report of the Managing Editor of the *American Political Science Review*, August 30, 1995.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28(4): 764–69.
- Rudder, Catherine E. 1999. “Executive Director’s Report.” *PSOnline* <<http://www.apsanet.org/PS/sept99/rudder.cfm>>. Accessed October 11, 1999.