

TABLE 7
Program Budget
Summary of Actual Revenue Line Items for the Fiscal Period 1992-93
and Anticipated Revenues for Fiscal 1993-94

Category	1992-93 Actual Revenue	1993-94 Proposed Revenue	Percentage of Revenue
Membership			
Individual	\$ 679,662.82	\$ 705,855.00	28%
Other Memberships	488,408.12	510,600.00	20%
Annual Meeting	398,939.25	420,500.00	17%
Sales and Advertising of Publications	258,767.12	281,200.00	11%
Departmental Programs	179,648.47	193,500.00	8%
Interest and Dividends	151,848.07	173,000.00	7%
Employment Services	87,926.84	110,600.00	4%
Rent	86,571.13	96,600.00	3%
Administrative	76,813.99	52,150.00	2%
Miscellaneous	(170.37)	—	—
TOTAL REVENUE	\$2,408,415.44	\$2,544,055.00	100%

Summary of Actual Expense Line Items for the Fiscal Period 1992-93
and Proposed Expenses for Fiscal 1993-94

Category	1992-93 Actual Expenses	1993-94 Proposed Expenses	Percentage of Expenses
Publications	\$ 541,977.98	\$ 603,728.00	24%
Annual Meeting	238,477.86	236,757.43	9%
Departmental Programs	202,346.34	213,300.00	8%
Committee Programs	158,777.04	200,000.00	8%
Employment Services	87,141.97	89,387.50	4%
Organized Sections	68,551.36	68,960.00	3%
Education Program	39,116.04	54,938.00	2%
Endowed Awards Program	20,566.37	24,400.00	1%
Governance	123,132.02	141,035.00	6%
APSA Representation	89,141.06	92,885.00	4%
General Administrative	240,050.80	273,440.00	11%
Building and Equipment	183,035.22	194,800.00	8%
Membership Office	168,498.56	168,168.00	7%
Business Office	112,070.08	120,672.50	5%
TOTAL EXPENSES BEFORE DEDUCTIONS OF DEPRECIATION	\$2,272,882.70	\$2,482,471.43	98%
Depreciation (Building and Equipment)	38,465.18	47,000.00	2%
TOTAL EXPENSES BEFORE ADJUSTMENTS	\$2,311,347.88	\$2,529,471.43	100%
Adjustments for Pending Obligations			
Annual Leave	5,782.25	12,000.00	0%
Life Memberships	4,700.00	2,500.00	0%
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$2,321,830.13	\$2,543,971.43	100%

TABLE 8
APSA National Salary Scale, 1993-94

APSA Position	Equivalent Government Grade	1993 Federal Salary Scale	1993-94 APSA Grade	1993-94 APSA Salary Scale	Number of Employees	
					FT	PT
<i>Political Scientists:</i>						
Executive Director	SES	92,900-115,700	8	80,000-95,000	1	
Deputy Director	15	66,609- 86,589	7	60,000-85,000	1	
Program Directors	13-14	47,920- 73,619	6	45,000-80,000	2	1
<i>Non-Political Scientists:</i>						
Program Managers	11-12	33,623- 52,385	5	32,000-40,000	4	
Senior Administrative Assistant	9-10	27,789- 39,783	4	26,000-37,000	4	
Administrative Assistant	7-8	22,717- 32,710	3	21,000-32,500	5	
Secretary, Receptionist, Maintenance	4-6	16,393- 26,572	2	18,000-27,500	3	
Clerk	1-3	11,903- 18,986	1	16,000-19,000	2	1

Association well in hard times, the most significant of which from a monetary standpoint is the Congressional Fellowship Program whose endowment produces over \$300,000 annually to fund that program (in its own budget) and contributes in excess of \$30,000 to APSA's operating budget.

With regard to operating funds, APSA shows a healthy income diversity and produces adequate revenues to cover expenses. In fact, APSA has shown a surplus for the past 13 years, and a balanced budget is anticipated for this fiscal year as well.

It has been a pleasure serving as your treasurer for the last two years, and I look forward to handing over these responsibilities to Susan Bourque, who will serve for FY 1993-95.

**Report of the
 Managing Editor of the
*American Political Science
 Review*, 1992-93**

G. Bingham Powell, Jr.
University of Rochester

After the many transitions of the previous year, 1992-93 was a year of consolidation for the *APSR*.

The Flow of New Manuscripts

The first year of a new Managing Editor typically sees an increased number of manuscript submissions. This surge of 10% or so then usually returns to normal levels in subsequent years. As shown by Table 1, 1992-93 was somewhat exceptional in this regard. In 1992-93 we received over 487 manuscripts, actually a slight increase from the 479 manuscripts of the previous year. Over 40 manuscripts of all kinds were received in the months of October, November, and December; about 50 manuscripts were received in April and June. It remains to be seen if these numbers represent a new steady state. In the last five years of Patterson's term the average number received per year was 426 manuscripts.

As Table 1 also shows, the distribution of manuscripts across sub-fields is roughly consistent with previous years. Unfortunately, last year's bumper crop in international

relations declined to previous percentage levels. Normative political theory shows a steady increase in both absolute and relative numbers over the last several years.

The Acceptance of Manuscripts

Table 2 shows the distribution across fields in manuscripts accepted for publication. These include the 57

pieces (articles, notes and controversies) published in March, June and September, 1993 or scheduled for publication in December 1993. The distribution of published manuscripts parallels roughly the distribution of manuscripts submitted across the subfields in the last year or so, consistent with previous experience.

Of course, because of lags in accepting and publishing manu-

scripts, as well as the fact that a large percentage of published manuscripts go through a "revise and resubmit" stage, the distribution of manuscripts published reflects at least in part the manuscripts submitted in the previous year. For this reason, Table 3, which is the usual table showing acceptance rates across subfields, is always somewhat problematic.

If we wanted to show a prospective author in some field the probability that any given manuscript might be accepted, the information that we would ideally want would be the eventual disposition of all new manuscripts submitted in some given period of time. As many manuscripts go through a "revise and resubmit" stage, we would want to include such manuscripts. Because authors often work over their revisions for a long time, these data could only be compiled much later.

As described in their annual reports, previous managing editors have adopted different approaches to calculating the acceptance rates. Neither approach is perfect. However, each is a fair approximation of true acceptance rates if submission rates in the different fields are fairly steady from year to year. (This assumption has generally been approximately correct, as can be seen in Table 1, but there are small fluctuations that can shape the rates.) Dina Zinnes seems to have reported the acceptance rates on manuscripts received during the year, counting revisions as new manuscripts in that year, in so far as that information was known at the time the annual report was prepared. Because of the delays, there are always yet unevaluated manuscripts (in the hands of the referees) which are excluded from the calculations. Not all manuscripts accepted or published in the year are included in such a table, because some of them were submitted in the previous year. Alternatively, Pat Patterson seems to have used the decision in the year as the basis for calculating the acceptance rates. This approach allows the acceptance rate to include all the acceptance decisions made in the year, but the denominator will overlap with—and not be the same as—the manuscripts received, because of lags at both ends.

TABLE 1
Distribution of Manuscripts Submitted to the *APSR* by Subfield from 1990-91 to 1992-93

Subfield	1990-91*	1991-92	1992-93
American Politics and Public Policy	39%	34%	37%
Comparative Politics	22%	20%	20%
Normative Political Theory	17%	21%	24%
International Relations	9%	14%	9%
Formal Theory	13%	10%	10%
Total	100%	99%	100%
Number of Manuscripts	438	479	487

*From Patterson, Bruce, and Crone 1991, p. 766, Table 1. Manuscripts submitted include both new manuscripts and revisions of previously submitted manuscripts. 1991-92 figures include 50 of the latter. 1992-93 figures include 47 revisions.

TABLE 2
Distribution of Manuscripts Published by the *APSR* by Subfield in 1991-92 and 1992-93

Subfield	1988-89*	1990-91*	1991-92**	1992-93**
American Politics and Public Policy	36%	42%	34%	39%
Comparative Politics	20%	23%	17%	19%
Normative Political Theory	18%	13%	24%	18%
International Relations	11%	7%	13%	14%
Formal Theory	15%	16%	11%	11%
Total	100%	101%	99%	101%
Number of Manuscripts	55	31	53	57

*From Patterson, Bruce and Crone, p. 766, Table 2. Figures based on decisions made in the given year, not on date of receipt or publication.

**Manuscripts published in the *APSR* (March-December).

TABLE 3
Publication Acceptance Rates by the *APSR* by Subfield in Recent Years and in 1991-92 and 1992-93

Subfield	1988-89*	1990-91*	1991-92**	1992-93**
American Politics and Public Policy	11%	9%	15%	13%
Comparative Politics	16%	10%	11%	14%
Normative Political Theory	13%	7%	11%	9%
International Relations	12%	8%	18%	18%
Formal Theory	15%	12%	14%	14%
Overall	12%	9%	13%	13%
Number of Decisions	na	na	356	382

*From Patterson, Bruce and Crone, p. 766, Table 3. Figures based on decisions in a given year, not on date of receipt or publication.

**Percentages are acceptances divided by acceptances plus rejections plus revise/resubmit, for manuscripts received from July 1 to June 30, decisions made as of mid-August. Pending manuscripts are not included.

Because our computerized data base includes only rejections of manuscripts for which we initially assigned the referees, we had to follow the Zinnes approach last year. For the sake of comparison, we have done the same here. As shown by Table 3, this approach generates an acceptance rate overall of 13% for the manuscripts received and decided in the 1992-93 year: Fifty manuscripts have been accepted of the 382 thus far received and evaluated. At the time this report was prepared, 105 manuscripts remained pending. This acceptance rate is (very slightly) larger than previous acceptance rates, but probably not significantly so. Although the increased size of the *Review* has allowed us to publish more manuscripts, it has thus far been paralleled by an increase in manuscripts submitted to us, as shown in Table 1.

Although the small number of manuscripts accepted in a given year in a given field can lead to substantial fluctuations, especially because of the patterns of revised manuscripts, Table 3 shows that the acceptance rates were reasonably similar across the subfields of political science. These results are consistent with the outcomes reported by previous managing editors. I am watching closely the slightly lower acceptance rate of normative political theory, but this represents only a difference of two or three manuscripts. Of course, large fields such as American politics and public policy contain many subfields (e.g., American judicial politics or election studies) that will show even more year to year fluctuation in both submissions and acceptances.

The Processing of Manuscripts: Procedure and Performance

We continue to use the same general procedures that have been employed at *APSR* for over 20 years and are used by most of the leading journals in our profession. Manuscripts are sent to referees (usually three) who are familiar with the relevant subfield. The name of the author is not revealed to the referees. The confidentiality of the referees is also protected. The managing editor uses the advice of the referees in

deciding whether to accept the manuscript, reject it, or encourage submission of a revised version. As any managing editor will explain, the advice of the referees is the predominant factor in the decisions about manuscripts.

The *APSR* managing editors have traditionally taken the position that we should try to give authors advice on manuscripts, even if we cannot publish them. Only a handful of obviously inappropriate manuscripts are rejected without review. In 1992-93, 30 manuscripts were rejected without review. Six of these were not classified in any field of political science and so not shown in Table 1. Twenty-four of the 487 political science manuscripts shown in Table 1 (about 5%) were rejected without review. In about a third of these cases, the manuscripts were returned to the author because of excessive length (over 50 pages), without prejudice against resubmission of a shorter version. In a few cases the manuscripts were unsolicited resubmissions where the editor felt that the previous version had been adequately reviewed.

A problem that seems to be growing in frequency is the submission of manuscripts that cover the same material as appears in a book that is being published at the same time. The problem is complicated by the short publication times for many book manuscripts and our extensive review process. As the *APSR*'s policy is only to publish original material, and our space is very scarce relative to the number of manuscripts submitted, we do not wish to review manuscripts that are identical to book chapters that would be in print before the article or simultaneously with it. On the other hand, it has always been appropriate to publish in *APSR* or elsewhere an article that is later expanded into or forms part of a more extensive book treatment of the same subject. While these general principles seem widely accepted, the relationship between works of different length and focus, as well as the problem of lags in publication time, has become an issue requiring more attention. I would welcome comments from members of the Association on these issues, which I have already mentioned to the APSA

Council and discussed with the *APSR* Editorial Board. At the suggestion of the Editorial Board, we shall be expanding slightly the "Instructions to Contributors" statement that appears in every issue to attempt to clarify further our policy concerning multiple submissions and simultaneous publication.

Recognizing that the advice of the referees is critical, we continue to make every effort to choose highly competent referees. Selecting three referees for each of about 450 manuscripts received and reviewed in the average year means initially seeking the advice of about 1,350 referees. Because about one initial referee in seven must be replaced for some reason, another 200 referees or so must be added to the initial set. Obviously, the sheer magnitude of the task is formidable.

The task is made more complex by the need to assemble appropriate panels for each manuscript. It is essential that each referee panel has at least one reader capable of dealing with the most technical and difficult parts of the manuscript and at least one reader closely involved with the subject and the approach being used. (Obviously, there are varying levels of overlap among these categories.) It is also desirable to have at least one reader who, although competent in the area, was not quite so closely involved with the immediate work. Given the diversity of subfields in political science, it is difficult for any individual to have the knowledge to assemble appropriate referee panels for all manuscripts.

Fortunately, the new technologies of FAX and electronic mail have made it possible to seek additional aid in the process of finding referees. In 1992-93 I continued the process, introduced last year, of consulting with the Editorial Board about referees, not just in special cases, but in a routine fashion on nearly every manuscript. This process required effort and dedication from the APSA graduate student interns as well as from our exceptionally dedicated and helpful Editorial Board.

When a manuscript was received, it was logged in and then assigned to a graduate student intern. The intern read the manuscript, and prepared an Editorial Board Referral Sheet

that included: brief summary, a list of special questions and comments, and a short list of possible referees. The list of questions/comments typically included information about the technical demands of the manuscript (Greek, statistics, country knowledge, etc.), the unavailability of obvious referees, and other information about the relationship of the manuscript to the field that might not be clear from summary and the author's abstract. After my approval, changes, and suggestions, the Editorial Board Referral Sheet and the manuscript's abstract were sent by FAX to an appropriate member of the Editorial Board (occasionally to two members). The Editorial Board member then responded by FAX or telephone, indicating the appropriateness of our proposed referees, making additional suggestions, offering interpretative advice. The intern suggested referees to me based on this FAX and referee records and availability. I made my final selection of referees based on all this information. Naturally, on occasion I consulted as well with other professional colleagues, in my department and outside it, for additional advice on referee selection.

In addition to this direct consultation on specific manuscripts, I should mention that the Editorial Board members helped make final decisions in some difficult cases (even reading some manuscripts whose technical demands exceeded my capacity) and worked with us to develop lists of referees for different subfields.

While no system can be perfect, as various authors will painfully report, I think that this complex approach continues to result in the selection of a very wide range of competent referees across all the subfields. In 1992-93 we sent 1,565 letters and manuscripts seeking advice to 1,042 individuals. We received 1,248 reviews in response to our requests. (In 1991-92 the Rochester office sent over 1,200 solicitations, to 830 different individuals—a figure that did not count solicitations from Ohio State for the 68 manuscripts they received in July and August, 1991.)

Because of the familiar "moving target" problem, some of these 1,248 responses are from reviewers solicited last year and it is still too early to

expect to hear from all of the referees solicited in the last months of this year. But as the numbers are fairly similar between our two years, it is a reasonable approximation to say that we received reviews in over 80% of the cases where we sought advice. Many of the cancellations were based on circumstances unique to a particular manuscript or time (having already offered advice on the manuscript or currently traveling), rather than representing a general unwillingness to serve the profession. Such cancellations were often accompanied by welcome recommendations for alternative referees. In only a small percentage of (very frustrating) cases did the referee fail to respond in any way to our manuscript and subsequent telephone messages.

This consultation experience seems to represent one of the largest numbers of referees the *APSR* has consulted in a single year. Such a statement must be made hesitantly, because the numbers have not been systematically reported. Previous reports frequently contain references to reviews solicited and received. But it is often unclear whether the numbers refer to reviews or to individuals and whether they represent the experience of an entire year or exclude manuscripts still pending final decision. It seems likely that the substance of the references varies from report to report. However, we find no comments that would suggest numbers as large as our experience of 1,565 solicitations sent and 1,248 manuscripts received from, we think, about 800 individuals.

Of course, sheer numbers of referees are in any case less important than the quality of the reviews and the decisions made on the basis of them. But we think that the increasing specialization of the discipline and its technical practices, as well as the very large numbers of manuscripts received, make it essential to use a wide referee base. And even our disappointed authors, who must constitute, of course, the vast majority, have the assurance that a specialist in their field was involved in the selection of the referees.

The process generated a very large number of competent, sometimes extraordinary, analyses and recommendations. These were not only

used to choose (and often improve) the best manuscripts, but to offer helpful advice to the authors of the many manuscripts that we could not accept. Many of the latter (about 50% according to a study done by Patterson, reported in Patterson and Smithey 1990, 652) are eventually published in another scholarly forum. I am extremely grateful to the many, many scholars who participated in the "Seminar by Mail" in 1992-93.

However, the referee consultation procedure continues to be time-consuming. We did take a number of steps to improve our manuscript processing time: (1) We added a third intern to our Rochester staff (a step that proved especially valuable when one intern left the program for personal reasons and there was a delay in recruiting a replacement). (2) We added several additional members to the Editorial Board. (3) We attempted further to tighten our office procedures. (4) We are working with the Editorial Board members on the creation of a computerized data base of referees, to facilitate the selection of potential referees to be proposed to a member of the Editorial Board. This last project has been an important focus of intern and Editorial Board effort, but is not yet complete.

The results of these efforts are encouraging, but far from ideal. As shown in Table 4 we did make important strides in cutting the time that manuscripts spend in our office, improving by over a working week. (Unfortunately, for technical reasons 1992-93 figures are based on medians, rather than means, which implies they are not quite comparable to the previous year, although exactly comparable to Patterson's first three years. Examination of a smaller subset of cases suggests that the numbers are not very different if we use means. The main table includes only the figures from the first nine months, for which the processing data are largely complete. The data including the tenth and eleventh months, which were included in the previous year means, are shown in the note.) Overall, we cut about seven working days from the average manuscript turn-around time. This is roughly keeping pace with Zinnes's

TABLE 4
Elapsed Time in the APSR Review Process (Work Days)

Processing Stage	1981-82	1982-83	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93
From receipt to referee assignment	—	—	4	7	11	12	11	9	26	22
From assignment to last review	—	—	53	47	35	37	39	42	44	41
From last review to decision	—	—	2	4	5	8	6	6	9	5
From receipt to final decision	71	64	59	58	49	52	52	51	72	65

Note: 1981-82 and 1982-83 are the first two years of the Zinnes editorship. Data from Zinnes 1983, pp. 811-12. Intermediate stages were not reported by Zinnes. 1985-91 are the Patterson editorship; data from Patterson, Bruce and Crone, Table 4, p. 768. Data from Zinnes and Powell are converted to working days (absolute calendar days are multiplied by 5/7), for consistency with Patterson. 1992-93 based on first nine months in year. Full year figures would be 22, 39, 5, 62 working days. 1985-88 and 1992-93 are medians; others are means.

performance, although still falling well short of the remarkable efficiency of Pat Patterson.

While I am pleased that in 1992-93 the manuscripts spent less time in our offices than the previous year, I remain unsatisfied by our performance. I believe that consulting the Editorial Board is worth some delay. But minimizing the turn-around time, especially for rejected manuscripts, is an important challenge for every APSR managing editor.

Transition in Format and Press

The transitions in format and press had occupied a good deal of time and effort in 1991-92, as described in last year's annual report. The last major stages of that transition were the location of an appropriate and affordable type of paper and the merging of the mailings of APSR and PS. Both goals were accomplished with the December 1992 issue. I am grateful to Cathy Rudder and Sheilah Mann for their great efforts to help us with the paper problem. We have now settled into the new format and time schedule relatively comfortably. We continue to experiment with the presentational possibilities of the larger pages. Analyses by the Association suggest that we have succeeded in achieving substantial cost savings as well as simultaneously expanding the space of the Review.

The Book Review

Professor Melissa Collie of the University of Texas at Austin continued to serve the profession as our book review editor in 1992-93. The work of the book review section of the APSR was carried out entirely at

the University of Texas under her direction, with the help of assistants to the book review editor Timothy Fackler, Nathalie Frensey and Christopher Marshall. As book reviews commissioned by Professor Collie began to appear in September 1992, Table 5 shows the number and distribution of books reviewed in the issues from the September 1992 through June 1993 issues. In total, 373 books were reviewed in these four issues. Two very interesting and well-received special book review essays (by Herbert Kitschelt on regime change and by David Brady on divided government) appeared in the December 1992 and March 1993 issues. The distribution of the reviews across the subfields of the

discipline, as shown in the table, varies from issue to issue. However in general it closely parallels the distribution of books submitted for review (shown in Table 6 below for 1992-93).

The review assignments by Professor Collie in 1992-93 are shown in Table 6. As the table shows, 1,982 books were received by the Book Review in 1992-93, up from 1,743 last year, and 559 were selected for review. This increase of about 20% in submitted and selected books has placed a further heavy burden on the Book Review. However, the proportion of books chosen for review, about 28%, was very similar to last year's 27%, and similar to the proportions selected for review in recent

TABLE 5
APSR Book Review: Report on Books Reviewed, September 1992-June 1993

Issue Reviewed	American		Comparative		Theory		IR	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
September 1992	44.4	(36)	24.7	(20)	13.6	(11)	17.3	(14)
December 1992	25.7	(26)	36.6	(37)	20.8	(21)	16.8	(17)
March 1993	38.9	(37)	31.6	(30)	14.7	(14)	14.7	(14)
June 1993	22.9	(22)	49.0	(47)	18.8	(18)	9.4	(9)

Note: The Ns include books reviewed in review essays and multiple- and single-book reviews.

TABLE 6
APSR Book Review: Report on Books Processed, August 1992-July 1993

Subfield	Books Received	Books Reviewed or Scheduled for Review	
		%	(N)
American Politics and Public Policy	612	27.1	(166)
Comparative Politics	686	27.1	(186)
Normative Political Theory	341	34.0	(116)
International Relations	343	26.5	(91)
Totals	1,982	28.2	(559)

Note: The N is the number of books for which invitations have been issued.

years, In 1987-88, for example, the *APSR* Book Review received 1,500 books and selected 418—28%—for review (Patterson, Ripley and Trish *PS* 1988, 912-13).

As Table 6 shows, the distribution of books reviewed is largely shaped by the distribution of books received in the various fields.

Concluding Comments

Whatever the difficulties and errors along the way, I hope and believe that the *Review* continues to publish the best of scholarship in political science. I am grateful to the Association and the Council for their support and to book review editor Melissa Collie and her team, associate editor Linda Lindenfelser, the 1992-93 *APSR* interns (Lynn Jarrell, Matt Gabel, Laura Stevens, and Frank Bell), copy editor Michael Lane, and the members of the *APSR* Editorial Board for all their strenuous efforts in making possible the accomplishments of the *Review* this year.

References

- Patterson, Samuel C., John M. Bruce, and Martha Ellis Crone. 1991. "The Impact of the *American Political Science Review*." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 24(4): 765-74.
- Patterson, Samuel C., Brian D. Ripley, and Barbara Trish. 1988. "The *American Political Science Review*: A Retrospective of Last Year and the Last Eight Decades." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 21(4): 908-25.
- Patterson, Samuel C. and Shannon K. Smithey. 1990. "Monitoring Scholarly Journal Publication in Political Science: The Role of the *APSR*." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 23(4): 647-56.
- Zinnes, Dina A. 1983. "Report of the Managing Editor of the *American Political Science Review*," *PS* 16(Fall): 810-13.

United States Information Agency Initiates Summer Institute on the American Political System

The United States Information Agency awarded grants to support a "Summer Institute on the American Political System for Foreign Educa-



Participants and Directors, Visiting Faculty, AU-APSA Summer Institute. *Front row* (left to right): Laszlo Vass, Angela Moyano, Fouad Shehab, Natalie M. L. M. Morales, Maree-Anne Reid, Johannes Breeveld. *Middle row*: Birsen Ors, Marta Rey-Garcia, Sheilah Mann, Susan W. Hammond. *Back row*: Edgar Nassar-Guier, Bertjan Verbeek, James R. Thurber, Frank J. Sorauf, Golam Morshed, Candace J. Nelson, Kalliopi Spanou, Jayadeva Uyangoda, Fabien Eboussi-Boulaga.

tors" at the American University and at Southern Illinois University. The American Political Science Association was a co-sponsor of the Summer Institute hosted by The American University. The two programs offered the faculty participants from other countries an intensive study of American politics and government along with consultations with U.S. faculty on research and teaching.

The sixteen faculty attending the institute at American University were:

- Johannes Breeveld, Anton de Kom University, Paramaraibo, Suriname
- Fabien Eboussi-Boulaga, University of Yaounde, Yaounde, Cameroon
- Takeshi Matsuda, Osaka University of Foreign Studies, Osaka, Japan
- Natalia M. L. M. Morales, University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines
- Golam Morshed, Rajshahi University, Dhaka, Bangladesh
- Angela Moyano, Instituto Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, Queretaro, Mexico City, Mexico
- Edgar Nassar-Guier, Autonomous University of Central America, San Jose, Costa Rica
- Birsen Ors, Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey
- Iqbal Ahmed Qureshi, University of

- Sindh, Islamabad, Pakistan
- Maree-Anne Reid, University of Queensland, Canberra, Australia
- Marta Rey-Garcia, Complutense University Madrid, Madrid, Spain
- Fouad Shehab, The University of Bahrain, Manama, Bahrain
- Kalliopi Spanou, Athens University, Athens, Greece
- Jayadeva Uyangoda, University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka
- Laszlo Vass, Budapest University of Economic Studies, Budapest, Hungary
- Bertjan Verbeek, Free University of Amsterdam, The Hague, Netherlands

The AU/APSA program used its Washington, D.C., location to offer presentations not only by political scientists but also by politicians, federal officials, and journalists. Site visits were made to Congress, the National Archives, C-SPAN, the State Department, and Annapolis for a program on federalism and state government. James A. Thurber and Susan W. Hammond were the Institute's co-directors, Candace J. Nelson, the coordinator, and Sheilah Mann, the education director.

American University faculty contributing to the program as lecturers were: Laird Anderson, Christine Degregorio, Katherine Farquhar,