

Table 1. Rankings of Ph.D.-granting political science departments, based on per-faculty publications in five leading political science journals, 1994-1998.

Rank	University
1.	Carnegie-Mellon University
2.	California Institute of Technology
3.	SUNY, Stony Brook
4.	University of Houston
5.	University of California, Riverside
6.	University of California, Davis
7.	Indiana University
8.	Texas A&M University
9.	University of North Texas
10.	Louisiana State University
11.	Yale University
12.	Florida State University
13.	University of Iowa
14.	University of Pittsburgh
15.	University of Colorado
16.	Washington University, St. Louis
17.	University of California, Los Angeles
18.	Emory University
19.	University of Rochester
20.	Michigan State University

Rankings are based on the number of publications per department faculty member (weighted by coauthorship) in the *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of Politics*, *Political Research Quarterly*, and *Polity*. Source: McCormick and Rice (2001). Note that the table from which these rankings are drawn in the original article was incorrect; the corrected table was obtained directly from the senior author.

Graduate Training and Research Productivity in the 1990s: A Look at Who Publishes*

James M. McCormick, Iowa State University
Tom W. Rice, University of Northern Iowa

The relationship between reputational rankings of political science departments and their scholarly productivity remains a source of discussion and controversy. After the National Research Council (1995) published its ranking of 98 political science departments, Katz and Eagles (1996), Jackman and Siver-son (1996), and Lowry and Silver (1996) analyzed the factors that seemingly influenced those rankings. Miller, Tien, and Peebler (1996) offered an alternate approach to ranking departments, based both upon the number of faculty (and their graduates) who published in the *American Political Science Review* and upon the number of citations that faculty members received. More recently, two studies have examined departmental rankings in other ways. Ballard and Mitchell (1998) assessed political science departments by evaluating the level of productivity in nine important disciplinary and subfield journals, and Garand and Graddy (1999) evaluated the impact of journal publications (and other variables) on the rankings of political science departments. In general, Miller, Tien, and Peebler found a high level of correspondence between reputation rankings and productivity, Ballard and Mitchell did not, and Garand and Graddy found that publications in “high-impact” journals were important for departmental rankings.

In this study, we also address the question of the relationship between reputation and productivity for political science departments, but our approach differs from these earlier studies in several ways. First, our analysis focuses primarily on the graduate-training institutions of the authors. Second, we examine articles published in five major political science journals from 1994 through 1998—*American Political Science Review*

(*APSR*), *American Journal of Political Science (AJPS)*, *Journal of Politics (JOP)*, *Political Research Quarterly (PRQ)*, and *Polity*. Third, by drawing on an earlier study conducted by McCormick and Bernick (1982), we compare the results of the current study with those of 20 years earlier to assess how the relationship between reputational rankings and scholarly productivity has changed.¹

Graduate Training, Journal Selection, and Reputation and Productivity Over Time

Our reason for focusing upon the graduate-training institution as the principal unit of analysis in examining reputational rankings and scholarly productivity is straightforward. Departments gain a reputation not only by the scholarly output of their faculty but also by the students they produce. Focusing upon departmental graduates is especially important, since tight job markets often compel potentially productive scholars to take positions in less prestigious departments. No longer do prestigious departments produce only scholars destined for other prestigious departments. Finally, and importantly, students accustomed to professional scholarly norms in their graduate institutions are likely to continue to follow those norms, regardless of their present institutional affiliation. Hence, there could well be a higher correspondence between reputation and scholarly productivity if the authors’ graduate-training departments were the focus of the analysis rather than if we analyzed the departments of the authors’ present institutional affiliations.

The five journals selected for use in this analysis also differ from those analyzed in recent studies. We selected these five because they represent the national association journal and the four leading regional association journals in the discipline. Each journal is broad-gauged in its coverage, and each offers articles representing all areas of the discipline. Thus, these outlets present a cross-section of the discipline. They have received consistently high ratings in periodic evaluations by political scientists (see, e.g. Garand 1990; Giles and Wright

1975). In short, these five journals are likely to cover the breadth of the discipline and to do so with quality control.

The design of our analysis parallels the 1974–78 study (McCormick and Bernick 1982) and thus enables us to assess the extent to which reputational rankings and scholarly productivity have changed over the past two decades. That is, we can see the extent to which some departments have shifted in their reputational rankings, how some departments have changed in their scholarly productivity, and how the relationship between reputation and productivity has varied over time. Our hunch is that we are unlikely to see much change in these rankings or in the relationship between reputation and productivity because many of the same highly ranked schools from the earlier period continue to be highly ranked in the 1995 survey. At the same time, though, some change has occurred among the most productive departments, as evidenced in the recent studies (although the graduate institutions of the authors were usually not the unit of analysis). Hence, there remains an important empirical question about the degree of correspondence between reputation and productivity now and from 20 years ago.

Our analysis proceeds in the following way. First, we determine where the authors of the five journals’ articles received their graduate training. Second, we rank the authors’ graduate departments by both the frequency and quality of articles. Third, we compare the rankings of these graduate institutions with the 1995 National Research Council reputational rankings and with the rankings of the present affiliations of the authors. In this way, we assess the degree of correspondence between reputational rankings, scholarly productivity by graduate school rankings, and scholarly productivity by present affiliation rankings. Lastly, we compare our results for the 1990s with those for the 1970s to gain some sense of the disciplinary change over the past two decades.

Data and Method

For the five journals, we considered articles, research notes, and the contro-

James M. McCormick is professor and chair of department of political science at Iowa State University. He has published in the areas of international politics and American foreign policy.

Tom W. Rice is professor and chair of the department of political science at the University of Northern Iowa. He has published articles in the areas of voting behavior, public opinion, and civic culture.

TABLE 1
Ranking of Political Science Departments by Productivity of Their Graduates, 1994–1998

	APSR	AJPS	JOP	Polity	PRQ	Weighted Score
Michigan	10.83	17.75	15.90	0.00	10.33	51.99
California, Berkeley	12.87	12.56	7.83	6.00	3.83	40.65
Chicago	12.67	7.58	4.42	14.33	4.50	39.31
Rochester	12.33	15.50	7.00	3.00	2.33	38.66
Indiana	7.70	10.42	6.48	2.25	10.29	34.19
Yale	11.08	10.33	6.17	4.00	4.00	33.60
Iowa	4.08	15.50	5.42	1.00	8.50	32.15
Minnesota	5.50	12.67	6.50	4.50	4.75	31.63
Wisconsin	4.50	8.58	7.00	5.50	7.17	29.78
Stanford	8.17	8.08	5.50	1.83	8.50	29.65
North Carolina	7.35	8.17	5.00	3.25	4.17	26.13
Harvard	8.92	3.50	4.92	8.00	1.33	24.52
Princeton	9.18	5.08	4.58	4.00	2.00	23.40
Washington, St. Louis	5.17	7.08	6.03	0.00	6.58	23.23
Ohio State	6.08	3.33	3.75	1.00	9.75	21.51
Duke	3.92	8.92	2.17	3.00	3.33	19.83
UCLA	5.50	1.29	3.67	2.00	8.00	18.23
Michigan State	3.58	5.00	3.17	1.33	5.50	16.99
Colorado	2.50	6.33	4.00	3.00	2.00	16.59
Texas	2.83	7.83	3.17	0.00	3.33	16.28

versy section (in *APSR*), but excluded such things as review essays and book reviews.² By the criteria we identified and studied 1057 articles and research notes, an increase of 99 articles from the 1974–78 period. Of the total, *APSR* had 227 entries, the *AJPS* 281, *JOP* 200, *Polity* 132, and *PRQ* 217. The greatest article increase from the earlier period occurred in *AJPS* and *PRQ*, with a growth of 75 and 36 entries, respectively. *Polity* also increased, although by only 10 more entries. *APSR* and *JOP*, however, declined slightly, with 10 and 12 fewer articles, respectively.

For each article entry, we first coded the present institutional affiliation of the author(s). In all, 1770 scholars published the 1057 articles in the five journals. Fifty-two percent of these entries (or 553 articles) were single-authored. The rest were multiauthored with most dual-authored, but three or more authors wrote 3–18% of the articles across these journals. Interestingly, the majority of articles in *AJPS* and *JOP* were coauthored, but a majority of articles in *APSR* and

PRQ were single-authored. By contrast, an overwhelming majority of articles in *Polity* were single-authored. Overall, then, the results for the most recent period reveal a greater tendency for joint authorship than 20 years earlier, when 73% of the articles in these journals were single-authored.

Scholars at American political science departments authored the overwhelming percentage of the articles in these journals. Authors from foreign institutions wrote only 4.7% of the articles; authors without departmental affiliations wrote 1.2% of the articles; and authors with other departmental affiliations (e.g., sociology, economics) wrote 2.8% of the articles. These numbers are generally of the same magnitude as those from 20 years earlier, although the numbers of authors without departmental affiliations or political science affiliations have decreased (from 2.2% and 6.6% respectively), and the number of political scientists with foreign institutional affiliations has increased from 3.3% in 1974–78. Still, political scientists who

were affiliated with American political science departments authored roughly 90% of all articles in these journals. Thus, these data allow us to paint an accurate portrait of productivity within the American political science profession.

In order to identify the graduate training of the articles' authors, we used a variety of source materials.³ The initial and principal source was APSA's *Graduate Faculty and Programs in Political Science 1998–2000* (1998). This source lists all departments that offer M.A. or Ph.D. programs, and their faculties. For the overwhelming number of departments, it also lists the institutions where faculty members received their highest degree. We gathered roughly two-thirds of our information on authors' graduate-training institutions from this source. We also consulted two other sources: APSA's *Directory of Members 1997–99* (1997) and *Directory of Undergraduate Political Science Faculty 1996–98* (1996). For those authors whom we could not find in any of these sources, we undertook Internet searches, sent emails, telephoned institutions with which they were possibly affiliated, and even telephoned past coauthors. As a result, we identified the graduate-training departments for over 98% of the authors.⁴

Our next step was to create a weighted publication score for each graduate department identified from the author list. To do so, we first totaled the number of articles or portions of articles that a graduate of a department contributed to each journal for the 1994 to 1998 period.⁵ Next, we weighted the journal score based upon the ranking reported by Garand (1990).⁶ By multiplying the number of articles produced by each department's graduates by the quality index for each journal and then totaling these results across the five journals, we obtained a weighted graduate-training score for each Ph.D. department in our study. These weighted scores are the basis for the rankings that we report. Finally, we also created a comparable weighted score for each institution based upon the affiliation of the author at the time when the article was written (present affiliation). We use these affiliation scores to rank departments and to compare them to the graduate-training scores.

Findings

Table 1 ranks the top 20 political science departments based upon the weighted graduate-training productivity scores and shows the number of articles

produced by graduates of these departments in each of the five journals. What is immediately striking is that, collectively, Big Ten, Ivy League, and West Coast political science departments dominate these rankings and that these departments have generally been recognized as the most prestigious in the profession. Furthermore, these top 20 departments dominate the absolute number of articles published in the five journals. The top 10 departments in this ranking, for instance, account for 37% of the articles in these journals, while the top 20 departments account for 58%. For *APSR* and *AJPS*, graduates of these 20 departments authored 64 and 63% of the articles, respectively; for *JOP*, 56% of the articles; and for *Polity* and *PRQ*, just over a majority of the articles (52 and 51%, respectively) come from these institutions. Clearly, these results reveal that graduates of relatively few American political science departments contribute a substantial portion of the articles in the five most important journals in the profession.

While a few of the same departments dominated the productivity in these journals two decades earlier, there are at least two important changes from the earlier era. First, 17 of the top 20 departments in the 1974–78 period (McCormick and Bernick 1982, 218) remained in the top 20 most productive graduate departments in the latest results. Three schools—Illinois, Syracuse, and Columbia—dropped out of the top 20 in the most recent period and have been replaced by Ohio State, Colorado, and Texas. Second, several schools that ranked in the second 10 in the earlier period have moved up in the rankings. Notably, Rochester, Indiana, and Iowa rank in the top 10 in productivity for the 1990s. Conversely, some schools that were top-ranked in the 1970s—notably, Yale, Harvard, and Princeton—have declined several ranks. It appears that for the five journals graduates from the Midwest have demonstrated the greatest increase in productivity, while graduates from the East Coast—primarily Ivy Leaguers—have demonstrated the greatest decline.

Productivity and Reputational Rank

Table 2 provides a more direct test of the relationship between reputation and graduate productivity. It lists the top 20 political science departments by the latest reputation study and the top 20 most productive departments in the five journals, based upon the weighted score

TABLE 2
Comparative Rankings of Political Science Departments by Reputation and Alternate Measures of Productivity

Reputational Rankings ^a	Graduate-Training Rankings	Affiliation Rankings
1. Harvard	1. Michigan	1. Texas A&M
2. California, Berkeley	2. California, Berkeley	2. Houston
3. Yale	3. Chicago	3. UCLA
4. Michigan	4. Rochester	4. Yale
5. Stanford	5. Indiana	5. Indiana
6. Chicago	6. Yale	6. California, San Diego
7. Princeton	7. Iowa	7. SUNY, Stony Brook
8. UCLA	8. Minnesota	8. Harvard
9. California, San Diego	9. Wisconsin	9. Ohio State
10. Wisconsin	10. Stanford	10. Michigan
11. Rochester	11. North Carolina	11. George Washington
12. MIT	12. Harvard	12. Stanford
13. Minnesota	13. Princeton	13. Minnesota
14. Duke	14. Washington, St. Louis	14. North Texas
15. Cornell	15. Ohio State	15. Michigan State
16. Columbia	16. Duke	16. North Carolina
17. Ohio State	17. UCLA	17. Emory
18. North Carolina	18. Michigan State	18. Washington, St. Louis
19. Texas	19. Colorado	19. Florida State
20. Indiana	20. Texas	20. Penn State

^aThe reputational rankings are drawn from "Appendix Table P-36 Relative Rankings for Research Doctorate Programs in Political Science" in National Research Council (1995, 602–5).

from Table 1. For comparative purposes, we also include in this table the ranking of departments by the present affiliations of the authors of articles in the journals.

As this table shows, most of the reputational departments are represented in the graduate-training rankings. In fact, 9 of the top 10 and 16 of the 20 reputational departments can be found in the graduate-training rankings. Only four schools—University of California-San Diego, MIT, Cornell, and Columbia—are not found in the graduate-training rankings. By contrast, graduates of Iowa, Washington University in St. Louis, Michigan State, and Colorado propel these schools to rank among the most productive, even though they do not place in the top 20 reputational rankings. Thus, graduates of these departments are much more productive than a reputational assessment might imply. Furthermore, even some departments that place in both rankings fare better than their reputational positions would

suggest. Consider Indiana, which ranks twentieth reputationally but ranks fifth by our productivity measure. However, Harvard ranks first reputationally, but only ranks twelfth in productivity. The important message with these results, though, is the close relationship between graduate-training, productivity, and reputational rankings in American political science departments.

These findings largely match those from two decades earlier. In the 1970s reputational departments were generally the most productive in the journals and remained so in the 1990s. The exceptions are notable. MIT and Cornell did not rank in productivity in the 1970s or 1990s. Syracuse, Duke, and Michigan State ranked in the productivity list in the 1970s but were not in the reputational list. Duke has now moved into the reputational rankings and remains on the productivity list for the 1990s. Michigan State remains on the productivity list for the recent period, but it still does

not rank in the top 20 reputational departments. Syracuse, by contrast, no longer ranks in either top 20.

When we turn to Table 2's present-affiliation rankings, however, the story is much different. Only 10 of the 20 reputational departments appear on this ranking (UCLA, Yale, Indiana, California-San Diego, Harvard, Ohio State, Michigan, Stanford, Minnesota, and North Carolina). The present affiliation ranking, however, also includes a number of departments that do not rank reputationally, but whose faculty members are highly productive. Texas A&M and Houston, the two most productive departments by this ranking, are particularly notable, but SUNY-Stony Brook, George Washington, North Texas, Michigan State, Emory, Washington University in St. Louis, Florida State, and Penn State also appear on this list. In short, reputation and productivity measured by the present affiliation are not strongly related for these five journals. Put somewhat differently, faculty members at some departments have much higher journal productivity rates than their departmental reputations might imply.

In a comparative context, the results for Table 2 mirror a pattern found with the 1970s data, in which only a modest number of reputational schools (eight out of 21) showed up in the affiliation rankings. Moreover, the overlap in the affiliation rankings between the two periods is relatively low. Only five reputational departments (Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana, UCLA, and North Carolina) and three nonreputational departments (Ohio State, Houston, Iowa) appear in both rankings.⁷ This suggests that different departments were more productive in different eras and that there have been some noticeable changes in the most productive departments.

At the same time, a comparison across the three rankings in Table 2 reveals considerable stability in productivity and identifies a core of departments that continue to contribute to these journals—regardless of the measure of productivity. Consider that UCLA, Harvard, Ohio State, Michigan, Stanford, Minnesota, and North Carolina appear on all three rankings, and Iowa, Michigan State and Washington University in St. Louis appear on the graduate-training and the affiliation rankings. Put simply, both graduates of and scholars from few departments contribute to the five journals. Most, but far from all of these scholars, represent the top 20 reputational departments.

Relative Productivity and Reputational Rank

So far, our analysis has considered only absolute productivity by departments in the five journals. We have not yet given a clear assessment of the productivity of departments that produce few graduates—even if those graduates are highly productive. As such, our last set of analyses—paralleling the 1974–78 study—controls for the impact of size to assess the levels of relative productivity and scholarly productivity.

We used two measures to standardize the graduate-training rankings and one measure to standardize the present-affiliation rankings. For the graduate-training rankings, we used the distribution of Ph.D.s by graduate department in the discipline at the present time and the number of recent Ph.D. graduates by department. The first measure approximates the number of political scientists, by graduate departments, who could potentially contribute to the five journals. To operationalize this measure, we undertook a systematic survey of all graduate departments listed in *Graduate Faculty and Programs in Political Science 1998–2000* (1998). By systematically counting the number of Ph.D.s from these departments, we obtained a reasonable estimate of the relative strength of various graduate programs in the profession. As noted in the earlier analysis (McCormick and Bernick 1982, 222), though, this approach has two potential difficulties: the source includes graduate departments but not undergraduate departments; and a few graduate schools do not report their faculty roster or their faculty's highest graduate degree to APSA. These problems are minimized in that APSA reports an overwhelming majority of departments and relatively few scholars from solely undergraduate departments contribute to the journals.⁸ Hence, the number of Ph.D.s in the profession from each department was the measure we used to standardize the weighted graduate-training score. The second graduate-training measure is simply the "average number of Ph.D.s granted annually in the last 3 years" by each Ph.D. department, as reported in *Graduate Faculty and Programs in Political Science 1998–2000* (1998, 351–52). Although this is only a short-term measure, it provides some indication of the relative number of graduates from various departments. By serving as a proxy for the number of Ph.D.s produced by a department over the long haul, it provides us with another measure for the relative productivity of each political sci-

ence department. Lastly, for the present affiliation rankings, we simply standardized those weighted productivity scores by the number of faculty within each department, as reported in *Graduate Faculty and Programs in Political Science 1998–2000* (1998, 351–52).

Table 3 compares the top 20 reputational rankings with the two standardized graduate-training rankings, and the standardized present-affiliation rankings. Across all of these rankings, relatively few reputational departments appear. Eight reputational departments appear in the first standardized graduate-training rankings, two in the second standardized graduate-training rankings, and four in the standardized affiliation rankings. In this sense, and much like 20 years earlier, the relationship between reputational departments and journal productivity is weak when relative productivity is compared with total productivity.

This table also identifies some departments that actively contribute to the five journals, despite having either relatively few recent graduates or relatively few total graduates. Notable on both standardized graduate-training rankings, for instance, are such departments as Rochester, Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Iowa, Washington University in St. Louis, Cal Tech, SUNY-Stony Brook, Rice, Colorado, Duke, Emory, and California-Riverside. According to this analysis, graduates of these departments are highly productive, although most do not work for the most reputational departments in the discipline.

The last column of the table (standardized affiliation rankings) identifies several departments that in recent years have had especially productive faculty. Once again, most of these department are not on the top 20 reputational list. The top seven departments on this standardized affiliation ranking—Carnegie-Mellon, Cal Tech, SUNY-Stony Brook, Houston, California-Riverside, North Texas, and Texas A&M—place higher than any of the top 20 reputational departments. After Indiana and Yale in the eight and ninth spots, almost all of the remaining departments are without top reputational rank, and all may be characterized as departments whose achievements exceed their reputations.

Conclusions

From analyzing who publishes in the five leading journals of the discipline for the 1994–98 period and comparing the results with those from the 1974–78 period, several important conclusions

TABLE 3
Comparative Rankings of Political Science Departments by Reputation and Alternate Standardized Measures of Productivity

Reputational Rankings ^a	Graduate Training Rankings I ^b	Graduate Training Rankings II ^c	Affiliation Rankings ^d
1. Harvard	1. Rochester	1. Texas A&M	1. Carnegie-Mellon
2. California, Berkeley	2. Wisconsin, Milwaukee	2. Illinois, Chicago	2. Cal Tech
3. Yale	3. Iowa	3. North Texas	3. SUNY, Stony Brook
4. Michigan	4. Michigan State	4. California, Irvine	4. Houston
5. Stanford	5. Stanford	5. Cal Tech	5. California, Riverside
6. Chicago	6. Washington, St. Louis	6. Rochester	6. North Texas
7. Princeton	7. Indiana	7. Wisconsin, Milwaukee	7. Texas A&M
8. UCLA	8. Cal Tech	8. West Virginia	8. Indiana
9. California, San Diego	9. Minnesota	9. Washington, St. Louis	9. Yale
10. Wisconsin	10. SUNY, Stony Brook	10. SUNY, Stony Brook	10. Florida State
11. Rochester	11. Rice	11. Emory	11. California, Davis
12. MIT	12. Colorado	12. Iowa	12. Louisiana State
13. Minnesota	13. Loyola University, Chicago	13. California, Riverside	13. Washington, St. Louis
14. Duke	14. Michigan	14. Rice	14. UCLA
15. Cornell	15. Duke	15. California, Davis	15. Penn State
16. Columbia	16. Emory	16. Colorado	16. Colorado
17. Ohio State	17. Yale	17. Carnegie-Mellon	17. Pittsburgh
18. North Carolina	18. Vanderbilt	18. Cincinnati	18. Rochester
19. Texas	19. California, Riverside	19. Duke	19. Emory
20. Indiana	20. California, Berkeley	20. Fordham	20. Iowa

^aThe reputational rankings are drawn from "Appendix Table P-36 Relative Rankings for Research Doctorate Programs in Political Science" in National Research Council (1995, 602–5).

^bTo obtain these graduate-training ranks, the weighted department scores were standardized by the number of recent graduates. The figure used for each department was the number reported in *Graduate Faculty and Programs in Political Science 1998–2000* (1998).

^cTo obtain these graduate rankings, the weighted department scores were divided by the number of political scientists in the profession who received their graduate training from that institution (as determined by our assessment of the profession of the American political science departments reported in *Graduate Faculty and Programs in Political Science 1998–2000* [1998]).

^dTo obtain these rankings, the weighted present affiliation scores were divided by the number of faculty members in a department. The figure used was the number reported in *Graduate Faculty and Programs in Political Science 1998–2000* (1998, 351–52).

emerge about the degree of stability and change in the discipline's productivity and about the relationship between reputation and productivity. First, when we measure productivity by the graduate training of the authors of these journal articles, there is close correspondence between reputation and productivity; there is no such correspondence when we measure productivity by the present affiliation of the authors. Similarly, when we conceptualize journal productivity in absolute terms, there is a close correspondence between reputational ranking and departmental graduate productivity; when we conceptualize journal productivity in relative terms, there is no such correspondence. There is little corre-

spondence between absolute or relative productivity, reputation ranking, and the present affiliation of article authors. To a great degree, these conclusions parallel the conclusions reached for the 1974–78 period, and in this sense the relationship between reputation and productivity in these journals has been stable.

Our results by present affiliation, however, suggest the degree of change in the profession. Many less reputational departments (as measured by the National Research Council report) currently prove to be the most productive. While some of these departments show up in the 1970s affiliation rankings (e.g., Carnegie-Mellon, Cal Tech, Houston, Rice), there are a number of new entries (e.g.,

Texas A&M, SUNY-Stony Brook, North Texas). In this sense, the diversity of the discipline is increasingly evident. Moreover, this diversity occurs in the affiliation rankings, whether viewed in terms of absolute or relative productivity.

Overall, though, more stability than change dominates our results. While the new entries into the productivity lists have affected the results, they have not substantially changed the productivity patterns in the profession. While the new entries remain the sources of incipient change within the profession, the graduates of the reputational departments continue to dominate the overall productivity pattern within the profession, much as they did in the 1970s.

Notes

* Thanks to Dan Beaver-Seitz and Jeremy Moffit for their assistance with data collection and analysis.

1. In this earlier study, we used the *Western Political Quarterly*. That journal, of course, is now titled *Political Research Quarterly*.

2. For *APSR*, we made a research design decision to include an entry under the "Controversy" section as one article with multiple authors.

3. We used the graduate training of the highest degree. That usually meant a Ph.D. We also sought to check whether the graduate training was in political science or another discipline. For those authors who were completing their graduate training at the time the article was published, we coded that institution as their school of graduate training. In some rare instances, where an undergraduate student was author or coauthor of an article, we decided not to use that current institution in the graduate-training analysis.

4. In all, we could not identify 30 authors' graduate-training backgrounds. This missing data total compares favorably with the amount of missing data in the 1974–78 analysis when 6.5% of authors' graduate training was undetermined (McCormick and Bernick 1982, 216).

5. In coding the authors of the articles, we also coded whether that person was a single author or one of multiple authors. For the former, we coded the entry as a 1.00, and for the latter, we coded the entry based upon the number of coauthors. For two authors, each was coded as .5; for three authors, .33, and so on. When we then aggregated by graduate-training institution (or by present affiliation), we ensured that multi-authored articles were proportioned equally among various graduate departments (or present-affiliation departments).

6. Garand (1990) reports the mean ratings of a large number of social science journals, actually based upon a survey by Giles, Mizell, and Patterson

(1989). These ratings are the result of a random survey of political scientists and represent an updating of the rating by Giles and Wright (1975), which is the basis of the analysis in the 1974–78 study. Using these ratings and using *APSR*, the highest-rated journal, as the base, we calculated the quality rating of the other journals as a fraction of *APSR*'s quality rating. Hence, with *APSR* as 1.00, *AJPS* was .987, *JOP* was .974, *PRQ* was .789, and *Polity* was .789.

7. To be sure, by the 1995 reputational rankings, Ohio State ranked in the reputational top 20, but it did not rank there in the 1970s.

8. On this point, see McCormick and Bernick (1982, 222). We note that for the 1974–78 analysis, we systematically surveyed the then-current *Guide to Graduate Study in Political Science*. This time, we surveyed all American political science departments listed in *Graduate Faculty and Program in Political Science 1998–2000* (1998).

References

- American Political Science Association. 1979. *Guide to Graduate Study in Political Science*. Washington, DC.
- . 1996. *Directory of Undergraduate Political Science Faculty 1996–98*. Washington, DC.
- . 1997. *Directory of Members 1997–99*. Washington, DC.
- . 1998. *Graduate Faculty and Programs in Political Science 1998–2000*. Washington, DC.
- Ballard, Michael J., and Neil J. Mitchell. 1998. "The Good, the Better, and the Best in Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31:826–28.
- Garand, James C. 1990. "An Alternative Interpretation of Recent Political Science Journal Evaluations." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 23:448–51.
- , and Kristy L. Graddy. 1999. "Ranking Political Science Departments: Do Publications Matter?" *PS: Political Science and Politics* 32:113–16.
- Giles, Micheal, and Gerald Wright. 1975. "Political Scientists' Evaluation of Sixty-three Journals." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 8:254–57.
- Giles, Micheal, Francie Mizell, and David Patterson. 1989. "Political Scientists' Journal Evaluations Revisited." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 22:613–17.
- Jackman, Robert W., and Randolph M. Siverson. 1996. "Rating the Rating: An Analysis of the National Research Council's Appraisal of Political Science Ph.D. Programs." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 29:155–60.
- Katz, Richard S., and Munroe Eagles. 1996. "Ranking Political Science Programs: A View from the Lower Half." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 29:149–54.
- Lowry, Robert C., and Brian D. Silver. 1996. "A Rising Tide Lifts All Boats: Political Science Department Reputation and the Reputation of the University." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 29: 161–67.
- McCormick, James M., and E. Lee Bernick. 1982. "Graduate Training and Productivity: A Look at Who Publishes." *Journal of Politics* 44:212–27.
- Miller, Arthur H., Charles Tien, and Andrew A. Peebler. 1996. "Department Rankings: An Alternative Approach." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 29:704–17.
- National Research Council. 1995. *Research Doctorate Programs in the United States: Continuity and Change*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.