

1982

Graduate Training and Productivity: A Look at Who Publishes

James M. McCormick
Iowa State University, jmmcc@iastate.edu

E. Lee Bernick
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Follow this and additional works at: http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/pols_pubs

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Political Science Commons](#)

The complete bibliographic information for this item can be found at http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/pols_pubs/29. For information on how to cite this item, please visit <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/howtocite.html>.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Political Science at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Political Science Publications by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

Graduate Training and Productivity: A Look at Who Publishes

Abstract

In two recent studies, Morgan and Fitzgerald and Robey ranked American political science departments on the basis of their faculty's research productivity in the major political science journals. The rankings which they produced were at some variance with the reputational rankings reported by Somit and Tanenhaus, Cartter, and, more recently, Ladd and Lipset. In particular, Robey reports that "... some southern universities seem to have made great strides in the last ten years while some Ivy League schools do not seem to be producing at a rate equivalent with their reputations." Morgan and Fitzgerald reach a similar conclusion about the relationship between reputation and productivity for the Ivy League and southern schools. These studies and their implications have generated a great deal of discussion among political scientists and, as might be expected, have been subjected to a variety of criticism. Criticisms, for example, have focused on the journals selected to measure productivity, the use of frequency of articles produced rather than their importance for the profession, and the failure to incorporate books and monographs in such evaluations.

Disciplines

Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research | Higher Education | Political Science

Comments

This is an article from *The Journal of Politics* 44 (1982): 212, [doi:10.2307/2130294](https://doi.org/10.2307/2130294). Posted with permission.

Graduate Training and Productivity: A Look at Who Publishes

JAMES M. McCORMICK

E. LEE BERNICK

IN TWO RECENT STUDIES, Morgan and Fitzgerald and Robey ranked American political science departments on the basis of their faculty's research productivity in the major political science journals.¹ The rankings which they produced were at some variance with the reputational rankings reported by Somit and Tanenhaus, Cartter, and, more recently, Ladd and Lipset.² In particular, Robey reports

* The authors would like to thank Dan Clement and Peter Sargent for assistance with the collection and coding of the data. The Political Science Departments at Iowa State University and Texas A&M University provided computer funding, for which we are grateful. Thanks are also due Bob Bernstein, Jon Bond, and Harvey Tucker for several comments and suggestions on this project.

¹ David R. Morgan and Michael R. Fitzgerald, "Recognition and Production Among American Political Science Departments," *Western Political Quarterly*, 30 (September 1977), 342-350; and John S. Robey, "Political Science Departments: Reputations Versus Productivity," *PS*, 12 (Spring 1979), 202-209.

² See the rankings by Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus, *American Political Science: Profile of a Discipline* (New York: Atherton Press, 1964), 34; Allan M. Cartter, *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education, 1966), 40-41; and the Ladd and Lipset survey as reported in Malcolm G. Scully, "The Well-Known Universities Lead in Ratings of Faculties' Reputations," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (January 15, 1979), 6-7.

that “. . . some southern universities seem to have made great strides in the last ten years while some Ivy League schools do not seem to be producing at a rate equivalent with their reputations.”³ Morgan and Fitzgerald reach a similar conclusion about the relationship between reputation and productivity for the Ivy League and southern schools.⁴ These studies and their implications have generated a great deal of discussion among political scientists and, as might be expected, have been subjected to a variety of criticism. Criticisms, for example, have focused on the journals selected to measure productivity, the use of frequency of articles produced rather than their importance for the profession, and the failure to incorporate books and monographs in such evaluations.⁵

Beyond these criticisms, though, a more crucial conceptual problem exists in evaluating these findings. Both the Morgan and Fitzgerald and Robey studies are implicitly hypothesizing that the present affiliation of those who publish is an appropriate way to assess the quality of American political science departments. The assumption presumably is that the particular work setting stimulates and facilitates research productivity, and such productivity, in turn, reflects the overall quality of the departments. Using this approach, then, both studies concluded that reputational and productivity rankings do not correspond for some schools.

But does the use of the present affiliation of those who publish fully test the reputational rankings of political science departments? For at least three interrelated reasons, we contend that it does not and suggest an alternate way of viewing the relationship between reputation and productivity. First, departments gain a national reputation not only by the research productivity of their present scholars but also through the students whom they produce. Second, in a job market which has been extraordinarily tight in the past decade, there has been a considerable diffusion of young scholars from prestigious schools to a variety of less prestigious universities and colleges. Third, because individuals have been socialized to professional norms in their graduate training, they continue to do research and to publish their results, albeit from different institutional settings. Thus, the disparity between productivity and reputation that Morgan and Fitzgerald and Robey report is prob-

³ Robey, “Political Science Departments,” 206, 208.

⁴ Morgan and Fitzgerald, “Recognition and Production,” 346, 348.

⁵ See, for example, Mostafa Rejai, “Letters to the Editor,” *PS*, 12 (Summer 1979), 428; and W. Phillips Shively, “Letters to the Editor,” *PS*, 12 (Fall 1979), 538.

ably less a function of the decline in the quality of some political science departments and more a function of changes in the job opportunity structure within the political science discipline.⁶ Moreover, we would hypothesize that there is a higher correspondence between reputation and productivity if the department of graduate training of such individuals is the unit of analysis rather than the present affiliation of those who publish. If this alternate analytical approach is employed, it may well be that the prestigious political science departments dominate the research production of the profession.

Our research tests this argument by examining articles appearing in five major political science journals—*The American Political Science Review*, *The Journal of Politics*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *Western Political Quarterly*, and *Polity*—from 1974-1978.⁷ First, we determine where the authors of

⁶ While we believe that these assumptions about the relationship between reputation and productivity are accurate, we do not demonstrate the specific validity of each one. Rather, our concern is with the consequence of these assumptions and the testing of the correspondence between graduate education and productivity. If this hypothesis is disconfirmed, we will need to reformulate our assumptions and our hypothesis. Furthermore, we have not exhausted the reasons why students of reputational schools might be expected to be highly productive. For instance, it might well be that there is a circulation of elites among the top schools which perpetuate these schools' dominance in productivity. In addition, an informal network (the "old school" network) may assist students from reputational schools in publishing articles and books. Similarly, graduates of the top reputational schools may be most productive largely for another reason—a self-selection one. That is, these graduates may be the "brightest" students who selected the "best" schools and, in turn, proved to be the most productive. In short, then, other reasons may be advanced as to why graduates of the reputational departments would be most productive. For a discussion of some of these issues, see Somit and Tanenhaus, *American Political Science*, 42-48; and Walter B. Roettger, "Strata and Stability: Reputations of American Political Scientists," *PS*, 11 (Winter 1978), 6-12. While all of these reasons should be investigated, our primary concern is the prior step to such investigations: to establish whether students of reputational schools are more productive than students of non-reputational schools. Such an inquiry is especially germane in light of the way this argument has been conceptualized and in light of the previous findings.

⁷ These journals were selected because they had been used in previous studies and because they represent the five major journals in American political science. Although *Social Science Quarterly* now has been earmarked as the official publication of the Southwestern Political Science Association (as Morgan and Fitzgerald report), its publication decisions tend to foster an interdisciplinary focus rather than solely a political science one. Thus, we decided not to employ it. This decision is consistent with that of Morgan and Fitzgerald. Robey, however, did use articles by political scientists from *SSQ* in his study. Since the general results of the two earlier studies are

these articles received their formal graduate training. Next, we rank departments by the frequency and quality of articles published by their students. Finally, we compare these graduate-training rankings with a recent reputation ranking and with affiliation rankings. In this way, we can begin to draw some conclusions about the interrelationships between reputation and productivity examined from the perspective of graduate training of the authors rather than from the perspective of their present affiliations.

DATA AND METHOD

For the five journals in this study, we selected articles and research notes but excluded comments, rejoinders, and review essays from consideration. The rationale for this procedure was consistent with that employed by Morgan and Fitzgerald in their earlier study—to include only those pieces of research which represented independent contributions by scholars.⁸ By applying this criterion, some 958 articles and research notes were earmarked for inclusion in our analysis. The number differed somewhat by journal with *The American Political Science Review* (237), *The Journal of Politics* (212), and *American Journal of Political Science* (206) contributing the most, and *Western Political Quarterly* (181) and *Polity* (122) the least.

For each of the articles, the present affiliation of the author(s) was coded from information obtained in the journals. In all, we identified some 1,286 authors and also determined that 27.1 percent of the 958 articles had multiple authors. Also evident in this initial coding was that some of the authors were from foreign institutions (3.3 percent), others were in governmental and non-governmental positions (2.2 percent), and still others were not political scientists (6.6 percent).⁹ What was most striking, and more crucial for our

highly similar, we tend to doubt whether the inclusion or exclusion of this journal would alter dramatically our analysis.

The 1974-1978 period was selected because these years are the ones for which the most recent and complete journal volumes were available when we began this project. Therefore, they allow us the most up-to-date assessment of productivity. Moreover, this five-year time span should be a sufficient one for ranking political science departments by productivity.

⁸ Morgan and Fitzgerald, "Recognition and Productivity," 345.

⁹ The identification of non-political scientists was done through information provided in each of the journals and through information obtained when we sought to determine their graduate training as discussed below.

inquiry, was that almost 90% of the contributors to these journals were political scientists located at American universities. Such a data set allows us a basis for ranking American political science departments.

In order to determine the graduate training of the authors, we surveyed a variety of political science directories and other source materials.¹⁰ Our initial and principal source for this information was the *Guide to Graduate Study in Political Science* for the years 1975 through 1979, published by the American Political Science Association. This particular source was useful not only because it listed graduate political science departments (both M.A. and Ph.D. departments) and their faculties, but, more importantly, because it listed where these faculty members received their highest degree.¹¹ Moreover, this single source provided approximately 70 percent of the graduate-training information for this study.¹² In an attempt to find the graduate training of the remaining authors, several other sources were consulted: (1) the 1973 *Biographical Directory* of the American Political Science Association; (2) *Dissertation Abstracts*; (3) the college catalogs of the authors' present affiliations (which usually provide the academic training of their faculty); and (4) letters of inquiry were sent to some authors whom we could not locate. As a result of all these efforts, only 6.5 percent of the authors' graduate training could not be determined.¹³

After coding the graduate-training information, we derived a

¹⁰ We only obtained graduate-training information on political scientists since our intent was to rank political science departments. As soon as we determined that an author had received training in a discipline other than political science, we gave him/her a separate code and excluded him/her from the rest of the analysis.

¹¹ The overwhelming majority of individuals coded had obtained Ph.D.s; however, there were some individuals who possessed only master's degrees or Ph.D. candidacies. The coding rule was to code the highest degree received and use that as the graduate-training institution. We also should note that in coding the graduate training for those from Johns Hopkins University from this source, it became very difficult to differentiate those who received their training at the Baltimore school and those who received it at the Washington campus. As a consequence, all individuals from either location were grouped under a single Johns Hopkins heading.

¹² The individuals who were not located in this source primarily were affiliated with schools without graduate programs and schools which did not report to the *Guide to Graduate Study in Political Science*. Additionally, there were some individuals who could not be located in these *Guides* because they were no longer affiliated with the schools from which they originally published their research.

¹³ The amount of missing data varied slightly by journal with the *Western Political Quarterly* having the highest percentage (9.6 percent), *The Journal of Politics* the lowest percentage (3.8 percent), and the rest (*The American Political Science Review*,

publication score for each department. We first aggregated the number of articles which a department's graduates produced by journal for the 1974 to 1978 period.¹⁴ Next, we weighted the journal score following the approach used by Morgan and Fitzgerald. In this scheme, *The American Political Science Review* was set equal to 1.00 while the quality scores of the other four political science journals were a fraction of this value, based upon their distance in quality assessment from the *Review*.¹⁵ By multiplying the quantity of articles by the quality index for each journal, and then combining these results across journals, we were able to compute a weighted publication score for each department in our data set. This weighted graduate-training score is the basis for ranking the various departments that we report shortly.

Finally, for comparative purposes, a weighted publication score was derived for each institution based upon the present affiliation of the authors. In calculating this score, we followed the same procedure as outlined for the graduate-training score except that the present affiliation of the author was the unit of analysis.¹⁶ Such a score is comparable in construction to that reported by Morgan and Fitzgerald and Robey, although some differences among the data sets do exist.¹⁷

American Journal of Political Science, and *Polity*) at about the mean (6.3 percent, 6.5 percent, and 6.5 percent respectively).

¹⁴ For articles with more than one author, we coded the graduate-training data (as well as the affiliation data) in a way which accorded fractional credit to each institution consistent with the number of authors involved. In other words, no one article could total to more than 1.00 among the various institutions.

¹⁵ Morgan and Fitzgerald, "Recognition and Production," 345, used a survey of political scientists by Michael W. Giles and Gerald W. Wright, Jr., "Political Scientists' Evaluations of Sixty-three Journals," *PS*, 8 (Summer 1975), 254-256, as the basis of their quality index. The quality scores for the other four journals were as follows: *The Journal of Politics*, .957; *American Journal of Political Science*, .943; *Polity*, .843; and *Western Political Quarterly* .829.

¹⁶ We used the affiliation of the author at the time of publication of the article. There was undoubtedly some slight shift in affiliation for a few authors between the time of submission and actual publication of their articles. Given the job market constraints in recent years, this shift is probably quite small. Nonetheless, we should acknowledge this potential problem for the analysis.

¹⁷ In comparison with the Morgan and Fitzgerald data, our calculations of the affiliation scores differ only in the years covered (1964-1973 as compared to 1974-1978). For the Robey scores, our calculations differ in terms of years covered (1968-1977 as compared to 1974-1978), the journals included (Robey added *Social Science Quarterly*), and in weighting (Robey used unweighted totals).

FINDINGS

Table 1 presents the rankings of the top twenty political science departments by productivity of their graduates in the five journals. What is immediately apparent is that the schools ranked high on this list are generally the ones that are recognized as the most prestigious in the discipline. Well-known Ivy League, Big Ten, and West Coast departments, along with other notable private schools, dominate the top twenty rankings. Moreover, the top ten schools appear to be heavily populated by those departments with the best reputations in the profession. In addition to showing the dominance of these traditionally prestigious institutions, this table also demonstrates that these few departments disproportionately account for the total number of articles appearing in the five journals. The top ten schools on this list produced more than 43 percent of the articles surveyed while the top twenty schools produced slightly

TABLE 1
RANKING OF POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS BY
PRODUCTIVITY OF THEIR GRADUATES,
1974-1978

	APSR	JOP	AJPS	Polity	WPQ	Weighted Score
1. Yale	21.25	10.00	11.95	5.00	.50	46.72
2. Harvard	14.75	10.50	5.00	11.00	5.83	43.62
3. Michigan	16.17	5.83	15.25	0.00	5.00	40.28
4. California- Berkeley	15.00	6.00	9.95	7.00	5.00	40.17
5. North Carolina	8.08	13.58	11.20	6.00	3.50	39.60
6. Wisconsin	10.50	14.00	9.03	1.50	6.00	38.65
7. Chicago	13.83	7.50	4.50	7.00	5.50	35.71
8. Stanford	13.03	5.83	8.83	0.00	5.50	31.50
9. Princeton	8.00	7.00	4.50	3.00	5.00	25.62
10. Illinois	5.33	2.25	9.17	2.83	7.50	24.74
11. Minnesota	3.20	5.50	6.50	2.50	8.00	23.33
12. Indiana	5.70	5.50	8.17	.50	4.50	22.87
13. Iowa	6.50	4.42	7.50	2.00	3.42	22.33
14. Syracuse	5.75	3.83	4.00	2.50	6.50	20.69
15. Rochester	7.83	2.00	10.50	1.00	.50	19.89
16. Duke	4.00	12.00	2.33	2.00	0.00	19.37
17. UCLA	4.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	7.50	16.76
18. Michigan State	.50	5.33	6.50	.50	4.33	15.74
19. Columbia	1.00	.75	4.50	7.00	4.50	15.59
20. Washington- St. Louis	1.00	5.50	5.00	2.50	1.00	13.92

more than 66 percent.¹⁸ Thus, this first set of results suggests that a considerable amount of research production is concentrated in the graduates of a relatively few departments and that these schools are primarily the ones that have been often viewed as the most prestigious.

Productivity and Reputational Rank

Although Table 1 implies support for our basic contention about the relationship between reputation and graduate productivity, it does not directly test it. Table 2, however, does this. The data in this table show the rankings of the top twenty political science departments by reputation, by graduate productivity, and by present affiliation using the Morgan and Fitzgerald data, the Robey data, and the data in this study.¹⁹ Most of the schools with high reputational rankings are represented in the graduate-training ranking. In fact, only 5 of the 22 schools on the reputational list are not represented: MIT, Cornell, Northwestern, Oregon, and Johns Hopkins. For the top ten, only one school (MIT) from the reputational list is absent from the graduate productivity list. More importantly, this same kind of correspondence is not evident for the other comparisons. Only about 50 percent of the schools that make up the top twenty in reputation appear in the Morgan and Fitzgerald and Robey rankings. Even fewer reputational schools show up in our affiliation data. On balance, then, these results do tend to confirm the basic contention: when productivity is conceptualized by where the authors received their graduate training, the prestigious schools continue to dominate the political science profession.²⁰

¹⁸ These figures were derived from summing the total unweighted number of articles across journals for the top ten and top twenty schools. The denominator was the total number of articles produced by political scientists in these journals. If we were to include all contributors, the percentages would be slightly lower. Interestingly, Somit and Tanenhaus, *American Political Science*, 46, note that, for their survey of authors in *The American Political Science Review* and *The Journal of Politics* for 1953, 1957, and 1961, 80 percent of the authors in the former and 70 percent in the latter held doctorates from "prestige" departments. Thus, our results seem to imply a decline in prestigious school dominance within political science, despite their substantial prominence. This conclusion, however, cannot be hard-and-fast since our data bases are not directly comparable.

¹⁹ The reputational ranking used in this study is the one provided by Morgan and Fitzgerald, "Recognition and Production," 348.

²⁰ As a further test of the argument, we constructed a series of two-by-two and

In making these comparisons, an important by-product has been to note the schools that do not appear on the reputational list, yet rank among the top twenty on the graduate-training list. These schools might be referred to as those departments on the rise within the profession—at least as measured by graduate productivity. Three departments fit into this category: Syracuse, Duke, and Michigan State. Whether this productivity represents a permanent advancement for those institutions or is the consequence of the particular graduates produced during the time period under examination remains to be seen. Nonetheless, at this particular juncture, these are the schools whose achievements exceed their reputations.

Relative Productivity and Reputational Rank

To this point in the analysis, we only have considered absolute productivity across the five journals to rank the departments. The approach disadvantages some schools that produce few graduates—even if those graduates are productive. In order to control for the impact of size, we sought measures by which we could standardize the ratings.²¹ Two measures were used: (1) the distribution of Ph.D.s by graduate departments at present, and (2) the number of recent Ph.D. graduates from each department.

The first measure provides a reasonable estimate of the distribu-

three-by-three contingency tables in which we compared reputational rankings with the top fifty rankings for the graduate training and affiliation data. For the two-by-two tables, the data were grouped into those schools ranked in the top twenty and those schools ranked below the top twenty in each list. (Since we had only the top twenty reputational ranks, the placement of schools into the less than top twenty category was done by deduction.) For the three-by-three case, the data were grouped into those schools ranked in the top ten, those ranked eleventh to twentieth, and those below the twentieth rank. Kendall's taus were calculated from these tables. The only significant results were those for the relationship between reputation and graduate training. In fact, the relationship was strongest for the three-by-three case (reaching .74), which suggests that the greater the reputation of a school, the more productive are their graduates. Overall, then, these data results added more support to our basic argument.

²¹ Concern for relative productivity seems warranted for another reason. As more and more political science departments are offering the Ph.D., the dominance of a few departments in the production of new doctorates has begun to wane. As a consequence, it is particularly important to evaluate the success of these smaller and newer programs. For some data on these changes in departments granting the Ph.D., see Somit and Tanenhaus, *American Political Science*, 30-31; and William J. Siffin, "Portents and Prospects: Graduate Study and the Profession," *PS*, 10 (Winter 1977), 10-12.

TABLE 2

COMPARATIVE RANKINGS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS BY REPUTATION AND ALTERNATE MEASURES OF PRODUCTIVITY

Reputational Rankings ^a	Graduate-Training Rankings	Affiliation Rankings ^b	Affiliation Rankings ^c	Affiliation Rankings (1974-1978 data)
1. Yale	1. Yale	1. Wisconsin	1. Michigan	1. Michigan State
2. Harvard	2. Harvard	2. Michigan	2. Kentucky	2. Michigan
3. Berkeley	3. Michigan	3. Kentucky	3. Florida State	3. Kentucky
4. Chicago	4. Berkeley	4. Yale	4. Michigan State	4. Ohio State
5. Michigan	5. North Carolina	5. Berkeley	5. Georgia	5. Wisconsin
6.5. MIT	6. Wisconsin	6. Georgia	6. Iowa	6. Cal. Tech.
6.5. Stanford	7. Chicago	7. Chicago	7. Wisconsin	7. Virginia
8. Wisconsin	8. Stanford	8. Stanford	8. Massachusetts	8. Houston
9. Princeton	9. Princeton	9. Florida State	9. Ohio State	9. Iowa
10. North Carolina	10. Illinois	10. Iowa	10. Indiana	10. Minnesota
11. Columbia	11. Minnesota	11. Harvard	11. Minnesota	11. Maryland
12.5. UCLA	12. Indiana	12. North Carolina	12. Texas	12. Indiana
12.5. Minnesota	13. Iowa	13. Rochester	13.5. Arizona	13. Wis.-Milwaukee
14.25. Cornell	14. Syracuse	14. Hawaii	13.5. Harvard	14. UCLA
14.25. Indiana	15. Rochester	15. Michigan State	15. Berkeley	15. Florida
14.25. Northwestern	16. Duke	16. UCLA	16. Yale	16. Berkeley
14.25. Rochester	17. UCLA	17. Ohio State	17. Stanford	17. Georgia
18.5. Iowa	18. Michigan State	18. Duke	18.5. Cal.-Riverside	18. Duke
18.5. Oregon	19. Columbia	19. Syracuse	18.5. Cornell	19. Arizona
20.33. Illinois	20. Washington-St. Louis	20.5. Purdue	20. Rochester	20.5. North Carolina
20.33. Johns Hopkins		20.5. Vanderbilt		20.5. Texas
20.33. Washington-St. Louis				

^a The reputational rankings are drawn from Morgan and Fitzgerald, "Recognition and Production," 348. The numbering for tied ranks has been changed slightly to conform with the convention used in other tied orderings.

^b Ranks are from Morgan and Fitzgerald, "Recognition and Production," 348.

^c Ranks are from Robey, "Political Science Departments," 205.

tion of political scientists by graduate departments who could potentially contribute to the professional literature. A major hurdle in using this measure was obtaining a list of the faculty of all political science departments and their graduate training. One relatively complete listing was provided by the *Guide to Graduate Study in Political Science*. We decided that a systematic sample from the 1979 *Guide* would enable us to obtain a good estimate of the relative strength of each department within the profession.²²

Nonetheless, two potential problems existed with this approach. First, because the *Guide* only included departments with graduate programs, our sample excluded faculty from exclusively undergraduate departments. By excluding such schools, we necessarily lose some information on the present graduate distribution within political science; however, the amount of information lost is relatively small since scholars from these schools contribute few articles to the literature.²³ In this sense, it seems defensible to use only the affiliation distribution at the graduate level to standardize productivity scores. A second problem also arose with this survey strategy. The systematic sample did not produce information on all schools that appeared on the graduate-training list. As a consequence, controlling for the size factor for all schools became an impossibility. This problem, however, turned out to be relatively insignificant since only schools with low graduate-training scores (beyond the top 50) did not show up in the systematic sample.

While the second measure does not have some of the problems of the first in terms of data availability, it is more selective in the information that it uses in standardizing the graduate-training scores.²⁴

²² The systematic survey was carried out by randomly selecting a beginning point and then choosing every sixth page from the *Guide* for inclusion in the sample. Since virtually every page of the *Guide* has a complete or partial listing of faculty members and their graduate training, pages without faculty listings did not cause a problem for our sample. From the pages selected, some 691 individuals and their graduate training were identified. Next, the number of graduate degrees from each institution was summed. This number then became the measure used in the standardization procedure.

²³ In the data set collected for this study, only 7 percent of the articles were authored by individuals from schools that did not appear in the 1979 edition of the *Guide to Graduate Study in Political Science*.

²⁴ The *Guide to Graduate Study in Political Science* provides a compilation of the average number of Ph.D.s granted annually within the past three years for virtually all institutions. We used the 1977-1979 *Guides* to get an overall average of recent graduates to use in our calculations. In a very few instances (e.g., Columbia), we

The working assumption underlying the use of this measure is that it is these more recent graduates who are most productive and that such a measure best captures (and controls for) the dynamics of the research output at the present time. Some caution, however, is needed in the use of this measure. Recall that productivity scores are a function of all scholars from an institution over time, but this standardizing measure (recent graduates) is restricted to the years of our study only. This creates a potential problem, especially in light of the cutback in graduate programs in recent years. As a result, the relative productivity scores for some schools may be somewhat inflated because they have a large pool of potential contributors over time, even though the number of recent graduates has declined. Although this reduction seems to have occurred across all programs (and thus would minimize the problem), we have no sure way of determining this. Therefore, we decided to employ this measure in conjunction with the relative distribution measure.²⁵ Through comparing the results obtained from each measure, we should be in a better position to say something about relative productivity in the discipline.

Table 3 compares the top twenty reputational ranking with the relative productivity ranking from the Robey set, our standardized affiliation data set, and the graduate-training scores standardized by the two measures.²⁶ The number of prestigious schools that appear in the affiliation lists is especially low. While 5 of the top twenty reputational schools show up in the Robey ranking, only 2 of these are found in the top ten. For the affiliation data of 1974-1978, 5 of the top twenty in reputation are in this ranking, but again only 2 are in the top ten. Thus, these results confirm earlier research about the limited impact of prestige schools on the

were not able to get information on recent graduates from this source; however, we were able to get estimates from *Graduate Programs and Admissions Manual 1977-1979*, Volume D, Social Sciences and Education (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1977).

²⁵ The rank orderings produced by employing these two measures correlate quite highly ($r = .73$). Thus, the measures tend to capture the same underlying dimensions, but, at the same time, each provides some distinct information.

²⁶ The affiliation scores were standardized by dividing each by the number of faculty members in a department. The figure used was the average of faculty size for 1976, 1977, and 1978. The 1976 and 1977 data were gathered from the *Guide to Graduate Study in Political Science* whereas the 1978 data were from Robey, "Political Science Departments," 207. Morgan and Fitzgerald did not standardize their productivity data and thus are not included in this part of the analysis.

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	Affiliation Rankings (1974-1978 data) ^e
1. Yale	1. Iowa	1. Rochester	1. Florida Atlantic	1. Carnegie-Mellon
2. Harvard	2. North Carolina	2. Wash.-St. Louis	2. Carnegie-Mellon	2. Michigan State
3. Berkeley	3. Vanderbilt	3. Kentucky	3. Kentucky	3. Kentucky
4. Chicago	4. Michigan State	4. Stanford	4. Emory	4. Iowa
5. Michigan	5. Syracuse	5. Vanderbilt	5. Rochester	5. Virginia
6.5. MIT	6. Yale	6. Brown	6. Florida State	6. Rochester
6.5. Stanford	7. Rochester	7. Michigan State	7. Iowa	7. Ohio State
8. Wisconsin	8. Kentucky	8. Boston College	8. Cal.-Riverside	8. Houston
9. Princeton	9. Minnesota	9. Yale	9. Michigan State	9. USC
10. North Carolina	10. Duke	10. North Carolina	10. Georgia	10. Wis.-Milwaukee
11. Columbia	11. Stanford	11. Duke	11. Cal. Tech.	11. Florida
12.5. UCLA	12. Illinois	12. Tulane	12. Ohio State	12. Cal.-Riverside
12.5. Minnesota	13. Princeton	13. Georgetown	13. Stanford	13. Wisconsin
14.25. Cornell	14. Wisconsin	14. Minnesota	14. Minnesota	14. Michigan
14.25. Indiana	15. Tulane	15. Michigan	15. Cal.-Irvine	15. Minnesota
14.25. Northwestern	16. Berkeley	16. New School	16.5. Arizona	16. Texas Tech
14.25. Rochester	17. Michigan	17. Case Western	16.5. Cincinnati	17. Duke
18.5. Iowa	18. Chicago	18. Houston	18. Vanderbilt	18. Rice
18.5. Oregon	19. Harvard	19. Pennsylvania	19. Michigan	19. Tulane
20.33. Illinois	20. Florida	20. Ohio State	20. Massachusetts	20. Arizona
20.33. Johns Hopkins				
20.33. Washington-St. Louis				

TABLE 3

(CONTINUED)

^a The reputational rankings are drawn from Morgan and Fitzgerald, "Recognition and Production," 348. The numbering for tied ranks has been changed slightly to conform with the convention used in other tied rankings.

^b To 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 average number reported in the *Guide to Graduate Study in Political Science* for the 1977 through the 1979 editions. Since the figure reported in each edition of the *Guide* is in itself averaged over the past three years, the figure ultimately employed in the analysis tends to cover the years of our study.

^c To 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 systematic sample of the discipline).

^d These standardized rankings come from Robey, "Political Science Departments," 207.

^e To obtain these rankings, the weighted present affiliation scores were divided by the number of faculty members in a department. The figure used was the average of the number reported for 1976 and 1977 in the *Guide to Graduate Study in Political Science* and the 1978 figures from Robey, "Political Science Departments," 207.

discipline when productivity is evaluated from the perspective of present affiliation.

The correspondence between the standardized graduate-training ranks and the reputational ranks is somewhat higher than the affiliation results, but not as high as for the unstandardized graduate-training data. Thirteen reputational schools appear in the graduate-training rankings, controlling for the number of recent graduates, while only 7 such schools show up in the graduate rankings, standardized by the distribution of Ph.D.s currently within the profession. Restricting the analysis to the top ten rankings in these two lists, 5 of these prestige institutions are found in each one. Thus, while the total number of prestige schools has declined in the productivity ranks, the ones with the best reputations are still represented in the top ten positions. Nonetheless, it is fair to conclude that the dominance of the reputational schools has declined when comparing the results for relative productivity with those for total productivity.²⁷

In light of this decline in the relative dominance of the prestige schools, some support exists for the generalizations originally advanced in the Morgan and Fitzgerald and Robey results. First, the departments whose reputations do not match their productivity tend to come more often from the Ivy League than elsewhere. Among the top reputational schools, for example, Harvard, MIT, and California (Berkeley) do not show up or appear on only one graduate ranking. For the rest of the prestige schools, Columbia, Cornell, Indiana, Northwestern, Oregon, and Johns Hopkins fail to make the top twenty in either ranking. Second, the departments which have replaced these schools on the productivity lists seem to come more often from the South than from any other region. Kentucky and Vanderbilt, for example, appear in the top ten of both productivity lists while Tulane and Duke appear consistently across the top twenty rankings. Moreover, while a number of other schools appear in either of the two rankings, only one other department (Michigan State) shows up across both rankings. Thus, in

²⁷ This decline was borne out further when we constructed a series of contingency tables using the standardized data. Only one set of taus reaches significance while the majority of them are negative. The only positive relationship is between reputation and graduate-training scores standardized by the number of recent graduates. Even here, though, the magnitude of the coefficients reaches only .35 in the two-by-two analysis.

terms of appearance across lists, the generalization about southern schools seems supported.

CONCLUSION

The results of our analysis provide neither uniform support for our original argument nor for that advanced by Morgan and Fitzgerald or Robey. Instead, they specify both sets of arguments and begin to provide a picture of the degree of stability and change within the profession. First, consistent with our original argument, we found strong support for the relationship between prestige and productivity: the graduates of the reputational schools produced the overwhelming portion of the research output examined in this study. In this sense, the reputational rankings appear well deserved and, indeed, do reflect the major contributors to the professional literature. Such results, moreover, imply a considerable stability in the political science profession. The schools that have traditionally led the discipline continue to do so—even in a profession which has grown in terms of the total number of political scientists in recent decades and in the number of schools granting the doctoral degree. Thus, it is quite premature to assert that the prestige schools have declined in their productivity within the political science discipline.

At the same time, the *relative* productivity of some of the prestige schools has not been consistent with their reputations. At this level of analysis, therefore, our results support those reported in the Morgan and Fitzgerald and Robey studies. In particular, some Ivy League schools have not produced at the rate their reputations would suggest and, in turn, these schools have been replaced by some southern universities within the productivity rankings. However, we would emphasize that these results are confined only to the rate of production for these schools and not their total impact. Thus, we would view the newly productive departments as the source of incipient change within the profession, but not yet as a source of substantial modification of the productivity pattern within the discipline. Whereas some change is beginning to take place within political science and some challenge exists to the dominance of the reputational schools, it is much more limited than the earlier studies suggest.