



**The Political Science 400: Citations by Ph.D. Cohort and by Ph.D.-Granting Institution**

Hans-Dieter Klingemann; Bernard Grofman; Janet Campagna

*PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 22, No. 2. (Jun., 1989), pp. 258-270.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=1049-0965%28198906%2922%3A2%3C258%3ATPS4CB%3E2.0.CO%3B2-U>

*PS: Political Science and Politics* is currently published by American Political Science Association.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/apsa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

---

# The Profession

---

## **The Political Science 400: Citations by Ph.D. Cohort and by Ph.D.- Granting Institution\***

---

**Hans-Dieter Klingemann**  
Freie Universität Berlin

**Bernard Grofman**  
and **Janet Campagna**  
University of California, Irvine

**T**here are four obvious ways to ascertain an individual or department's standing in a discipline: reputation, publication record, citations, and responsibility for the graduation of first-rate students. Each has advantages and disadvantages.

Reputation, as judged by survey data, comes closest to tapping our common-sense understanding of "who's who" in the discipline. Reputational surveys of departments conducted by the American Council of Education and similar groups are well established (e.g., COBARC, 1982).

But, just as there may be Fortune 400 companies whose names are little known to the public, a more objective indicator of standing, publication record, might seem more useful than reputation, even though expert ratings seem to reflect information about the external world and not just about the predisposition of the informants. For example, some departments with well-known names may be getting high rating based on past status, and some newly strong departments may not yet have a reputation consistent with their merit. Here the problem is what to count and how to weight it. Are all publications alike? Aren't some journals more prestigious than others? What do we do about books? Etc. Welch and Hibbing (1983) solve this problem by counting only those

articles that appear in a small set of prestigious journals. Crewe (forthcoming) weights some journals more heavily than others and gives special weight to books.<sup>1</sup> While imperfect, these seem to us to be reasonable approaches to a difficult problem.

In our own earlier work (Klingemann, 1986) we made exclusive use of the third mode of evaluation. We provided citations ratings. We listed the total citations received by 1985 (non-emeritus) faculty for each U.S. and Canadian Ph.D.-granting institution and ranked departments by these totals. We also identified the 20 most cited political scientists in each of five fields of interest (positive theory and political theory; American politics and political behavior; comparative politics; international relations; and public policy; public administration, and public law). We believe this approach has considerable merit.

A fourth approach is to evaluate departments in terms of the Ph.D.s they turn out, rather than in terms of the citations (or productivity) of the faculty presently on their staff. Clearly it is of interest to know where the most highly cited (or the most highly productive) faculty got their Ph.D.s.

In this essay we extend our previous work in two ways. First, we identify the 25 most highly cited individuals *in each 5-year cohort*,<sup>2</sup> thus permitting us to identify younger (measured in terms of year of Ph.D.) scholars omitted from our previous listing and to study the age structure of the discipline's most cited individuals. Second, we use data on where the 400 most cited scholars got their Ph.D.s to rank departments in terms of the success (in quantitative citation terms) of the students whom they graduated in each of the past several decades. This allows us to rank departments in terms of the Ph.D.s they produce rather than their faculty, per se. As far as

we are aware, this is the first time this type of analysis has been done.

### The Political Science 400

Table 1 lists the names of the Ph.D. institutions and field(s) of interest of the 400 most cited political scientists<sup>3</sup> teaching at Ph.D.-granting institutions 1980-1985, grouped by five-year Ph.D. cohorts.<sup>4</sup> For each cohort we list the top 25 members of that cohort among the 400 most-cited individuals.<sup>5</sup>

In Table 2 we summarize this data according to Ph.D.-granting university.

To help see the pattern in Table 2 more clearly, in Table 3 we identify the top 20 universities overall and trace their ranking by decade.

There are a number of interesting features of this table. First, Harvard reigned as the premier Ph.D.-producing university until 1960 (indeed, it had clear dominance from 1949-1954). Moreover, Harvard continues to be one of the top three departments, as judged in terms of the citation ranking of the Ph.D.s it produces.<sup>6</sup>

Second, by our measure, Yale became the premier Ph.D.-producing university beginning in 1964. Prior to that, though quite strong, it lagged behind Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, and the University of Chicago.

Third, some institutions which were quite strong in terms of graduate programs in the 1940s and 1950s fell dramatically in ranking in the early or late 1970s. Princeton, for example, which had vied with Harvard and Yale for the number one position in 1955-59, was not in the top ten in either the 1960s or the 1970s. Columbia, which had been in second place in the 1940s and tied for third in the 1950s, was in 9th place in the 1960s, and was no longer in the top ten by the 1970s. Conversely, some universities have risen to recent prominence. Northwestern, since 1960, is a clear case in point, as is Stanford.

Fourth, like Harvard and Yale, the University of Chicago has consistently been among the top half-dozen institutions in terms of highly cited Ph.D. students produced.

Fifth, throughout the entire post-WWII

period, private schools have produced a disproportionate number of individuals who went on to be numbered among the most highly cited Ph.D.s (we shall later compare Ph.D.s in the top 400 to Ph.D.s produced to control for the fact that private universities turn out a disproportionate share of all Ph.D.s). However, in recent years a higher proportion of highly cited Ph.D.s have had Ph.D.s from state institutions, and three institutions—the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, and UC Berkeley—would seem clearly established as presently among the top dozen Ph.D. programs in terms of the caliber of the top students they produce (with other state schools, e.g., Indiana, clearly among the top 20). Indeed, in the 1970s, the University of Michigan was (along with Yale, and Harvard) one of the three top producers of subsequently highly cited Ph.D.s. Also, if we look at the University of California system as a whole, that system was number five overall.

Sixth, some universities, not otherwise among the top ten over all, have had remarkable 5-year periods. This was true of both Stanford and the University of Rochester in the period 1970-1974. Both these institutions were among the top ten producers of highly cited Ph.D.s for the 1970s. It is too early to tell whether they will maintain that status in the 1980s.<sup>7</sup>

Seventh, strikingly (but not surprisingly)<sup>8</sup> there is a considerable correspondence between the overall rankings of universities based on their Ph.D.s and those based on either reputation or citations of their faculty—but there are a few key exceptions. MIT, for example, has a highly regarded faculty which has not produced many highly cited Ph.D.s.

This last observation brings us to an important methodological point. Should we not control for the raw number of Ph.D.'s produced (by cohort, by department)? A critique of our earlier work on departmental citations (Klingemann, 1986) was that we failed to control for departmental size. Normalizing departmental citations to obtain a per capita figure (Way, 1987; see also Greenberg, 1987) left most of the top 20 universities relatively unchanged, although UCLA and Rutgers dropped in ranking, but a few schools with small de-

## The Profession

Table I. Top Twenty-Five Individuals as Measured by Index I by Five-Year Cohorts

Name	University	UniPHD	Year	Index	FINT*
<b>1980+</b>					
J. Mearsheimer	U. of Chicago	Cornell	1980	134	5/6
Paul Bracken	Yale	Yale	1982	134	5
Barnett Rubin	Yale	U. of Chicago	1982	113	2/3
N=3					
<b>1975-79</b>					
Theda Skocpol	U. of Chicago	Harvard	1975	472	7/9
Stanley Rosen	USC	UCLA	1978	268	7
James Gibson	U. of Houston	U. of Iowa	1975	254	3/12
Donald Kinder	U. of Michigan	UCLA	1975	233	3/16
Robert Rich	Carnegie-Mellon	U. of Chicago	1975	190	NA
James Alt	Washington U.	Essex	1978	190	3/8
E. Carmines	Indiana U.	SUNY Buffalo	1975	176	3/16
Charles Ostrom	Michigan State U.	Indiana U.	1975	162	5/3
John Aldrich	U. of Minnesota	U. of Rochester	1975	155	2/3
Kenneth Meier	U. of Oklahoma	Syracuse	1975	148	4/8
Milton Heumann	Rutgers	Yale	1976	141	12
James Fishkin	Yale	Yale	1975	141	1/2
Frank Fischer	Rutgers	NYU	1978	141	3/4
Samuel Kernell	UC San Diego	UC Berkeley	1975	127	9/14
Gregory Markus	U. of Michigan	U. of Michigan	1975	127	16/17
David Cameron	Yale	U. of Michigan	1976	127	4/7
Bruce Cain	Caltech	Harvard	1976	120	2/3
Terry M. Moe	Stanford	Minnesota	1976	120	8/9
Albert Cover	SUNY Stony Brook	Yale	1976	120	9/13
James Kuklinski	U. of Illinois-Urbana	Iowa	1975	120	9/16
Philip Dubois	UC Davis	U. of Wisconsin	1978	120	9/12
Valerie Bunce	Northwestern	U. of Michigan	1976	113	14/8
W. M. Leogrande	American U.	Syracuse U.	1976	113	5/7
John Nelson	U. of Iowa	U. of N. Carolina	1977	113	1/8
Joseph Stewart	U. of New Orleans	U. of Houston	1977	106	4/8
Larry Sabato	U. of Virginia	Oxford	1977	106	10/11
N=26					
<b>1970-74</b>					
Norman Nie	U. of Chicago	Stanford	1970	832	16/9
Morris Fiorina	Harvard	U. of Rochester	1972	698	9
Douglas Hibbs	Harvard	U. of Wisconsin	1972	564	3
Benjamin Page	U. of Texas-Austin	Stanford	1973	536	9/16
Hugh Hecho	Harvard	Yale	1970	444	7
Otto A. Davis	Carnegie-Mellon	Claremont	1970	423	NA
Jon Elster	U. of Chicago	Paris U.	1972	367	1
John Ferejohn	Stanford	Stanford	1972	360	2/3
Arthur Miller	U. of Michigan	U. of Michigan	1971	360	3/15
Walter Laqueur	Georgetown	Princeton	1973	353	5
Wayne Cornelius	UC San Diego	Stanford	1974	353	7/8
G. O'Donnell	U. of Notre Dame	Yale	1971	331	7/1
Stephen Krasner	Stanford	Harvard	1972	324	5
R. McKelvey	Caltech	U. of Rochester	1970	303	9/16
Gary Jacobson	UC San Diego	Yale	1972	289	9/13
Robert Jackman	Michigan State	U. of Wisconsin	1972	282	7/8
Michael Cohen	U. of Michigan	UC Irvine	1972	282	4
Kenneth Shepsle	Washington U.	U. of Rochester	1970	275	2/9
Wesley Skogan	Northwestern	Northwestern	1971	261	12/11

Table 1 (continued)

Name	University	UniPHD	Year	Index	FINT*
Roger Hansen	Johns Hopkins	Johns Hopkins	1970	226	6/5
Alan Gilbert	U. of Denver	Harvard	1974	226	1/2
Lee Sigelman	U. of Kentucky	Vanderbilt U.	1973	226	4/7
Herbert Asher	Ohio State U.	U. of Michigan	1970	219	13/16
Susan Welch	U. of Nebraska-Lincoln	U. of Illinois-Urbana	1970	219	11/10
Bernard Grofman	UC Irvine	U. of Chicago	1972	219	2/8
n=25					
<b>1965-69</b>					
Graham Allison	Harvard	Harvard	1968	620	7
Stephen Brams	NYU	Northwestern	1966	599	2
Ron Inglehart	U. of Michigan	U. of Chicago	1967	543	7
Ted Gurr	Northwestern	NYU	1965	515	7/2
J. D. Singer	U. of Michigan	NYU	1965	494	3/8
P. C. Schmitter	U. of Chicago	UC Berkeley	1968	479	7/5
Robert Axelrod	U. of Michigan	Yale	1969	465	8
Robert Keohane	Brandeis	Harvard	1966	409	5
Edward Tufte	Yale	Yale	1968	402	3/9
Robert Jervis	Columbia	UC Berkeley	1968	395	5
Adam Przeworski	U. of Chicago	Northwestern	1966	360	8/2
Michael Lipsky	MIT	Princeton	1967	338	8/9
James C. Scott	Yale	Yale	1967	338	7
J. Kirkpatrick	Georgetown	Columbia	1968	331	7/1
Paul Abramson	Michigan	UC Berkeley	1967	303	7/17
Gerald Kramer	Caltech	MIT	1965	289	2/3
Walter Connor	Boston U.	Princeton	1969	282	7/5
Allen Schick	U. of Maryland	Yale	1965	282	13/9
Douglas Rae	Yale	U. of Wisconsin	1966	254	1/2
Seweryn Bialer	Columbia	Columbia	1966	247	9
Alan F. Westin	Columbia	Harvard	1965	247	7
Suzanne Berger	MIT	Harvard	1967	247	7
Malcolm Feeley	U. of Wisconsin	U. of Minnesota	1969	240	12/8
Robert Erikson	U. of Houston	U. of Illinois-Urbana	1969	233	2/3
Sheldon Goldman	U. of Massachusetts	Harvard	1965	233	12
N=26					
<b>1960-64</b>					
Theodore Lowi	Cornell	Yale	1961	790	8/9
Michael Crozier	UC Irvine	Paris U.	1963	698	4/8
Frances Piven	City U. of NY	U. of Chicago	1962	627	11/15
Everett Ladd	U. of Connecticut	Cornell	1964	620	15/16
Ole R. Holsti	Duke	Stanford	1962	592	8/9
Thomas Dye	Florida State U.	U. of Pennsylvania	1961	592	8/9
Arend Lijphart	UC San Diego	Yale	1963	536	5/7
Bruce Russett	Yale	Yale	1961	508	5/8
Rudolph Rummel	U. of Hawaii	Northwestern	1963	486	5
Jerry Hough	Duke	Harvard	1961	458	7/2
Nelson Polsby	UC Berkeley	Yale	1961	416	9/16
Walter Burnham	MIT	Harvard	1962	409	9
David Sears	UCLA	Yale	1961	409	16/17
Mayer Zald	U. of Michigan	U. of Michigan	1961	381	8/4
Fred Greenstein	Princeton	Yale	1960	360	14/9
Jack Walker	U. of Michigan	U. of Iowa	1963	353	9/15
Ira Sharkansky	U. of Wisconsin	U. of Wisconsin	1964	345	4/9
Chalmers Johnson	UC Berkeley	UC Berkeley	1961	331	7/3

**The Profession**

**Table I (continued)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>University</b>	<b>UniPHD</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Index</b>	<b>FINT*</b>
M. K. Jennings	UC Santa Barbara	U. of North Carolina	1961	324	3/17
Morton Halperin	Yale	Yale	1961	310	5
David Mayhew	Yale	Harvard	1964	310	9/13
Stuart Nagel	U. of Illinois-Urbana	Northwestern	1961	268	8/3
Herbert Jacob	Northwestern	Yale	1960	261	9/12
Robert Gilpin	Princeton	UC Berkeley	1960	261	5/4
Charles O. Jones	U. of Virginia	U. of Wisconsin	1960	261	9
N=25					
<b>1955-59</b>					
James Q. Wilson	Harvard	U. of Chicago	1959	1121	4/9
Brian Barry	Caltech	NA	1958	770	*
Philip Converse	U. of Michigan	U. of Michigan	1958	768	15/16
Brian Berry	Carnegie-Mellon	NA	1958	760	*
Daisy Flory	Florida State U.	Princeton	1959	564	10
R. Golembiewski	U. of Georgia	Yale	1958	444	4/17
Daniel Elazar	Temple	U. of Chicago	1959	437	10/11
Alexander George	Stanford	U. of Chicago	1958	423	5/14
Richard Fenno	U. of Rochester	Harvard	1956	402	9/13
Lester Milbrath	SUNY Buffalo	U. of North Carolina	1956	317	8/3
Juan Linz	Yale	Columbia	1959	317	7
Richard Falk	Princeton	Yale	1955	303	5/6
James Rosenau	USC	Princeton	1957	296	7
Malcolm Jewell	U. of Kentucky	Penn State U	1958	296	10/13
Gerald Pomper	Rutgers	Princeton	1959	282	9/16
Robert Tucker	Princeton	Harvard	1958	275	7/1
Leonard Freedman	UCLA	UCLA	1959	268	15
Robert Salisbury	Washington U.	U. of Illinois-Urbana	1955	254	9/13
Roger Noll	Caltech	Harvard	1957	233	2/8
Myron Weiner	MIT	Princeton	1955	219	11/15
Glenn Snyder	SUNY Buffalo	Columbia	1956	219	5/6
Walter Murphy	Princeton	U. of Chicago	1957	190	12/7
S. C. Patterson	U. of Iowa	U. of Wisconsin	1959	190	8/9
J. A. Schlesinger	Michigan State U.	Yale	1955	176	15/10
James N. Rosenau	USC	Yale	1958	176	15/16
N=26					
<b>1950-54</b>					
James March	Stanford	Yale	1953	1361	4
Sam Huntington	Harvard	Harvard	1951	1072	4/7
Karl Deutsch	Harvard	Harvard	1951	698	2/5
Edward Banfield	Harvard	U. of Chicago	1952	501	2/11
Robert Lane	Yale	Harvard	1950	437	17
Z. Brzezinski	Columbia	Harvard	1953	395	5
Peter Bachrach	Temple	Harvard	1951	374	17/11
Lucien Pye	MIT	Yale	1951	331	7/17
Warren Miller	U. of Michigan	Syracuse	1954	331	9/15
Kenneth Waltz	UC Berkeley	Columbia	1954	324	5/6
Stanley Hoffman	Harvard	U. of Paris	1953	303	5/6
Richard Neustadt	Harvard	Harvard	1951	289	8/14
Ernst Haas	UC Berkeley	Columbia	1953	289	2/7
Harry Eckstein	UC Irvine	Harvard	1953	289	2/7
Duncan MacRae	U. of North Carolina	Harvard	1950	261	8
James Davies	U. of Oregon	UC Berkeley	1952	261	16/7

Table I (continued)

Name	University	UniPHD	Year	Index	FINT*
David Apter	Yale	Princeton	1954	261	2/7
Ithiel de S. Pool	MIT	U. of Chicago	1951	247	7/16
Vincent Ostrom	Indiana U.	UCLA	1950	233	1/2
A. F. K. Organski	U. of Michigan	NYU	1951	190	5
Donald Mathews	U. of Washington	Princeton	1953	190	9/13
Henry A. Turner	UC Santa Barbara	U. of Chicago	1950	190	15/9
Morton A. Kaplan	U. of Chicago	Columbia	1951	183	1/2
Alvin Rubenstein	U. of Pennsylvania	U. of Pennsylvania	1950	176	5/7
N=24					
<b>1945-49</b>					
Seymour M. Lipset	Stanford	Columbia	1949	1706	7/15
David Easton	UC Irvine	Harvard	1947	1184	2/7
Charles Lindblom	Yale	U. of Chicago	1945	1156	2/7
Reinhard Bendix	UC Berkeley	U. of Chicago	1947	726	1/7
William Riker	U. of Rochester	Harvard	1949	663	2/9
Murray Edelman	U. of Wisconsin	U. of Illinois-Urbana	1949	508	17/8
Glendon Schubert	U. of Hawaii	Syracuse	1948	416	8/12
Giovani Sartori	Columbia	U. of Florence	1946	402	1
Sheldon Wolin	Princeton	Harvard	1949	282	1
Fred W. Riggs	U. of Hawaii	Columbia	1948	254	4/7
Robert Tucker	Johns Hopkins	UC Berkeley	1949	204	6/5
Doris Graber	U. of Illinois-Chicago	Columbia	1947	204	16/17
Adam Ulam	Harvard	Harvard	1947	190	5/7
Herb McCloskey	UC Berkeley	U. of Minnesota	1946	176	16/17
Victor Thompson	U. of Florida	Columbia	1948	155	4
Irving Bernstein	UCLA	Harvard	1949	155	12
Robert Scalapino	UC Berkeley	Harvard	1948	148	7
Albert Somit	S. Illinois U.	U. of Chicago	1947	141	1/4
William Kaufman	MIT	Yale	1948	113	8
Sam Eldersveld	U. of Michigan	U. of Michigan	1946	113	7/15
Inis L. Claude	U. of Virginia	Harvard	1949	113	1/5
Arthur Maass	Harvard	Harvard	1949	99	15/16
Harold Guetzkow	Northwestern	U. of Michigan	1948	92	2/5
N=23					
<b>1940-44</b>					
Robert Dahl	Yale	Yale	1940	1375	1/2
Raymond Vernon	Harvard	Columbia	1941	818	5
Louis Henkin	Columbia	Harvard	1940	564	5/6
Samuel Beer	Harvard	Harvard	1943	458	10
Heinz Eulau	Stanford	UC Berkeley	1941	338	2/3
Milton Esman	Cornell	Princeton	1942	176	4/5
Harold Seidman	U. of Connecticut	Yale	1940	169	4/14
Lynton Caldwell	Indiana	U. of Chicago	1943	127	8
Felix Oppenheim	U. of Massachusetts	Princeton	1942	92	1/2
N=9					
<b>1935-39</b>					
(no observations)					
<b>1930-34</b>					
Peter Drucker	Claremont	Frankfurt	1931	324	8
N=1					

## The Profession

Table I (continued)

Name	University	UniPHD	Year	Index	FINT*
<b>Pre-1930</b>					
Jacob Van Ek	U. of Col. Boulder	Iowa State U.	1924	430	9
N=1					

\*Field of Interest Codes

- 01 Political Thought and Philosophy
- 02 Formal or Positive Theory
- 03 Methodology
- 04 Public Administration and Organization Behavior
- 05 International Relations and World Politics
- 06 International Organizations and Law
- 07 Comparative Politics
- 08 Public Policy
- 09 American Government and Politics
- 10 Federalism, State Politics and Intergovernmental Relations
- 11 Urban and Ethnic Politics
- 12 Public Law and Judicial Politics
- 13 Legislative Politics
- 14 Presidential or Executive Politics
- 15 Political Parties and Interest Groups
- 16 Electoral Behavior and Public Opinion
- 17 Political Psychology and Socialization
- NA No data available

partments moved up dramatically (e.g., Caltech from 46 to 5, Johns Hopkins from 12 to 4, UC Irvine from 15 to 7, Rochester from 16 to 8).

We believe that both raw and normalized ratings are useful. Each conveys somewhat different information.

Some universities (e.g., UC Berkeley, UCLA, Columbia, University of Chicago, Yale, Harvard, Indiana, Johns Hopkins, Princeton, University of Maryland, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, NYU) have relatively large Ph.D. classes. Thus it may be less surprising that a high proportion of highly cited Ph.D.s come from these universities, since a high proportion of all Ph.D.s come from these universities.<sup>8</sup>

For each of the 20 universities with at least five Ph.D.s in the "top 400" we produce in Table 4 an "index of overrepresentation," their share of Ph.D.s in the top 400 divided by their share of all 1980 Ph.D.s.<sup>9,10</sup>

Here we are able to see that Harvard, Yale, etc., not only produce lots of Ph.D.s, but a higher proportion of the ones they do turn out are highly cited than would be

expected by chance. (Of course, the entering students might well have been superior in talent to start with. Whether a graduate education is a value-adding or merely a value-signaling enterprise remains an open question.) Note that, when we control for numbers, Yale now overtakes Harvard, and that schools like Syracuse, University of Rochester, and University of Iowa, with relatively small Ph.D. cohorts, move up dramatically.

Another relevant question is about the number of scholars of each cohort who are in the "top 400" relative to the number that would be expected by chance alone given that the number of Ph.D.s in each cohort is quite different. We show in Table 5 the raw number of political science Ph.D.s by cohort and the number in the "top 400" citation category. In parentheses we show percentages, and in the last column an "index of representation," the ratio of the two percentages.

A startling feature of Table 5 (at least to the present authors) is the fact that more than 50% of all Ph.D.s in political science this century were produced in the 1970s.

It is not easy to interpret the "index of



Table 2. University Granting Ph.D. Frequency by Five-Year Cohort (Top 400)

Cohort	University	Frequency
1980+	Cornell	1
	U. of Chicago	1
	Yale	1
N=3		
1975-79	Yale	4
	U. of Michigan	3
	Harvard	2
	Syracuse	2
	U. of Chicago	2
	U. of Iowa	2
	UCLA	2
	Florida State U.	1
	Indiana	1
	NYU	1
	Northwestern	1
	SUNY Buffalo	1
	UC Berkeley	1
	UC Santa Barbara	1
	U. of Houston	1
	U. of Minnesota	1
	U. of North Carolina	1
U. of Pennsylvania	1	
U. of Rochester	1	
U. of Wisconsin	1	
N=30		
1970-74	Yale	9
	U. of Michigan	8
	Harvard	7
	Stanford	6
	U. of Rochester	5
	UC Berkeley	4
	U. of Chicago	4
	Northwestern	3
	Princeton	3
	U. of Illinois-Urbana	3
	U. of Wisconsin	3
	Columbia	2
	Cornell	2
	Indiana	2
	MIT	2
	Syracuse	2
	Johns Hopkins	2
	U. of Iowa	2
	U. of Minnesota	2
	U. of North Carolina	2
	U. of Washington	2
	Brandeis	1
	Claremont	1
	Colorado State U.	1
	Michigan	1
	UC Irvine	1

Table 2 (continued)

Cohort	University	Frequency
	UCLA	1
	UC Santa Barbara	1
	U. of Colo. Boulder	1
	U. of Kentucky	1
	U. of Oregon	1
	U. of Pittsburgh	1
	Vanderbilt	1
N=87		
1965-69	Harvard	12
	Yale	9
	U. of Chicago	8
	Columbia	6
	Northwestern	6
	U. of Michigan	5
	U. of Wisconsin	5
	MIT	4
	UC Berkeley	4
	Princeton	3
	Stanford	3
	U. of Iowa	3
	NYU	2
	UCLA	2
	U. of Minnesota	2
	U. of North Carolina	2
	Cornell	1
	George Washington	1
	Indiana	1
	Syracuse	1
	Johns Hopkins	1
	U. of Florida	1
	U. of Illinois-Urbana	1
	U. of Missouri-Col.	1
	U. of Oklahoma	1
	U. of Pennsylvania	1
U. of Pittsburgh	1	
U. of Washington	1	
Vanderbilt	1	
N=89		
1960-64	Yale	13
	Harvard	8
	U. of Chicago	8
	Northwestern	5
	Stanford	4
	UC Berkeley	4
	Columbia	3
	Indiana	3
	U. of Michigan	3
	U. of Wisc. Madison	2
	Cornell	2
	Duke	2
	U. of Iowa	2
	U. of North Carolina	2
	Radcliffe	1
	UCLA	1

## The Profession

Table 2 (continued)

Cohort	University	Frequency
N=76	U. of Illinois-Urbana	1
	U. of Minnesota	1
	U. of Oregon	1
	U. of Pennsylvania	1
	U. of Texas Austin	1
	U. of Wisc. Milwaukee	1
	Vanderbilt	1
1955-59	Harvard	10
	Princeton	8
	Yale	7
	U. of Chicago	4
	Columbia	2
	Duke	2
	U. of Michigan	2
	Cornell	1
	Ohio State U.	1
	Penn State U.	1
	Radcliffe	1
	Johns Hopkins	1
	UC Berkeley	1
	UCLA	1
	U. of Illinois-Urbana	1
U. of North Carolina	1	
U. of Virginia	1	
U. of Wisconsin	1	
N=46		
1950-54	Harvard	14
	Columbia	6
	U. of Chicago	6
	Princeton	3
	Yale	3
	Syracuse	2
	UCLA	2
	U. of Minnesota	2
	NYU	1
	SUNY	1
	UC Berkeley	1
	U. of Pennsylvania	1
U. of Wisconsin	1	
N=43		
1945-49	Harvard	9
	Columbia	4
	U. of Chicago	3
	U. of Michigan	2
	Syracuse	1
	UC Berkeley	1
	U. of Florida	1
	U. of Illinois-Urbana	1
	U. of Minnesota	1
Yale	1	
N=24		

Table 2 (continued)

Cohort	University	Frequency
1940-44	Harvard	2
	Princeton	2
	Yale	2
	Columbia	1
	UC Berkeley	1
U. of Chicago	1	
N=9		
1935-39	(no observations)	
1930-34	Frankfurt	1
N=1		
Pre-1930	Iowa State U.	1
N=1		

representation." In terms of the contributions of different cohorts it is the 1950s and the 1960s cohorts which are most overrepresented relative to size, but, even though we have controlled for the effect of cohort size, there is still a generation effect of unknown shape. Clearly, older scholars have more time to become known and to write articles which continue to be cited; but also, at some point, with rare exceptions (e.g., Marx), citations to a scholar begin to flag if he or she has done little new work. Thus, we can't be sure whether the overrepresentation of the 1950s and 1960s cohort is a function of something special about them or merely a reflection of the fact that theirs is the generation which, as of 1985, was at the peak of disciplinary visibility. By tracking cohort citations *over time* we hope in future work to be able to investigate the rise and fall in visibility within political science of Ph.D. "generations."

### About the Authors

Hans-Dieter Klingemann is professor of political science at the Freie Universität Berlin. He was president of the International Society of Political Psychology in 1986.

Bernard Grofman is professor of political science at the University of California, Irvine.

Janet Campagna is a Ph.D. candidate in political science at the University of California, Irvine.

Table 3. Top Twenty Universities by Decade

University	Overall Rank	By Decade			
		1970s	1960s	1950s	1940s
Harvard	1 (64)	3 (9)	2 (20)	1 (24)	1 (11)
Yale	2 (48)	1 (13)	1 (22)	3 (10)	4 (3)
U. of Chicago	3 (36)	5 (6)	3 (16)	3 (10)	3 (4)
U. of Michigan	4 (29)	2 (11)	6 (8)	4 (8)	5 (2)
U. of California (all campuses)	5 (27)	4 (9)	4 (11)	5 (5)	5 (2)
Columbia	6 (24)	9 (2)	5 (9)	4 (8)	2 (5)
Princeton	7 (19)	8 (3)	10 (3)	2 (11)	5 (2)
UC Berkeley*	8 (17)	6 (5)	6 (8)	7 (2)	5 (2)
Northwestern	9 (15)	7 (4)	4 (11)	na (0)	na (0)
U. of Wisconsin	10 (13)	7 (4)	7 (7)	7 (2)	na (0)
Stanford	10 (13)	5 (6)	7 (7)	na (0)	na (0)
U. of Minnesota	11 (9)	8 (3)	10 (3)	7 (2)	6 (1)
UCLA*	11 (9)	8 (3)	10 (3)	6 (3)	na (0)
U. of North Carolina	12 (8)	8 (3)	9 (4)	7 (1)	na (0)
Syracuse	13 (7)	7 (4)	12 (1)	7 (1)	6 (1)
U. of Iowa	13 (7)	9 (2)	8 (5)	na (0)	na (0)
U. of Illinois-Urbana	13 (7)	8 (3)	11 (2)	7 (1)	6 (1)
U. of Rochester	14 (6)	5 (6)	na (0)	na (0)	na (0)
MIT	14 (6)	9 (2)	9 (4)	na (0)	na (0)
Indiana	15 (5)	10 (1)	9 (4)	na (0)	na (0)
TOTAL	(343)	(91)	(137)	(83)	(32)

\*Included in the U. of California (all campuses) totals.

Table 4. Top Twenty Universities Ratings Normalized by Number of Ph.D.s Granted in 1980

Normalized Rank	Number of "Top 400"	Number of 1980 Ph.D.s	University
1	48	15	Yale
2	64	22	Harvard
3	15	6	Northwestern
4	8	4	Syracuse
4	6	3	U. of Rochester
5	37	20	U. of Chicago
6	7	4	U. of Iowa
7	29	17	U. of Michigan
8	19	14	Princeton
9	9	8	U. of Minnesota
9	9	8	UCLA
9	8	7	U. of North Carolina
10	13	13	Stanford
10	17	17	UC Berkeley
11	24	27	Columbia
11	13	15	U. of Wisconsin
12	7	9	U. of Illinois-Urbana
13	27	41	U. of California (all campuses)
14	6	12	MIT
15	5	16	Indiana

## The Profession

Table 5. Number of Political Science Ph.D.s by Five-Year Cohorts<sup>a,b</sup>

Cohort	Frequency/(%)	Frequency in Top 400/(%)	Index of Representation
Pre-1935	442 (.03)	2 (.004)	.13
1935-39	304 (.02)	0 (.000)	.00
1940-44	407 (.03)	9 (.020)	.66
1945-49	564 (.04)	24 (.060)	1.50
1950-54	364 (.03)	46 (.110)	3.70
1955-59	474 (.04)	49 (.120)	3.00
1960-64	578 (.05)	79 (.190)	3.80
1965-69	1056 (.08)	92 (.220)	2.75
1970-74	3574 (.28)	88 (.210)	.75
1975-79	3171 (.25)	32 (.080)	.32
1980+	1700 (.13)	3 (.007)	.05
Totals =	12,634		

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Center for Education Statistics, "Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred" surveys.

<sup>a</sup>Pre-1950 figures obtained by taking a constant percentage (2%) of total Ph.D.s granted. This percentage was chosen based on the average percentage that Political Science Doctorates constituted of the total in the post-1950 period.

<sup>b</sup>Excludes degrees given in public administration and international relations.

## Notes

\*This is the second in a proposed series in "Political Science: Snapshots of a Discipline" drawing on data in the Social Science Citation Index and the APSA Biographical Directory. Planned future papers include "Endogamy and Exogamy in Political Science Hiring Practices," "Is Anybody Out There Reading? A Gini Index of Citation Inequality in Political Science," and "Citation is the Sincerest Form of Flattery: Citation Clique Structure in Political Science." We are indebted to the Word Processing Center, School of Social Science, UCI, for manuscript typing. For one of us, the inspiration for this research came from Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus, *American Political Science: A Profile of a Discipline*, New York: Atherton Press, 1964, and from a course in the sociology of science at the University of Chicago taught by Duncan MacRae.

1. "Nonetheless, we believe that citation frequency is a more accurate indicator of the scholarly quality of faculty than is simply the number of articles published" (Klingemann, 1986: 654). However, we make no claim that citations tell the whole story. Like Minogue (1986), we believe in convergent indicators, "recognizing that quantity is a multidimensional concept." For example, a department whose members are highly productive (highly cited) may or may not turn out students of the same sort.

2. There are several technical problems in using citation data.

First, while the data base is available for on-line analysis, extensive use of it gets to be expensive.

Second, and more importantly, it is difficult to obtain an accurate computer count of the number of citations to a given individual. A certain amount of human judgment is required (e.g., on the one hand, Robert Dahl may be listed as R. A. Dahl or R. Dahl (or even, wrongly, as P. Dahl or R. F. Dahl); and on the other hand there may be multiple persons with the same last name in the SSCI index (sometimes even more than one political scientist). The rule we used was "when in doubt, count it," but if the publication appeared in the *Journal of Dermatology*, for example, or the *Review of Slavic Linguistics*, it was omitted (Klingemann, 1986: 653).

Third, there is a problem with multiple authorship, since SSCI only lists the first author. We checked citations by letter of the alphabet and found, at the aggregate level, no significant bias (Klingemann, 1986: 655). Nonetheless, this does not mean that particular individuals who are part of a long-standing collaboration with someone earlier in the alphabet than they and who always publish articles in alphabetical order may not be slighted by our giving no weight except to first-listed authors. See Cnudde (1986), Klingemann (1987) and Cnudde (1987).

Fourth, as Minogue (1986: 403) reminds us,

certain works may be cited negatively, because they represent error to be refuted. Of course, even errors are important only if they appear in articles which people take seriously enough to bother refuting, so we do not regard this as a major problem. (Cf. "A Person is known by the enemies he makes").

Fifth, as Minogue (1986: 404) warns, "People cite their friends, pay off debts, show off the breadth of their reading, and hedge their bets," and, we might add, people also cite themselves. All this is true and gives some reasons for caution, but does not really change much at the gross level of analysis because the gap in number of citations received by the most highly cited individuals and even those in the next decile is so very large. (One specific issue, clique-based mutual inflation of citations, we hope to explore in future work.)

Sixth, citations vary by subdiscipline and field of interest. The world's leading expert on Africa is apt to receive fewer citations than a not so distinguished student of American politics. In this paper we have attempted to compensate for this problem, in part, by identifying subfields of interest. In previous work (Klingemann, 1986), we separately grouped faculty into five subfield categories and ranked people only within-category.

3. Actually there are 424 names in the list because of ties. Data were obtained by counting lines of citations. (See Footnote 2).

4. Only faculty teaching at Ph.D.-granting institutions in the U.S. and Canada in 1984-85 are listed. The affiliation listed is as of 1984-85. Thus, some highly cited individuals (e.g., Daniel Elazar) not teaching at a Ph.D.-granting institution are omitted, as are a few highly cited individuals whom particular quirks of fate omitted (e.g., Aaron Wildavsky, who was head of Russell Sage at the time we looked at university departmental mastheads).

5. For the cohorts before 1945 and after 1980 there are not as many as 25 individuals among the top 400. The citation data is too recent for the former, and omits many of the latter because emeritus faculty were not counted.

6. It would have been nice to have been able to tabulate citations by Ph.D.-granting institutions for all 15,000 or so APSA members. Because citation data require human intervention to deal with potential sources of coding error, that was a coding task well beyond our limited resources.

7. We should be careful to warn that it may be premature to use citation data for Ph.D.s granted in 1975 and after, since it takes time to develop a program of research and establish a visible place in the discipline. Nonetheless, our own subjective judgment is that most of the names in the 1970-74 cohort and earlier

became visible (and cited) early in their career. The time-path of citations is another topic we hope to investigate in future work.

8. Cf. the old Chicago proverb, "In the great bowling alley of life, the more balls you throw the more likely you are to knock down ten pins."

9. This is unfair to "new" institutions; since 1980 Ph.D. production overstates their rate of Ph.D. production over the entire post-WWII period. Unfortunately, the only data we had on Ph.D. production by department did not go back before the 1970s and the three-year totals (produced yearly) that were reported made us suspicious about aggregating.

10. Table 4 reports data only for universities that list five graduates in the "top 400." Otherwise a number of universities with one or two highly cited graduates which produce very few Ph.D.s would be at the top. For example, the University of California, Irvine has one Ph.D. in the "top 400," but it produced no Ph.D.s in 1980 and only six Ph.D.s in its 20 or so years of existence. With those percentages, UC Irvine would be the most highly rated Ph.D. producer in the country, if we included schools with fewer than five Ph.D.s.

## References

- Committee on Assessment of Quality Related Characteristics of Research Doctorate Programs in the United States (COBARC), 1982. *An Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs in the United States: Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.
- Cnudde, Charles. 1986. Letter *PS* 19 (Fall) 850-852.
- Cnudde, Charles. 1987. Letter, "A Reply to Klingemann," *PS* 20 (Summer): 618-619.
- Crewe, Ivor. forthcoming. "Reputation, Research and Reality: The Publication Records of UK Departments of Politics." *Political Studies*.
- Greenberg, Edward S. 1987. "Perils in Citation Counting." *PS* 20 (Winter): 6-7.
- Klingemann, Hans-Dieter. 1986. "Ranking the Graduate Departments in the 1980s: Toward Objective Indicators." *PS* 19 (Summer): 651-661.
- Klingemann, Hans-Dieter. 1987. Letter, "More Citation Countings: Reply to Charles Cnudde." *PS* 20 (Summer): 616-618.
- Minogue, Kenneth. 1986. "Politics and the Gross Intellectual Product." *Government and Opposition*. Vol. 21 No. 4: 396-405.
- Way, Frank. 1987. "Deadwood." *PS* 20 (Winter): 7-9.

## The Profession

Welch, Susan and John R. Hibbing. 1983. "What Do the New Ratings of Political Science Departments Measure?" *PS* 16: 532-540.

## Introducing the *National Political Science Review*

---

A new journal has hit the political science profession with the publication of the first volume of the *National Political Science Review* in February 1989. Published annually by the National Conference of Black Political Scientists, the NPSR includes scholarly research and commentary reflective of diverse interests and perspectives of scholars from various backgrounds and life experiences. According to Lucius Barker, NPSR editor and Gellhorn Professor of Public Affairs and Political Science at Washington University (St. Louis) the NPSR "represents an important step in the growth and development of the NCOBPS as a professional scholarly organization.



Paula D. McClain, book review editor, and Lucius J. Barker, editor, presents commemorative copy of the NPSR to Dianne Pinderhughes, president of the National Conference of Black Political Scientists at its annual meeting held in Baton Rouge, LA, March 15-18, 1989.

Barker observes that "the rich diversity of interests and scholarship represented in the NPSR is clearly reflected in the coverage and treatment of topics that should appeal to a wide readership. "Among the major feature articles, for example, are contributions by Stuart Clark, a Ph.D. candidate at Yale on "Liberalism and Black Political Thought," and an article by Robert H. Salisbury, Souers Professor of American Politics at Washington University (St. Louis) on "Political Movements in American Politics." Additionally, a number of scholars offer varied commentaries on two special symposia: "The Iran-Contra Affair" and a bicentennial assessment of "Black Americans and The Constitution."

The NPSR also includes a major book review section that uses a variety of formats in which to view recent and current literature: a Book Forum with review essays on selected books dealing with "Jesse Jackson and Presidential Politics;" four extensive bibliographic essays surveying literature on Black Politics, Women and Politics, Chicano Politics, and American Indians; and regular book reviews.

The NPSR welcomes contributions on any important research problem in political science but is particularly interested in theoretical/empirical research that focuses on politics and policies that advantage or disadvantage groups or individuals by reasons of race, ethnicity, sex, or other such factors.

Contributions should be no longer than 30 typewritten pages double-spaced, and should follow guidelines of the *Chicago Manual of Style*. An abstract of no more than 150 words should appear on a separate cover sheet. Five copies of each manuscript should be sent to Lucius J. Barker, Editor, *National Political Science Review*, Department of Political Science, Washington University, St. Louis, MO. 63130.

Requests for book reviews should be sent to Paula D. McClain, Book Review Editor, School of Public Affairs, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85387. Inquiries about standing orders for the NPSR should be addressed to Transaction Publishers, Rutgers-The State University, New Brunswick, N.J. 08903.