

Integration and Fragmentation in Political Science: Exploring Patterns of Scholarly Communication in a Divided Discipline

The Journal of Politics
Volume 67, Issue 4
(November 2005)

Disclaimer: This document is the final version of the manuscript, submitted by the corresponding author to *The Journal of Politics* Editorial Office. Readers should note that it will not reflect any corrections or revisions that may occur during the copyediting process. But, any such changes will be relatively minor. Therefore, this draft should be identical in all important respects to the version that will appear in print, in JOP 67:4.

James C. Garand
Louisiana State University

This is the Presidential Address for the 2005 annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, January 6-8, 2005. I am indebted to my collaborator Micheal Giles for his willingness to share the data that we had collected for our joint research on this topic, as well as for his thoughtful comments on various aspects of this project.

**INTEGRATION AND FRAGMENTATION IN POLITICAL SCIENCE:
EXPLORING PATTERNS OF SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
IN A DIVIDED DISCIPLINE**

Abstract

Political science is generally thought of as a discipline with strong divisions and often-intense patterns of disagreement, most of which are driven by political scientists' subfield and methodological orientations. In this address I explore subfield and methodological cleavages in political science as they relate to patterns of scholarly communication—in particular, in how political scientists differ in the value that they give to various political science journals. Using survey data on political scientists' assessments of quality, familiarity, and impact for 115 political science journals (Garand and Giles, 2003), I find that political scientists differ in their rankings of the elite journals in the discipline, depending on subfield and, to a lesser extent, methodological approach. However, based on correlations and factor analyses, there is strong coherence in how political scientists from different subfield and methodological groups rank the full range of political science journals. Finally, I model journal evaluations and familiarity as a function of subfield and methodology variables. These results suggest that there are moderate subfield and methodology effects in how political scientists evaluate political science journals, but there are stronger effects of these variables in terms of political scientists' levels of familiarity with these journals. I conclude by discussing the implications of observed cleavages in scholarly communication for the fragmentation and integration of the political science discipline.

Political scientists are prone to bouts of introspection about their home discipline. These periods of self-reflection reveal a discipline with strong divisions and often-intense patterns of disagreement. Other social science disciplines are not exempt from these periods of introspection, and intellectual conflict is certainly not unheard of in sociology, economics, psychology, and other social science disciplines. But political scientists seem to be particularly adept at identifying sharp internal divisions. If one accepts the commentary of some of the leading observers of the discipline, these divisions set political scientists into separate intellectual camps. Gabriel Almond (1988) suggests that many political scientists sit at “separate tables,” while Kenneth Shepsle (1990) sees self-contained intellectual communities—“islands or keys” is his metaphor of choice—lying “off the mainland” where most political scientists reside. Whatever metaphor one uses, the prevailing view is that at least some political scientists are split into warring factions, with little hope of reconciliation.

There are numerous potential sources of cleavage in the political science discipline. On the most obvious level, political scientists are divided along subfield lines, with our discipline housing scholars who study a wide range of topics in American politics, comparative politics, international relations, political philosophy, public policy and administration, as well as a variety of interdisciplinary subjects. Our academic departments and professional organizations are usually organized along subfield lines, and it is not rare to observe conflict over the question of how valued (but scarce) resources (e.g., departmental faculty lines, number of panels at professional meetings, etc.) should be allocated among the subfields.

At an even more fundamental level, political scientists are often divided along methodological and epistemological lines. For instance, what should we as political scientists do and how should we do it? Can politics be studied scientifically? What is the relative value of quantitative, qualitative, and philosophical approaches in studying politics? What are the appropriate methods for studying political phenomena? Should the work of political scientists be directed toward solving the problems of society, or should our goal be the development of a pure understanding of politics above and beyond what we can contribute to current political debate? These are major questions that divide political scientists, and the divisions that result are intense if for no other reason that they tap into questions about what is valued

by the scholarly community and what is not. Just as the values divide splits Red and Blue states, so the values divide splits political scientists into different intellectual camps.

My purpose here is to explore cleavage patterns among political scientists in one major area in which they are likely to differentiate themselves—i.e., in patterns of scholarly communication in political science journals. Political science journals vary considerably in the kinds of research that they publish about politics, as well as in their subfield specialties and methodological orientations. Some journals, such as the American Political Science Review and regional association journals such as the American Journal of Political Science, Journal of Politics, or Polity, are considered “general” journals, insofar as they publish research across a range of subfields and methodological approaches. Other journals are broad subfield journals, insofar as they publish research on a wide range of specific topics within a single subfield. Journals such as Comparative Politics, Comparative Political Studies, American Politics Research, Political Theory, or International Studies Quarterly would fall in this category. Still other journals—Latin American Research Review, Review of Politics, and Legislative Studies Quarterly come to mind—are specialized journals in that they publish work in a relatively narrow substantive area, either within a specific subfield or across subfields. In a fragmented discipline, one would expect political scientists to differ in terms of how they value various journals, which journals they read, and how they evaluate the quality of research published in these journals.

To explore these divisions, I use data collected as part of a large-scale collaborative project (with Micheal Giles) on political scientists and the political science discipline. Using data on political scientists’ familiarity with and evaluations of 115 political science journals, I explore how patterns of scholarly communication vary across political scientists’ subfields and methodological orientations. Specifically, do political scientists differ in their evaluations of political science journals depending on whether they classify themselves as having a quantitative, mixed, or qualitative methodological orientation? Do scholars in American politics, comparative politics, international relations, political theory, or public policy/administration differentiate themselves in terms the journals that they evaluate favorably and with which they are familiar?

These questions are important ones, if for no other reason that the answers provide political scientists with an opportunity to map patterns of division in the discipline. But more importantly, the degree to which political science is fragmented or integrated may have important implications for knowledge production and the efficiency of the political science discipline. One can only speculate about the effects of disciplinary fragmentation and integration. For instance, it is plausible to suggest that fragmented disciplines are likely to lack the patterns of constructive cross-fertilization across subfields and methodological approaches that contribute to the development of new ways of exploring old and new questions. When scholars have their work read and evaluated by scholars who can contribute the perspective of different fields or methodological approaches, the quality of the research enterprise improves. But what does it mean for the accumulation of knowledge if political scientists in different subfields or methodological traditions have little contact with one another?

A DIVIDED DISCIPLINE?

It would be a mistake to think of the current pattern of division in the discipline as an aberration or historical anomaly. Arguably, the history of political science is replete with examples of intramural divisions over the methodological, philosophical, and scientific underpinnings of the discipline. Many of these debates have emerged and died down, only to reemerge with different players. Freeman (1991) and Seidelman (1985) describe the debates that occurred over the advocacy by scholars such as Charles Merriam and Harold Lasswell of the scientific study of politics and the use of science to solve the problems of American political life during first half of the 20th century. During the 1950s and 1960s, the behavioral movement took center stage and became a tempting target for critics concerned about what they perceived as a depoliticization of political science and the undue focus—some would say fetish—with methodology, research design, and quantification. The debate culminated in the late 1960s with a battle for the heart and soul of the American Political Science Association (APSA), led by a group of scholars who later formed the Caucus for a New Political Science. In a foreshadowing of what would eventually become the Perestroika movement during the early 2000s, the Caucus members sought to make the APSA (and, more generally, political science as a discipline) more explicitly political, more

attentive to contemporary political and policy problems, and less focused on science and method. The behavioral movement described so aptly by Robert Dahl (1961) and David Easton (1967) quickly evolved—or devolved, depending on one’s point of view—into its post-behavioral phase (Easton, 1969; Seidelman, 1985; Freeman, 1991). With the emergence of the Perestroika movement and its critique of the political science discipline, patterns of division in the political science discipline have drawn renewed (and considerable) attention in recent years (Kasza, 2001; Smith 2002; Fukuyama 2005), though there is considerable dissent from the Perestroika critique (Bennett, 2002; Landman, 2002; Finifter, 2000).

Taken broadly, is the assertion of a divided discipline supported by the evidence? The claim that political scientists are divided along subfield or methodological grounds has been a common thread in writing about the political science discipline. When scholars with such diverse perspectives as Almond (1988), Smith (2002), Bennett (2002), and Parenti (1983) summarize their experiences as political scientists by stating that the political science discipline is fragmented, it is difficult to disagree. I suspect that this is the experience of most (if not all) political scientists, and one would be hard pressed to find an active political scientist who is not aware of the rudimentary methodological disputes that prevail in the discipline. However, it is also the case that there has been very little systematic data brought to bear on this question. Most of the writing on this subject is historical (cf., Ricci, 1984; Seidelman, 1985), while other more recent works are largely experiential, impressionistic, or anecdotal. That does not mean that these interpretations and perceptions about the fragmented discipline are not correct; rather, this merely means that these interpretations and perceptions have not been subjected to more systematic scrutiny and analysis. Because the conventional wisdom is occasionally wrong, it is important and useful to explore the full contours of disciplinary fragmentation and integration using more systematic data.

Previous research seeking to explore the contours of division in political science on a more systematic basis is by no means extensive. In one of the few systematic studies on the subject, Grant (2005) considers how political scientists structure their organizational ties, primarily in terms of their APSA section memberships and program participations at the annual APSA meeting. Instead of

cleavages in organizational ties being linked to methodological differences—i.e., to what Grant refers to as the “hard-soft” model—Grant finds that the organization of political scientists section membership and program participation is structured primarily around subfield designations. Simply, political scientists join APSA sections and participate at professional conferences based on because subfield considerations and much less so on their methodological orientation. On the other hand, Garand and Giles (2003) explore the role of political scientists’ subfield designations and methodological approach on the structure of cleavages in scholarly communication, measured in terms of how political scientists evaluate a small group of the leading journals in political science. Unlike Grant, Garand and Giles find that methodological approach has more consistent effects than subfield in shaping political scientists journal evaluations, though nontrivial subfield effects are also observed. The bottom line is that subfield and methodological approach both matter in terms of creating cleavages among political scientists, though the relative effect of subfield and methodology differs across organizational and scholarly communication venues.

DATA AND METHODS

The analysis reported here is based on the data collected by Garand and Giles (2003) on journal evaluation, familiarity, and impact. A complete description of the data collection procedures can be found in Garand and Giles (2003). In the Spring and Summer of 2001 Giles and I mailed a questionnaire to a sample of 1400 American political scientists, of whom 559 (40%) returned completed questionnaires. The questionnaire includes a broad range of items, including descriptive information about the respondents themselves and information about their views toward 115 political science journals.¹ Two major questions are used to measure the dependent variables used in this study. First, we asked respondents to “assess each journal in terms of the general quality of the articles that it publishes,” using an 11-point scale ranging from 0 (poor) to 10 (outstanding). Second, we also asked respondents to indicate whether or not they were familiar with each journal; this variable is coded 1 for respondents who indicate that they are familiar with a given journal, and 0 otherwise.

These two variables can also be combined for each journal to form a measure of journal impact, which I suggest is a function of both the strength of the evaluation that political scientists give to a particular journal and the degree to which political scientists are familiar with a given journal (Garand, 1990; Crewe and Norris, 1991; Garand and Giles, 2003). My reasoning is that the journals with the highest subjective impact on the political science profession are those that are the most favorably regarded by political scientists and that are read by and familiar to large numbers of political scientists.² Given this, it is necessary to weight journal evaluations by journal familiarity. However, Garand (1990) has found that a simple weighting scheme results in a measure of journal impact that is more highly correlated with journal familiarity than journal evaluation. Given this, I adopt the approach adopted by Garand (1990) to measure journal impact:

$$\text{Journal impact} = \text{Journal Evaluation} + (\text{Journal Evaluation} * \text{Journal Familiarity})$$

where Journal Evaluation is the mean score on the 11-point evaluation scale, and Journal Familiarity is the proportion of respondents who report that they are familiar with a given journal. This measure has a theoretical range from 0 to 20. A journal that achieves a perfect mean evaluation of 10.0 and that is familiar to all political scientists will have an impact score of 20, while a journal that is evaluated poorly and/or with which no political scientists are familiar would earn an impact score of 0. Garand and Giles find that this impact measure is almost equally correlated with familiarity and evaluation, so it appears to do well in giving journals relatively equal credit for having strong evaluations and strong familiarity among political scientists.³

Aggregate Analysis

In order to explore patterns of fragmentation among political scientists in how they evaluate the major journals in political science, I conduct two separate sets of analysis. First, I have created an aggregate-level data set that has the journal as its unit of analysis. This data set includes variables reflecting measures of journal evaluations, journal familiarity, and journal impact. But most importantly, I have calculated each of these three variables for subsets of respondents representing each of six subfields (American politics, comparative politics, international relations, political theory, political

methodology, and public policy and administration) and each of five self-reported methodological approaches (quantitative, qualitative, mixed quantitative and qualitative, normative theory, and formal theory). Because of the small number of respondents, I have dropped the political methodology, normative theory, and formal theory categories from this part of the analysis; moreover, I group the small number of judicial politics respondents with the American politics respondents, and I combine the small numbers of public policy and public administration respondents as well.

Using these data it is possible to conduct several analyses that speak to the pattern of division among political scientists. First, I report the rank ordering of journals by subfield and methodological approach. This permits one to observe how political science journals are ranked among different groups of political scientists, but more importantly this permits explicit comparison of journal rankings among subfield and methodological groups. In a fragmented discipline one would expect to see considerable variation in the rankings of scholarly journals across subfield and method. Second, I explore the structure of journal rankings across subfield and methodological groups. Are there strong correlations in journal rankings across these groups? Do journal rankings coalesce across subfield and methodological approach to form a single dimension of journal rankings, or are there two or more dimensions of rankings? Here again, in a fragmented discipline the rankings of journals should be so dissimilar across subfield and methodological groups that there is little coherence or structure in the rankings.

Individual-Level Analysis

The original data set upon which Garand and Giles (2003) work is based is an individual-level data set with the political scientist respondent as the unit of analysis. I use this data set to explore further the degree to which there are subfield and methodological differences among political scientists in how they evaluate the journal media in political science.

First, following up on the analysis of 16 journals by Garand and Giles (2003), I conduct an analysis of variance on journal evaluations for all 115 journals in the data set to consider how the mean journal evaluations vary across subfield and methodological approach. Using these results, it is possible to

consider the hypothesis that the mean evaluation is equal for all groups of political scientists and, if not, which subfields or methodological approaches are dominant for each journal.

Second, I model journal evaluations for each journal as a function of dummy variables representing each of the subfields (except comparative politics, which serves as the subfield comparison group) and methodological approaches (except for qualitative methods, which serves as the methods comparison group). There is some evidence that comparative and international relations scholars are more likely to be qualitative in their methodological orientation, and so it is important to disentangle the effects of subfield and methodological approach in the same model. This permits me to ascertain whether it is subfield, methodological approach, both, or neither that account for the evaluations of a given journal.

Third, one of the questions left unexplored by Garand and Giles (2003) is the degree to which political scientists' familiarity with various political science journals varies across subfield and methodological approach. Garand and Giles do explore subfield and methodology effects for evaluations of journal quality, but they do not consider similar effects for journal familiarity. One possibility is that political scientists differ only marginally across subfield or method in how they evaluate the quality of various political science journals, but that political scientists may vary much more in terms of the journals with which they are familiar and on which they rely for communication with other scholars in their fields. The implications of disciplinary fragmentation in scholarly communication are quite different for familiarity differences than evaluation differences.

EMPIRICAL RESULTS: AGGREGATE ANALYSIS

Journal Rankings Across Subfields

As a starting point, I begin by examining in Table 1 the rank ordering of journals in terms of their journal impact, both in general and across the various subfields. The journals are ranked according to the overall impact scores reported by Garand and Giles (2003); these rankings are found in the first pair of columns, and subfield-specific rankings are included in separate columns. Because of space limitations, I report the rankings only for the four largest subfields of American politics, comparative politics,

international relations, and political theory. Moreover, I report rankings only for those journals ranked in the top 20 overall or in the top 20 in one of the four subfields.⁴

In terms of overall impact, the journals are ranked as one might expect. The top of the list includes the American Political Science Review, widely considered to be the flagship journal of the discipline, along with the American Journal of Political Science and Journal of Politics, general journals published by the Midwest Political Science Association and Southern Political Science Association, respectively. These journals are followed by World Politics, International Organization, and the British Journal of Political Science, all of which focus on international relations and comparative politics and/or have an international audience. Three of the next four journals are from the disciplines of sociology and economics—American Sociological Review, American Economic Review, American Journal of Sociology—coupled with Comparative Politics. The second 10 includes major subfield journals (i.e., Comparative Political Studies, International Studies Quarterly, Political Theory), respected general journals (i.e., PS: Political Science and Politics, Political Research Quarterly, and Political Science Quarterly), and highly-regarded specialty journals (i.e., Public Opinion Quarterly, Journal of Conflict Resolution, and Legislative Studies Quarterly). All in all, the top 20 journals are comprised of journals that are widely recognized and well evaluated by those familiar with the articles they publish.

How do these rankings hold up when one moves to the specific subfields? For the top 20 journals, the answer is only mixed. First, in looking at the elite journals of the discipline there is not great consistency in the rankings of journals across subfield. For instance, the American Political Science Review is ranked first overall in terms of broad-based disciplinary impact, but it is not ranked first in any of these four largest subfields.⁵ The American Political Science Review is ranked 2nd among scholars in American politics and political theory, but it is ranked 5th for those in comparative politics and international relations. The American Journal of Political Science is ranked 2nd overall, 1st in American politics, but 7th in comparative politics and international relations and 10th among political theorists. The two leading journals among comparativists and international relations specialists, World Politics and International Organization, are ranked well down the list by American politics and political theory scholars. While there is some sense of disciplinary integration insofar as these journals are ranked in the

top tier (out of 115 rated journals) across all fields, within this top echelon of journals there is a fair amount of variation in rankings. Clearly, American politics scholars see the leading journals in political science differently than scholars in international relations and comparative politics, who see things differently than political theorists.

Second, it is noteworthy that in each subfield there are several journals ranked among the top 20 journals among all political scientists combined but that are not ranked among the top 20 by scholars in the respective subfield—American politics (six journals), comparative politics (five journals), international relations (four journals), and political theory (eight journals). A total of 19 journals are not ranked in the overall top 20 but make it to the top 20 journals in specific subfields. The biggest gaps between the general ranking and a specific subfield ranking are for Security Studies (ranked 67th overall, 16th among international relations specialists), Signs (ranked 64th overall, 15th among political theorists), Review of Politics (ranked 48th overall but 7th by political theorists), Journal of Peace Research (ranked 52nd overall, 13th among international relations scholars), and History of Political Thought (ranked 39th overall, 5th by political theorists).

Journal Rankings Across Methodological Approaches

It is also possible that journal impact varies across different groups of political scientists, depending on self-reports of their methodological orientation. In Table 2 I report the results of journal rankings, broken down by respondents' methodological approach.⁶ Here again, there is a fair amount of variation in the rankings of journals across methodological approach. Political scientists in the mixed methods category are a bellwether for all political scientists combined, insofar as they rank order their top 20 journals in a way that is very similar to the general ranking of all political scientists. The top four journals for mixed methods respondents are identical to the top four journals for all respondents combined, and most of the specific rankings for each journal are fairly close to the rankings of the all methods group.

Political scientists in the quantitative methods group deviate moderately in their rankings from those observed for the all methods group. The American Journal of Political Science is the leading journal by a

small margin among quantitative political scientists, with the American Political Science Review and Journal of Politics 2nd and 3rd, respectively. World Politics, International Organization, and Comparative Politics are ranked lower among quantitative scholars than among all scholars in general, though these journals remain in the top 20 even for quantitative scholars.

Qualitative scholars differ from other scholars primarily at the top of their list. World Politics, International Organization, and Comparative Politics are ranked among the top three journals by qualitative scholars, and the American Political Science Review does no better than 4th. International Security is ranked 5th among qualitative scholars, though it is ranked only 18th among scholars from all subfields combined. Several other journals are ranked by qualitative scholars several notches below the general ranking; these include the American Journal of Political Science, British Journal of Political Science, American Economic Review, and American Journal of Sociology.

It is also noteworthy that several journals fail to be ranked among the top 20 journals by the general group of scholars from all subfields but also make the top 20 within specific subfields. Quantitative scholars do not include PS: Political Science and Politics, Political Science Quarterly, International Security, and Political Theory among their top 20, replacing these instead with the American Politics Quarterly, Political Analysis, Social Science Quarterly, and Political Behavior. Two of the excluded journals are generally thought to be more qualitative in orientation, and a third is a leading journal among normative theorists. Scholars characterizing their methodological approach as mixed exclude only two journals from their top 20 that are ranked in the top 20 among all scholars; the Legislative Studies Quarterly and Political Theory drop out and are replaced by the American Politics Quarterly and Political Analysis. Finally, qualitative scholars have five journals from the overall top 20 that fail to make their top 20 list. These journals include four journals with a quantitative bent—i.e., Political Research Quarterly, Public Opinion Quarterly, Journal of Conflict Resolution, and Legislative Studies Quarterly—along with a leading normative theory journal, Political Theory. The replacements are comprised of journals all of which have a more qualitative or theoretical orientation, including Comparative Studies in Society and History, Journal of Democracy, Latin American Research Review, Politics and Society, and Studies in American Political Development.

The bottom line is that political scientists' methodological orientations "matter" in terms of which journals they evaluate most favorably, though the effect of methodological approach is not a stark one. There is some shuffling around in the ranking ordering of journals across the different methodological approaches, and there are some journals whose favorable ratings are unique to specific methodological groups. It would appear that there is some continuity in journal rankings across methodological approach, but scholars in these groups do not necessarily see eye-to-eye when it comes to the leading journals in their methodological areas.

Exploring the Structure of Aggregate Journal Rankings

How are the rankings of political science journals structured across subfield and methodological groups? As noted, I have created for each subfield and methodological group a series of aggregate, journal-level variables representing political scientists' journal evaluations, familiarity, and impact. Are these variables highly correlated with one another, suggesting that how scholars in one subfield or methodological group rank the journals is related to journal rankings by scholars in other subfield and methodological groups? Is there a structure to these relationships? In a highly fragmented discipline one would not expect to observe a discernible structure in evaluations, familiarity, and impact across various groups of political scientists. But where such structure exists, it may suggest a commonality in how scholars evaluate the professional media in the discipline that cuts across subfield and methodology.

As a starting point, I estimate the correlation matrix for political scientists' evaluations of 115 political science journals on the 0-10 scale, with these evaluations measured separately for all respondents and for respondents in American politics, comparative politics, international relations, political theory, and public policy and administration, as well as for respondents reporting a quantitative, mixed method, and qualitative methodological orientation. I also estimate a similar correlation matrix for political scientists' familiarity with each of the 115 journals, as well as for journal impact of each of these journals.⁷ What stands out is that all of these correlations are both positive and significant, suggesting that the manner in which political scientists in one subfield or methodological group evaluate, are familiar with, and assess the impact of various political science journals is similar to that of other

subfield or methodological groups. There is some variation in the magnitude of these correlations, but the correlations for journal evaluation, familiarity, and impact suggest a high level of structure in how scholars across different subfields and methodological approaches evaluate the full range of journals in political science.

Yet it is unclear if these correlations coalesce together sufficiently to suggest that there is a single dimension of journal evaluation, familiarity, or impact across the various subfields and methodological approaches. In order to consider this possibility, I conduct a series of principal component factoring analyses, one for each combination of journal evaluations, familiarity, and impact, on one hand, and subfield and methodological approach, on the other. These results are summarized in Table 3.⁸

One can see from Table 3 that journal evaluations, familiarity, and impact are reasonably well structured across subfield and methodological groups. In each set of principal components factoring results, there is at least one eigenvalue above 1.00, the normal cutoff for the establishment of a coherent dimension. In each case the amount of variance explained is substantial, ranging from 0.611 to 0.882. What this means is that for each combination the pattern of correlations fits together well enough to generate a single dimension of journal evaluation, familiarity, and impact that cuts across different subfields and methodological approaches.

There is only exception to this pattern of one dominant dimension. In Table 3 I note that two dimensions emerge from the principal component factoring results for subfield groups and the journal familiarity measure. The principal components analysis reveals a strong first dimension that is similar to the dimension that emerges for the other combinations (eigenvalue = 3.057; proportion of variance explained = 0.611). However, in this case a weaker second dimension emerges (eigenvalue = 1.090, proportion of variance explained = 0.218). In looking at the factor loadings, it appears that this dimension represents an international and comparative politics dimension. It is also possible to generate factor scores, and when one rank orders the journals along this second dimension it is clear that all of the highly rated journals are from international relations, comparative politics, and area studies. The most highly rated journal outside of these areas is the American Political Science Review (ranked 38th), and

most of the other journals outside of international relations and comparative politics are ranked in the bottom half on this second dimension.

All in all, these results suggest that, at least at the aggregate level, a single dimension well represents rankings of journal evaluations, familiarity, and impact across subfield and methodological approach. The journal rankings for scholars in American politics, comparative politics, international relations, political theory, and public administration and policy are reasonably well correlated with one another, and the result is a single dimension of scholarly communication patterns for journal evaluations, familiarity, and impact. The same pattern is observed for methodological orientation; the journal rankings for quantitative, mixed methods, and qualitative scholars are high correlated with one another, and these rankings form a single dimension for journal evaluations, familiarity, and impact.

What do these aggregate level findings reveal about patterns of fragmentation and integration in scholarly communication among political scientists? At the most basic level, there would appear to be more integration in journal rankings than might have previously been realized. In a highly fragmented discipline, the correlations between journal rankings among subfield and methodological groups should be relatively small, and arguably the structure obtained from a factor analysis of these rankings should be either multidimensional or weakly dimensional. The observation of a dominant single dimension of journal rankings suggests more integration than expected.

It is also important to note that the dimensionality in journal rankings applies to the full set of 115 journals, but this dimensionality breaks down somewhat when one considers the rankings of only the elite journals in the profession. For the most part, there seems to be general agreement across subfield and methodological approach about which journals are at the top and what journals are at the bottom of the ranking of 115 journals. Taking all journals collectively, there appears to be fairly strong dimensionality in how political scientists across subfield and method rank political science journals. However, when one examines the elite journals in political science (i.e., those ranked in the top 20 for all political scientists or within specific subfields), there is disagreement about the relative rankings of these journals. This fragmentation at the higher levels shows up in Tables 1 and 2, where one can see that there is some disagreement over how the journals are ranked. Looking broadly, there is some consensus over

journal rankings, but there is less agreement across subfield and method in terms of political scientists' evaluations of the leading journals.

EMPIRICAL RESULTS: INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL ANALYSIS

It is useful and important to know that aggregate journal evaluations, familiarity, and impact are highly correlated across subfield and methodological groups. However, the high correlations observed in the previous section should be interpreted with some caution. These strong correlations—and, by implication, the strong dimensionality in journal rankings—do not necessarily mean that political scientists in different subfield and methodological groups evaluate journals equally. Rather, the high correlations largely capture the similarity in the rank ordering of scholarly journals across subfields and methodological approaches. While it is useful to know that scholars in different subfields rank journals similarly, the resulting high correlations may also hide considerable differences in how political scientists evaluate different journals. For instance, it may be the case that the mean journal evaluation is systematically higher or lower in one subfield compared to others, even though journal evaluations in this subfield are highly correlated with journal evaluations in other subfields. There may be other differences in the features of the distribution of journal evaluations across subfields or methodological approaches, even as the correlations are strong and significant. Ultimately, it is possible for one to mistakenly interpret strong correlations in journal rankings across subfield or methodological groupings—along with the resulting strong dimensionality in journal rankings—as indicating similarity in journal evaluations, familiarity, and/or impact.

It is for this reason that it is important to supplement the aggregate-level study of journal rankings with the analysis of individual-level data on journal evaluations and familiarity.⁹ As noted, the data set collected by Garand and Giles includes a measure of journal familiarity for each respondent, as well as a measure of journal evaluation for those respondents able to evaluate each specific journal. Instead of asking about how aggregate journal evaluations covary with one another, in this section I model individual journal evaluations and familiarity as a function of various subfield and methodological approach variables.

Analysis of Variance Results: Journal Evaluation

As a starting point, I conduct an analysis of variance (ANOVA) of political scientists' journal evaluations, coded on the 11-point scale from 0 (poor quality) to 10 (extraordinary quality). This permits me to test the null hypothesis that the mean subjective evaluations for each journal are equal across subfields and across methodological orientations. The full ANOVA results are far too detailed to be reported in a simple table, so I have summarized these results in Table 4.¹⁰

As one can see from the summary information in Table 4, there are significant subfield differences in political scientists' journal evaluations for only 24 of the 115 journals (20.9%); this means that for only about one-fifth of journals are political scientists differentiated by subfield in terms of how they evaluate the quality of articles published in these journals. Of these journals, in 15 cases scholars in the subfield of public policy and administration exhibit a higher mean evaluation than scholars in other subfields, followed by 14 cases in which comparative politics scholars evaluate a given journal more favorably. Among the top 11 journals, six exhibit a significant difference of means across subfield groups: American Political Science Review (F = 5.94, evaluated more favorably by scholars in American politics and public policy and administration), American Journal of Political Science (F = 10.20, American politics and public policy and administration), Journal of Politics (F = 5.85, American politics, public policy and administration, and political theory), World Politics (F = 6.14, comparative politics), Comparative Politics (F = 2.50, comparative politics, public policy and administration), and Comparative Political Studies (F = 2.81, comparative politics and public policy and administration). Overall, differences in mean evaluations across subfield are observed for only a small subset of journals, though a higher proportion of elite journals are differentiated by respondents' subfield orientations.

In the second column of Table 4 I present the summary of ANOVA results for methodological divisions, and as one can see there is a much stronger tendency for political scientists from different methodological orientations to differentiate themselves in terms of how they evaluate specific journals. In 51 of 115 cases (44.3%), political scientists differ significantly in their subjective journal evaluations depending on their methodological approach. Of these, qualitative scholars are the dominant methodological category in 40 cases, followed by 13 cases in which quantitative scholars constitute the

dominant category. It is particularly noteworthy that these methodological differences are more likely to occur among the highest impact journals; 15 of the top 25 journals (based on Garand and Giles' ranking) exhibit a methodological difference in evaluations, as well as 13 of the top 18 journals. These highly-ranked journals are most likely to appeal to general audiences, insofar as they are designed to be either general journals that cut across subfield lines (e.g., American Political Science Review, American Journal of Political Science, Journal of Politics) or broad subfield journals (e.g., Comparative Politics, Comparative Political Economy, International Organization, World Politics). Hence one would expect these journals to be widely respected by scholars from a variety of methodological perspectives, but this appears to be less the case than expected. Among those high-impact journals with significant methodological differences, the American Political Science Review, American Journal of Political Science, Journal of Politics, American Economic Review, Political Research Quarterly, Journal of Conflict Resolution, and American Politics Quarterly are evaluated more favorably by quantitative scholars, while World Politics, International Organization, Comparative Politics, PS: Political Science and Politics, Political Science Quarterly, International Security, and Polity are all more favorably evaluated by qualitative scholars.

Based on these ANOVA results, it would appear that political scientists' evaluations of political science journals are differentiated more by their methodological approach than by their subfield. This is particularly the case for the highest ranked journals in political science, the majority of which receive higher evaluations from scholars adopting one methodological approach or another.

Regression Results: Journal Evaluation

There is some modest level of collinearity between subfield and methodological approach. Qualitative scholars are more likely to reside in the fields of comparative politics and international relations, and quantitative scholars are more likely to represent the fields of American politics and public policy and administration. While there are certainly a number of comparativists and international relations scholars who adopt a quantitative approach, along with some American politics and public policy scholars who adopt a qualitative approach, there is enough of a relationship between subfield and

methodological approach that it is difficult to disentangle the separate effects of these variables without estimating a full multivariate model that includes both sets of variables. Before one can say that methodological approach and/or subfield are related to political scientists' subjective journal evaluations, it is important to control for the effects of all variables simultaneously.

I estimate a regression model for each journal, the results of which are summarized in Table 5. The dependent variable for each model is political scientists' subjective journal evaluation, which I depict as a function of five binary subfield variables (i.e., variables for American politics, international relations, political theory, public policy and administration, and political methodology, with comparative politics the excluded category) and four binary methodological approach variables (i.e., one each for quantitative methods, mixed methods, formal modeling, and normative theory, with qualitative methods the excluded category). Rather than report the coefficients for each variable for 115 regression equations, for the sake of brevity I summarize the number of significant subfield and methodology coefficients.¹¹

Turning first to the subfield coefficients, one can see that there is only moderate evidence of subfield effects in how political scientists evaluate political science journals. Of the 575 subfield coefficients (i.e., 115 journals times five subfields), only 47 (i.e., 8%) are statistically significant at the .05 level in a two-tailed test. This means that only 1 in 12 of the subfield coefficients are significant at conventional levels. Since I am using comparative politics as the excluded comparison group, this suggests that in most cases political scientists' evaluations of these 115 journals do not differ significantly from the evaluations of comparative politics scholars. Of the 47 significant coefficients, 13 are associated with the field of political methodology, with 12 associated with American politics.

There is a somewhat higher number of significant coefficients for the methodology variables. Of the 460 coefficients representing respondents' methodological approach (i.e., 115 journals, four coefficients), 58 (i.e., 12.6%) achieve statistical significance at the .05 level. Of these significant coefficients, 34 involve the quantitative methodological approach, and another 19 involved mixed-methods respondents.

Overall, these results point to a limited joint effect of political scientists' subfield and methodological orientation on how they subjectively evaluate these political science journals. For some

journals, subfield and method “matter” for how political scientists view the quality of articles published in their pages. In fact, for 60 of 115 journals (52%) there is at least one subfield or methodology coefficient that achieves statistical significance. For other journals—the remaining 55 journals present no significant subfield or methodology coefficients--these two sets of attributes are inconsequential.

Logit Results: Journal Familiarity

This far I have presented evidence of only moderate subfield and methodology effects on patterns of divisions among political scientists. Political scientists evaluations of the quality of research published in some journals are affected by their subfield and methodological identifications, but there are many journals for which these divisions are unimportant.

One possibility is that the sources of cleavage in the political science discipline rest less with how political scientists evaluate the quality of journals and more with the journals with which they are familiar. It is possible that political scientists evaluate some journals similarly, regardless of method or subfield, while for others their evaluations depend directly on the subfield and methodology with which they identify. But it is also possible that one source of cleavage among political scientists is in the journals with which they are familiar and to which they are regularly exposed. Arguably, international relations scholars will not be familiar with all of the journals read regularly by political theorists, and the same is likely to be the case with other combinations of subfield and methodological orientations.

In order to consider this possibility, I estimate a series of logit models, one for each journal, with the dichotomous familiarity variable for each journal depicted as a function of subfield and methodological approach variables. Here again, I include in these familiarity models the same independent variables that I included in the evaluation models discussed above. Comparative politics is the excluded subfield category, and qualitative methods is the excluded methodology category. The coefficients for this model represent the degree to which political scientists in a given subfield or methods category differ from comparative politics and qualitative methods, respectively, in their familiarity with a given journal.

These coefficients are summarized in Table 6.¹² It is clear that there are many more subfield and methodology coefficients that achieve conventional levels of statistical significance for the familiarity

models than for the evaluation models. Fully 230 of 575 subfield coefficients (40%) are statistically significant, suggesting that there are considerable subfield differences in how familiar political scientists are with various journals. Of these, 78 of 115 American politics coefficients (67.8%) are statistically significant; 50 of these are negative, implying that American politics scholars are less familiar than comparative politics scholars with a given journal, and the remaining 28 are positive, implying a higher level of familiarity for Americanists. The number of significant coefficients is 43 (37.4%) for international relations, 26 (22.6%) for political theory, 32 (27.8%) for political methodology, and 51 (44.3%) for public policy and administration. Clearly, there are significant subfield cleavages in terms of the journals with which political scientists are familiar.

The patterns of fragmentation in journal familiarity are not quite as stark across different methodological groups. Only 97 of 460 methodology coefficients (21.1%) are statistically significant; of these, 91 are positive and 16 are negative. The lion's share of these significant coefficients comes from quantitative methods (45, or 39%--40 positive and 5 negative) and mixed methods (32, or 27.8%--31 positive and 1 negative), with formal theory (13, or 11.3%) and normative theory (7, or 6.1%) approaches accounting for the remainder. The large number of positive coefficients for the quantitative and mixed categories suggests that quantitative and mixed scholars are more familiar with these journals than qualitative scholars.

Overall, the results from the logit models of journal familiarity point to a strong source of division among political scientists, at least in comparison to the results from the journal evaluations models. These logit results suggest that scholars differ considerably in the journals with which they are familiar, depending on their subfield and, to a lesser extent, their methodological orientation. The consistency of these two sources of fragmentation in the discipline can be demonstrated by the fact that for 107 of the 115 journal models (93%) at least one subfield or methodology coefficient achieves statistical significance at conventional levels. Clearly, journal familiarity varies across different subfield and methodological groups.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

There is considerable discussion among political scientists about the fractured nature of our discipline. Prominent scholars such as Gabriel Almond have bemoaned the fact that many political scientists sit at “separate tables” without sampling from the menus at other tables. In recent years the Perestroika movement has raised criticisms about the practice of political science, with the implication that there are sharp methodological differences among political scientists. The existence of divisions in political science has been part of the conventional wisdom in the discipline for some time. Despite the claim that political science is a fragmented discipline, to date there has been little systematic empirical evidence that this is the case. To be sure, many political scientists find the conventional wisdom of disciplinary fragmentation to be consistent with their own experiences. But the contours of these divisions have not been studied extensively in the literature.

In this paper I explore patterns of fragmentation and integration in political scientists’ assessments of major political science journals, an important aspect of scholarly communication in the political science discipline. Using survey data collected originally by Garand and Giles (2003), I consider how political scientists evaluate political science journals in terms of journal quality, familiarity, and impact. But most importantly, I measure these three characteristics separately for political scientists in different subfield and methodological groups. These aggregate measures reveal a fair amount of variation in how political scientists evaluate the leading political science journals, depending on their subfield or methodological approach. Considering quality, familiarity, and impact for all 115 political science journals, I find that there is some structure across subfield and methodology groupings in how journals are ranked. A single dimension emerges in most cases; the only exception is for subfield divisions in journal familiarity, where a weak second dimension emerges that represents comparative politics, international relations, and area studies journals. The bottom line is that there is structure to how political scientists in various subfields and methodological orientations rank order political science journals, but there is a fair amount of variation in rankings among the top echelon of political science journals.

I also use individual-level data to estimate a series of models that depict political scientists’ journal evaluation and journal familiarity as a function of subfield and methodology variables. The journal

evaluation results suggest that there are some differences in how subfield and methodological groups evaluate political science journals, though these differences are observed for only a subset of the 115 political science journals. The differences that are observed are somewhat more likely to be on a methodological basis than on a subfield basis. On the other hand, the journal familiarity results provide clear evidence that political scientists differ significantly across subfield and methodological orientation in terms of the journals with which they are familiar. The fragmentation in journal evaluations is certainly nontrivial, but the clearest pattern of fragmentation occurs in the journals with which political scientists indicate they are familiar. The upshot is that there are patterns of subfield and methodological fragmentation in political scientists evaluations of journal quality and familiarity with political science journals. The patterns suggest that methodological differences are somewhat more important for journal evaluations, while subfield differences are substantially more likely for journal familiarity.

So What?

Why are these patterns of division in political science important? What are the implications of the level of fragmentation in scholarly communication that can be observed in these data?

First, the interpretation of these differences depends on one's perspective. Some division in how political scientists evaluate the various modes of scholarly communication is inevitable in a mature discipline. Specifically, a discipline such as political science will have a high level of specialization, both in terms of subfields and in methodological approaches (Jervis, 2002). Specialization has great value in scholarly communities, and it is quite natural for scholars to want to have their work read by other scholars in their field of specialization. For instance, scholars working in comparative politics would certainly want to read and/or submit their work to journals such as Comparative Politics, Comparative Political Studies, Latin American Research Review, or the European Journal of Political Research. These are the journals that publish work that is major part of a comparativists' scholarly community, and it is reasonable for comparative politics scholars to read the work of (and have their work read by) other comparativists. The same is true for other specialized communities in the discipline.

The problem is that one scholar's specialization is another scholar's insularity. When scholars retreat to their specialized scholarly communities, it is possible that they miss the opportunity for cross-fertilization that occurs from interaction with those who are not entrenched in that community. For example, while international relations scholars who study international conflict benefit from communication with other specialists, it is also the case that scholars who study conflict in other settings may be able to offer a different perspective on how to think about this subject. The same can certainly be said for other specializations in each of the subfields. Perhaps Jervis (2002: 188) best articulates these issues:

Specialization is both necessary and troublesome. It is necessary because it allows us to study problems and theories closely; it is a problem because it takes our minds off broader questions and cuts us off from findings and perspectives in other areas. It also encourages the development of arcane concepts and terms that make communication difficult within social science and impossible outside it...An obvious cost of specialization is that we fail to learn from each other and waste effort reinventing the wheel. [my emphasis]

If political science is a discipline in which scholars in specialized communities focus their attention on a limited number of specialized scholarly outlets, the benefits of cross-fertilization across subfields, methodological approaches, and substantive specialties are lost.

Second, what is the role of general, cross-subfield journals in building an integrated discipline? Arguably, the general journals have the greatest potential for fostering integration in the political science discipline, since scholars in each of the subfields and methodological approaches are likely to see the work of scholars from other backgrounds. The potential for cross-fertilization is enhanced insofar as scholars from disparate subfields and methodological orientations communicate with each other and are exposed to research from other perspectives. When American politics scholars are reading at least some of the same journals being read by scholars in comparative politics, political theory, and international relations, and when quantitative scholars are reading at least some of the same journals that mixed method and qualitative scholars are reading, then there exists the potential for constructive dialogue across subfield and methodological approach.

Of course, broad subfield journals can also play a role in disciplinary integration, primarily by linking scholars from specialized areas within a given subfield. However, the sole reliance on broad subfield journals limits disciplinary integration across subfields. It is also likely that many of the more specialized journals contribute to the fragmentation of the discipline, though some specialized journals—Legislative Studies Quarterly, Electoral Studies, and Political Psychology come immediately to mind—cut across subfield or methodological cleavages and hence may contribute to disciplinary integration.

The role of general disciplinary journals in shaping the integration of the political science discipline has been limited. For one thing, many of the general journals have been criticized—fairly or not—for focusing too heavily on American politics and/or quantitative methods, to the exclusion of research from other subfields or methodological orientations. This is certainly part of the Perestroika complaint about the American Political Science Review and other general journals. Note, for instance, the finding discussed above that political scientists differentiate on methodological grounds 13 of the top 18 journals—most of which are either general journals or broad subfield journals—in terms of their evaluations, with an equal number of journals being favored by qualitative and quantitative scholars, respectively. In an integrated discipline, one might expect less differentiation among these general and broad subfield journals.

To be sure, there has been some effort on the part of some of the major association journals to encourage participation from other subfields and methodological approaches, but this effort has often failed to produce results. For instance, the three general journals—the American Political Science Review, the American Journal of Political Science, and the Journal of Politics—have reached out to comparative politics and international relations scholars in an effort to increase the representation of those subfields in articles published by those journals. However, many scholars in these subfields perceive that a publication in World Politics, International Organization, Comparative Politics, International Studies Quarterly, or Comparative Political Studies has a greater impact on their careers than a publication in one of the broader general journals. The current incentive system inspires reliance on broad subfield journals or even more specialized journals, with the possible result that specialization is emphasized over disciplinary integration and cross-fertilization.

Ultimately, it appears likely that the political science discipline will remain somewhat fragmented in the foreseeable future. Methodological divisions in the discipline show little sign of abating. It is also unlikely that subfield differences in patterns of scholarly communication will diminish; scholars will continue to target political science journals based in part on specialization considerations and the goal of reaching colleagues in their home subfields. Perhaps this is the way it should be. But scholarly life, as in life in general, is full of tradeoffs, and the attention to specialization carries with it the possibility that political scientists from different subfields and methodological orientations are unlikely to communicate as much as is optimal for scholarly progress in a well-integrated discipline.

ENDNOTES

1. Obviously, political scientists also communicate their research findings through books, which have often been excluded from studies of scholarly communication in political science. For a notable exception, see Goodson, Dillman, and Hira (1999).
2. It is important to note that this conceptualization of journal impact reflects the subjective value that both favorable evaluations of the quality of research published in a journal and widespread familiarity with a given journal are important ingredients in assessing the impact of a journal on the political science profession. As is the case with any set of values, I recognize that there are those who will disagree with this value system, though I believe that this is a reasonable way of thinking about journal impact.
3. It is also worth noting that all three of these measures—evaluation, familiarity, and impact—are highly reliable. The relationships between each pair of these variables measured in 1989 (see Garand 1990) and in 2001 (see Garand and Giles, 2003) are very strong and positive, indicating a high level of consistency from one time period to the next.
4. A table reporting the actual impact scores and rankings for the top 20 journals among all respondents and within each subfield can be found in Appendix 1 on the Journal of Politics website.
5. It is worth noting that the American Political Science Review is ranked first among political scientists who identify themselves in the subfields of public policy and public administration. (Results not shown.)
6. A table reporting the actual impact scores and rankings for the top 20 journals among all respondents and within each methodological approach can be found in Appendix 2 on the Journal of Politics website.
7. For the sake of brevity these correlations are not reported here, though they can be found in Appendices 3-5 on the Journal of Politics website.
8. The more detailed factor analysis results (including factor loadings and scoring coefficients) are reported in Appendices 6-11 on the Journal of Politics website.

9. Journal impact is a journal-level concept, so it is not possible to explore individual-level variation in perceptions of journal impact.
10. A more detailed table is available in Appendix 12 on the Journal of Politics website. In this table I report the F statistic for the test of differences in means, and where there is a significant difference I indicate, based on the review of the group means, which subfield or methodological group is dominant for each journal.
11. In Appendix 13 (found on the Journal of Politics website) I present a more detailed table of these results. I report the directions for coefficients that are statistically significant at the .05 level, denoted “P” for positive coefficients and “N” for negative coefficients. Nonsignificant coefficients are denoted with a blank.
12. In Appendix 14 (found on the Journal of Politics website) I present a more detailed table of these results. I report the directions for coefficients that are statistically significant at the .05 level, denoted “P” for positive coefficients and “N” for negative coefficients. Nonsignificant coefficients are denoted with a blank.

REFERENCES

- Almond, Gabriel. 1988. "Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science." PS 21 (Autumn): 828-42.
- Bennett, Stephen Earle. 2002. "'Perestroika' Lost: Why the Latest 'Reform' Movement in Political Science Should Fail." PS: Political Science and Politics 35 (June): 177-79.
- Crewe, Ivor and Pippa Norris. 1991. "British and American Journal Evaluation: Divergence or Convergence." PS: Political Science and Politics 24 (September): 524-30.
- Dahl, Robert. 1961. "The Behavioral Movement in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest." American Political Science Review 55 (December): 763-72.
- Easton, David. 1967. "The Current Meaning of Behavioralism," in James Charlesworth (ed.), Contemporary Political Analysis. New York: Free Press.
- Easton, David. 1969. "The New Revolution in Political Science," American Political Science Review 63 (December): 1051-61.
- Finifter, Ada. 2000. "Editor's Notes," American Political Science Review 94 (December): viii-xi.
- Freeman, Donald. 1991. "The Making of a Discipline," in William Crotty (ed.), The Theory and Practice of Political Science, Volume One of Political Science: Looking into the Future. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 2005. "How Academia Failed the Nation: The Decline of Regional Studies." <http://www.sais-jhu.edu/pubaffairs/publications/saisphere/winter04/Fukuyama.html>.
- Garand, James C. 1990. "An Alternative Interpretation of Recent Political Science Journal Evaluations." PS: Political Science and Politics 23 (September): 448-51.
- Garand, James and Micheal Giles. 2003. "Journals in the Discipline: A Report on a New Survey of American Political Scientists," PS: Political Science and Politics 36 (April): 293-308.
- Giles, Micheal, Francie Mizell, and David Paterson. 1989. "Political Scientists' Journal Evaluation Revisited." PS: Political Science and Politics 22 (September): 613-17.
- Giles, Micheal and Gerald Wright. 1975. "Political Scientists' Evaluations of Sixty-Three Journals." PS 7 (Summer): 254-57.
- Goodson, Larry, Bradford Dillman, and Anil Hira. 1999. "Ranking the Presses: Political Scientists Evaluations of Publisher Quality." PS: Political Science and Politics 32 (June 1999): 257-62.
- Grant, J. Tobin. 2005. "What Divides Us? The Image and Organization of Political Science." PS: Political Science and Politics 38 (July): forthcoming.
- Jervis, Robert. 2002. "Politics, Political Science, and Specialization." PS: Political Science and Politics 35 (June): 187-89.
- Kasza, Gregory. 2001. "Perestroika: For an Ecumenical Science of Politics." PS: Political Science and Politics 34 (September): 597-99.

- Landman, Todd. 2002. "Rebutting 'Perestroika': Method and Substance in Political Science." unpublished manuscript.
- Parenti, Michael. 1983. "The State of the Discipline: One Interpretation of Everyone's Favorite Controversy," PS 16 (Spring): 189-96.
- Ricci, David. 1984. The Tragedy of Political Science: Politics, Scholarship, and Democracy. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Seidelman, Raymond. 1985. Disenchanted Realists: Political Science and the American Crisis, 1884-1984. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Shepsle, Kenneth. 1990. "Untitled Commentary," in Monroe, Kristen et al., "The Nature of Contemporary Political Science: A Roundtable Discussion." PS: Political Science and Politics 23 (March): 40-42.
- Smith, Rogers. 2002. "Should We Make Political Science More of a Science or More About Politics?" PS: Political Science and Politics 35 (June): 199-201.

Table 1. Ranking of top 20 political science journals, by subfield

	All subfields	American Politics	Comparative Politics	International Relations	Political Theory
Top 20 Journals (Garand and Giles)					
<u>American Political Science Review</u>	1	2	5	5	2
<u>American Journal of Political Science</u>	2	1	7	7	10
<u>Journal of Politics</u>	3	3	9	9	3
<u>World Politics</u>	4	10	1	2	16
<u>International Organization</u>	5	--	3	1	18
<u>British Journal of Political Science</u>	6	4	6	11	9
<u>American Sociological Review</u>	7	6	10	12	6
<u>American Economic Review</u>	8	9	11	8	12
<u>Comparative Politics</u>	9	19	2	10	--
<u>American Journal of Sociology</u>	10	12	15	20	11
<u>Comparative Political Studies</u>	11	--	4	15	--
<u>PS: Political Science and Politics</u>	12	13	17	19	8
<u>Political Research Quarterly</u>	13	5	--	--	14
<u>International Studies Quarterly</u>	14	--	13	4	--
<u>Political Science Quarterly</u>	15	14	19	18	--
<u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>	16	8	--	--	--
<u>Journal of Conflict Resolution</u>	17	--	--	6	--
<u>International Security</u>	18	--	14	3	--
<u>Legislative Studies Quarterly</u>	19	7	--	--	--
<u>Political Theory</u>	20	--	--	--	1

Table 1 (continued)

	All subfields	American Politics	Comparative Politics	International Relations	Political Theory
Other Journals					
<u>American Politics Quarterly</u>	24	11	--	--	--
<u>Social Science Quarterly</u>	25	15	--	--	--
<u>Polity</u>	23	16	--	--	4
<u>Law and Society Review</u>	31	17	--	--	--
<u>Political Behavior</u>	34	18	--	--	--
<u>Studies in American Political Development</u>	32	20	--	--	17
<u>Journal of Democracy</u>	26	--	8	--	--
<u>Comparative Studies of Society and History</u>	28	--	12	--	--
<u>Latin American Research Review</u>	30	--	16	--	--
<u>Politics and Society</u>	33	--	18	--	--
<u>World Development</u>	38	--	20	--	--
<u>Journal of Peace Research</u>	52	--	--	13	--
<u>Journal of Political Economy</u>	22	--	--	14	13
<u>Security Studies</u>	67	--	--	16	--
<u>History of Political Thought</u>	39	--	--	--	5
<u>Review of Politics</u>	48	--	--	--	7
<u>Signs</u>	64	--	--	--	15
<u>Public Administration Review</u>	21	--	--	--	19
<u>Journal of Theoretical Politics</u>	35	--	--	--	20

Note: These figures represent the ranking of each journal among all respondents and among respondents in American politics, comparative politics, international relations, and political theory. Within each subfield, a "--" denotes that the journal is not ranked among the top 20 among respondents in that subfield.

Table 2. Ranking of top 20 political science journals, by methodological approach

	All Methods	Quantitative	Mixed	Qualitative
Top 20 Journals (Garand and Giles)				
<u>American Political Science Review</u>	1	2	1	4
<u>American Journal of Political Science</u>	2	1	2	8
<u>Journal of Politics</u>	3	3	3	6
<u>World Politics</u>	4	11	4	1
<u>International Organization</u>	5	16	7	2
<u>British Journal of Political Science</u>	6	4	6	13
<u>American Sociological Review</u>	7	6	5	11
<u>American Economic Review</u>	8	5	11	19
<u>Comparative Politics</u>	9	19	8	3
<u>American Journal of Sociology</u>	10	8	10	18
<u>Comparative Political Studies</u>	11	14	13	12
<u>PS: Political Science and Politics</u>	12	--	9	9
<u>Political Research Quarterly</u>	13	7	15	--
<u>International Studies Quarterly</u>	14	15	17	10
<u>Political Science Quarterly</u>	15	--	14	7
<u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>	16	9	16	--
<u>Journal of Conflict Resolution</u>	17	13	18	--
<u>International Security</u>	18	--	14	5
<u>Legislative Studies Quarterly</u>	19	10	--	--
<u>Political Theory</u>	20	--	--	--

Table 2 (continued)

	All Methods	Quantitative	Mixed	Qualitative
Other Journals				
<u>American Politics Quarterly</u>	24	12	19	--
<u>Political Analysis</u>	29	17	20	--
<u>Social Science Quarterly</u>	25	18	--	--
<u>Political Behavior</u>	34	19	--	--
<u>Comparative Studies in Society and History</u>	28	--	--	14
<u>Journal of Democracy</u>	26	--	--	15
<u>Latin American Research Review</u>	30	--	--	16
<u>Politics and Society</u>	33	--	--	17
<u>Studies in American Political Development</u>	32	--	--	20

Note: These figures represent the ranking of each journal among all respondents and among respondents identifying with a quantitative, mixed (both quantitative and qualitative), and qualitative methodological approach. Within each methodological approach, a "--" denotes that the journal is not ranked among the top 20 among respondents classifying themselves in that methodological category.

Table 3: Summary of principal component factoring results

	Subfield		Methodological Approach	
Journal Evaluations	Eigenvalue:	3.202	Eigenvalue:	2.147
	Proportion Explained:	0.640	Proportion Explained:	0.716
Journal Familiarity	Factor 1:		Eigenvalue:	2.646
	Eigenvalue:	3.057	Proportion Explained:	0.882
	Proportion Explained:	0.611		
	Factor 2:			
	Eigenvalue:	1.090		
	Proportion Explained:	0.218		
Journal Impact	Eigenvalue:	3.323	Eigenvalue:	2.460
	Proportion Explained:	0.665	Proportion Explained:	0.820

Table 4. Summary of analysis of variance results for tests of differences among means for subfield and methodological groups

	Subfield	Methodological Approach
Percentage (number) of significant F statistics	20.9% (24)	44.3% (51)
Frequency of dominant categories		
American politics	4	--
Comparative politics	14	--
International relations	2	--
Political Theory	9	--
Public Policy / Administration	15	--
Quantitative methods	--	13
Mixed methods	--	2
Qualitative methods	--	40

Table 5. Summary of regression results for effects of subfield and methodological approach on evaluations of political science journals

	AP	IR	PT	PM	PPPA	Quant	Mixed	Formal	Norm
Significant positive coefficients	3	0	3	0	6	9	2	0	3
Significant negative coefficients	9	11	2	13	0	25	17	2	0
Total significant coefficients	12	11	5	13	6	34	19	2	3
Subfield coefficients									
Positive	12								
Negative	35								
Total	47 of 575 (8.2%)								
Methodology coefficients									
Positive	14								
Negative	44								
Total	58 of 460 (12.6%)								
All coefficients									
Positive	26								
Negative	79								
Total	105 of 1035 (10.1%)								
Models with at least one significant coefficient:	60 of 115 (52.2%)								

Table 6. Summary of logit results for effects of subfield and methodological approach on familiarity with political science journals

	AP	IR	PT	PM	PPPA	Quant	Mixed	Formal	Norm
Significant positive coefficients	28	17	16	29	21	40	31	4	6
Significant negative coefficients	50	26	10	3	30	5	1	9	1
Total significant coefficients	78	43	26	32	51	45	32	13	7
Subfield coefficients									
Positive	111								
Negative	119								
Total	230 of 575 (40.0%)								
Methodology coefficients									
Positive	81								
Negative	16								
Total	97 of 460 (21.1%)								
All coefficients									
Positive	192								
Negative	135								
Total	327 of 1035 (31.6%)								
Models with at least one significant coefficient:	107 of 115 (93.0%)								