

regarded by a jury who undoubtedly knew its own mind when it came to pornography (*Alexander v. United States*, 271 F.2d 140 (8th Cir. 1959)). Similarly, the university political science professor who testified on the effects of hair length in public schools may have ventured beyond his area of expertise; at least so thought the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals (*Karr v. Schmidt*, 460 F.2d 609, 612-613 (5th Cir. 1972)).

Nevertheless, political scientists generally have been respectfully received in most cases reviewed. In many cases their opinions have been central to the resolution of key issues. As awareness of the contributions of social scientists spreads in the legal community, political scientists can expect additional opportunities to test their experience in federal and state courtrooms.

About the Author

Lawrence J. Leigh

Lawrence J. Leigh is Assistant United States Attorney in San Francisco, and is an adjunct faculty member of the School of Law, University of California, Berkeley. He has a Ph.D. in government from the University of Arizona and a J.D. from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law. He is the former Deputy Director of the staff of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.



British and American Journal Evaluation: Divergence or Convergence?*

Ivor Crewe, *Essex University*
Pippa Norris, *Edinburgh University*

One sign of a mature science is the internationalization of its research community. Natural scientists, whether in the Soviet Union, India or the United States, tend to share a common theoretical discourse, scientific literature, and research agenda. Their ideas, working methods and research results transcend national boundaries. They belong to a global community of knowledge and they compete in an international market for academic labor. Has political science reached the same level of development?

There is some evidence of a growing integration of national political science communities. Worldwide organizations such as the International Political Science Association and the International Society for Political Psychology, as well as the leading foundations, have encouraged cross-national research programs and the international dissemination of research and mobility of scholars; at the continental level associations like the European Consortium for Political Research have fostered similar transnational activities. But these research networks encompass only a fraction of each nation's political scientists. The sign

of a truly international community of scholars is whether they share the same intellectual concerns and professional standards. Given the common language and overlapping culture of Britain and the United States, one might expect such a development to be particularly advanced in the United States and Britain.

In the case of political science, however, many observers have their doubts. In a recent article David McKay (1988) suggests that political science in Europe and the United States has developed in divergent directions. A range of organizational and linguistic factors are responsible, but the primary cause lies in the very different intellectual traditions that dominate the United States and Europe. As a result, McKay suggests, American scholars rarely read, cite or publish in European journals, and European scholars, while not quite as parochial, pay more attention to European than to U.S.-based journals.

Does evidence support this argument? Do political scientists in the West restrict their academic reading to their own side of the Atlantic? This article aims to cast some light on this question by comparing famil-

ilarity with different journals, evaluations of journal quality and measures of journal impact among a representative sample of British and American political scientists. Familiarity with journals is important, because periodicals are the primary mechanism for conveying information about research findings and the development of ideas to the academic community. The academic community's evaluation of journals is also important, because the quality of the journals in which colleagues publish is one of the most common academic criteria for determining appointments, tenure, promotion and research awards. In an ideal world a political scientist's quality would be judged by reading his or her body of work. In reality the proliferation and specialization of political science means that the appropriate expertise is not always available to evaluate a colleague's published work. Since publication in the most competitive professional journals is the outcome of a rigorous process of peer review, we often judge articles by the perceived quality of the journals in which they appear. Whether European and American political scientists are familiar with the same journals,

and share a common view about their quality, therefore has a practical as well as intellectual significance.

Methods, Sample and Data

Two major approaches to ranking journals have been adopted in the United States: the “impact” approach, which ranks journals using citation data; and the “reputational” approach, which asks a representative sample of political scientists to evaluate selected journals (Christenson and Seligman, 1985; and Robey, 1982). More sophisticated systems model approaches are sometimes proposed, but these are difficult to operationalize (Lester, 1990). This research employs the straightforward “reputational” approach by asking a representative sample of political scientists to rank a range of periodicals.

Our research design replicated the measures of journal quality and familiarity developed by Giles et al. (1975, 1989). Giles asked a random sample of political scientists in the United States ($n = 215$) to evaluate a list of 78 political science journals. Respondents were asked to rate the quality of each journal with which they were familiar on a scale running from 0 (poor) to 10 (outstanding). We undertook a small pilot study of senior British political scientists, on behalf of the Political Studies Association, followed by the full survey in October 1990. A questionnaire was distributed to all political scientists registered in the *PSA Staff Directory, 1989* ($N = 1,051$). We received 366 replies, including 312 fully completed questionnaires, representing a total response rate of 35 percent. The sample was reasonably representative of the profession as a whole. Compared with all staff in the *PSA Staff Directory*, the sample had a very similar profile in terms of university/polytechnic sector, tenure, gender, age, subject and territorial specialization, but contained a slightly higher than proportionate number of full-time, permanent and senior members of the profession (Crewe and Norris, 1991). The full survey asked respondents to evaluate 189 journals, but for the comparative analysis we have dropped journals not listed in Giles’s survey, as well as four on Giles’s list:

TABLE 1.
The Twenty Journals with the Highest Quality Evaluations
Among American and British Political Scientists

American Political Scientists	British Political Scientists
1 <i>World Politics</i>	<i>International Organisation</i>
2 <i>American Sociological Review</i>	<i>World Politics</i>
3 <i>American Political Science Review</i>	<i>Soviet Studies</i>
4 <i>American Journal of Sociology</i>	<i>Journal of Latin American Studies</i>
5 <i>American Journal of Political Science</i>	<i>Political Theory</i>
6 <i>Journal of Politics</i>	<i>China Quarterly</i>
7 <i>Soviet Studies</i>	<i>Slavic Review</i>
8 <i>International Organisation</i>	<i>British Journal of Political Science</i>
9 <i>Comparative Politics</i>	<i>American Political Science Review</i>
10 <i>Slavic Review</i>	<i>Political Studies</i>
11 <i>Administrative Studies Quarterly</i>	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>
12 <i>British Journal of Political Science</i>	<i>American Sociological Review</i>
13 <i>China Quarterly</i>	<i>International Affairs</i>
14 <i>Political Theory</i>	<i>Daedalus</i>
15 <i>Public Administration Review</i>	<i>American Journal of Political Science</i>
16 <i>Comparative Political Studies</i>	<i>Journal of Politics</i>
17 <i>International Studies Quarterly</i>	<i>Political Science Quarterly</i>
18 <i>Journal of Conflict Resolution</i>	<i>Comparative Politics</i>
19 <i>Foreign Affairs</i>	<i>International Studies Quarterly</i>
20 <i>Journal of Latin American Studies</i>	<i>Politics & Society</i>

Note: Excluding journals with a response rate of less than 5% in the British or American surveys.
Sources: Political Studies Association Survey of Journals, 1990; Giles, Mizell and Patterson, 1989.

altogether 74 journals are compared, of which 65 are published in North America and 9 in the United Kingdom. To compare a journal’s overall impact in Britain and the United States, we adopted the summary measure developed by Garand (1990), which combines the evaluation and familiarity indicators. The full results are presented for reference in the Appendix.

Results

Quality. In a perfectly integrated community of scholars the impact of journals would be the same irrespective of national boundaries. Our first question, therefore, is whether there is an Anglo-American consensus about the quality of journals. Our survey found a strong and significant correlation (Pearson’s $r = 0.69$) between British and American evaluations of journal quality—at least for those journals which could be compared. As Table 1 shows, fifteen of the top twenty evaluated journals in the United States figured among the top twenty evaluated journals in Britain and, of course, vice versa. The five highly-ranked American outliers were *Administrative Studies Quarterly* (11th), *Public Administra-*

tion Review (15th), *Comparative Political Studies* (16th), *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (18th), and *Foreign Affairs* (19th). The five high-ranking British outliers were *Political Studies* (10th), *International Affairs* (13th), *Daedalus* (14th), *Political Science Quarterly* (17th), and *Politics and Society* (20th).

The above list hints at two sources of national differences in the perceived quality of a journal. The first is intellectual tradition. Three of the journals that are more highly regarded in the United States than Britain tend to publish formal, mathematical and quantitative approaches to the research (*Administrative Studies Quarterly*, *Comparative Political Studies* and *Journal of Conflict Resolution*), whereas three of the journals regarded much more highly in Britain than the United States tend to publish qualitative, reflective and theoretical work (*Daedalus*, *Political Science Quarterly* and *Politics and Society*). The second factor is national provenance: two of the British outliers are U.K.-based publications, whereas all five of the American outliers are U.S.-based publications.

Familiarity. The considerable agreement about the perceived quality of

journals was accompanied, however, by striking contrasts between British and American political scientists in their familiarity with different journals: the correlation was a relatively weak ($r = 0.40$). This correlation would probably have been weaker still, moreover, if Giles's list had included more of the journals which British political scientists rated highly in our full survey—journals such as *Parliamentary Affairs*, *Ethics*, *Electoral Studies*, *West European Politics* and the *Journal of Modern History*. As Lester (1990) has pointed out, the absence of non-U.S. journals on Giles's list is itself evidence of a latent bias against European political science.

We may identify three reasons for the different levels of journal familiarity between the United States and Britain: associational sponsorship, subject coverage and national provenance. The first two do not imply nationally divergent academic communities. We would expect journals that are distributed as part of membership of national or regional political science associations to be far more familiar in one country than the other, and this was indeed the case. The journals with which the large majority of American political scientists were familiar, and the large majority of British journalists were unfamiliar, included *PS: Political Science & Politics* (87 percent as against 11 percent), *Western Political Quarterly* (78 percent as against 13 percent), and *Journal of Politics* (91 percent as against 28 percent) and *Polity* (69 percent as against 9 percent). Similarly, the one British journal which was familiar to the large majority of British political scientists (75 percent) but to only a small minority of their American counterparts (25 percent) was *Political Studies*, the journal of the United Kingdom's Political Studies Association.

We would also expect journals devoted to domestic politics to be much more familiar among their national academic community than abroad, given the relative concentration of courses and research in each country on domestic politics. Hence, the non-association journals with the widest "familiarity gaps" between the United States and Britain

included *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, *American Politics Quarterly* and *Publius* in the United States and *Political Quarterly* in Britain; moreover, many of the regional association journals are largely devoted to the study of United States politics. But associational sponsorship and subject coverage are only part of the explanation for differences in familiarity. The *American Political Science Review* was familiar to the majority of British political scientists (60 percent) as well as, of course, almost every American political sci-

. . . American political scientists are less insular than their British counterparts: the proportion of American political scientists reading U.K.-based journals was two and a half times the proportion of British political scientists who read U.S.-based journals.

entist (99 percent). What also mattered was the national provenance of the journal. As Table A-2 shows, American political scientists were somewhat more familiar with U.S.-based journals (38.8 percent) than with U.K.-based journals (25.0 percent), whereas British political scientists were considerably more familiar with U.K.-based journals (39.0 percent) than with U.S.-based journals (10.9 percent).

At face value these figures suggest that, contrary to McKay's assumption, American political scientists are less insular than their British counterparts: the proportion of American political scientists reading U.K.-based journals was two and a half times the proportion of British political scientists who read U.S.-based journals. With so many more U.S.-based journals than U.K.-based journals in the list it could be argued that British political scientists were bound to

appear the more insular; but the fact that American political scientists were as familiar, on average, with their sixty-seven U.S.-based journals as British political scientists were with their nine U.K.-based journals suggests that the U.S.-U.K. disparity of numbers in the list of journals was not a factor affecting familiarity.

The persistence of national biases is well illustrated in the case of specialist journals of comparative politics and of international relations. In these fields of the discipline, even more than others, one might expect a cross-Atlantic community of scholars in which the national provenance of journals was irrelevant. However, the U.S.-based *Comparative Politics* and *Comparative Political Studies* were more familiar to American political scientists (55 and 46 percent of them, respectively) than to their British counterparts (39 and 24 percent of them), whereas the U.K.-based *Government and Opposition* was twice as well known on the British side of the Atlantic (68 percent) as on the American (33 percent). Similarly, of the four general international relations journals on the list, the U.K.-based *International Affairs* was the most familiar to British political scientists and the least familiar to American political scientists.

Impact. A journal's overall impact is the product of its perceived quality and its familiarity among members of the academic community. We have already shown that British and American political scientists converged in their evaluation of most journals but differed in their familiarity with them. We would therefore expect national variations in journal impact largely to reflect national dissimilarities in familiarity, and indeed this proved the case. Table 2, based on Garand's summary measure of impact, lists the twenty journals with the most impact in the United States and Britain. Five journals appear in the "top ten" of both countries: *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *World Politics*, *Comparative Politics* and the *British Journal of Political Science*. Another seven journals are common to the top twenty of both countries. That leaves eight

TABLE 2.
The Twenty Journals with the Strongest Impact Among American and British Political Scientists

American Political Scientists		British Political Scientists
1	<i>American Political Science Review</i>	<i>Political Studies</i>
2	<i>Journal of Politics</i>	<i>British Journal of Political Science</i>
3	<i>American Journal of Political Science</i>	<i>American Political Science Review</i>
4	<i>World Politics</i>	<i>Government and Opposition</i>
5	<i>American Sociological Review</i>	<i>World Politics</i>
6	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>	<i>International Affairs</i>
7	<i>Foreign Affairs</i>	<i>American Journal of Political Science</i>
8	<i>Comparative Politics</i>	<i>International Organisation</i>
9	<i>British Journal of Political Science</i>	<i>Comparative Politics</i>
10	<i>Western Political Quarterly</i>	<i>Political Theory</i>
11	<i>Public Administration Review</i>	<i>Political Quarterly</i>
12	<i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>	<i>Journal of Politics</i>
13	<i>Daedalus</i>	<i>Foreign Affairs</i>
14	<i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i>	<i>Soviet Studies</i>
15	<i>Polity</i>	<i>Daedalus</i>
16	<i>Journal of Conflict Resolution</i>	<i>European Journal of Political Research</i>
17	<i>Political Science Quarterly</i>	<i>Journal of Asian Studies</i>
18	<i>International Organisation</i>	<i>Annals of the American Academy of Political Science</i>
19	<i>Annals of the American Academy of Political Science</i>	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>
20	<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	<i>Political Science Quarterly</i>

Sources: Political Studies Association Survey of Journals, 1990; Giles, Mizell and Patterson, 1989.

journals which appeared in the “top twenty” of the United States but not Britain. Of these, two—the *American Sociological Review* and *Western Political Quarterly*—figured among the “top ten” in the United States and are thus stark examples of journals whose impact was confined to national boundaries. The other six include two journals of public administration (*Public Administration Review* and *Administrative Science Quarterly*) and two association

journals (*PS* and *Polity*) but two other journals whose special field might be expected to have international appeal, *Public Opinion Quarterly* and *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. Four journals appeared in the British “top ten” but not even in the American “top twenty”—*Political Studies*, *Government and Opposition*, *International Affairs* and *Political Theory*. Of these the first three are U.K.-based, while the inclusion of *Political Theory* might reflect

the greater prominence of political theory in political studies in Britain compared with the United States. Of the four other journals appearing in the British but not the American “top twenty,” three are U.K.-based journals (*Political Quarterly*, *Soviet Studies* and *European Journal of Political Research*).

We can therefore conclude that the growth of international associations may have fostered links between scholars. We are all familiar with the David Lodge stereotype of the “have paper, will travel” academic winging his way from Euphoria State to Rummidge University, or at least from the PSA to the APSA conferences. We might expect that British and American political scientists, given their similarities in language and culture, would fulfill this stereotype most closely. Some certainly do. Yet the results from our research indicate that although British and American political scientists tend to agree about the quality of many journals, nevertheless they tend to read a different set of journals and hence, by implication, to be familiar with a different literature, theoretical discourse and research agenda. For those concerned with the need to avoid national parochialism this situation may seem unfortunate; for those concerned with the need to maintain intellectual diversity this situation may be seen in a more positive light.

Appendix

TABLE A-1.
Evaluations of Journal Quality

	Great Britain	United States	Difference	
1	6.29	6.90	.61	<i>Administrative Studies Quarterly</i>
2	5.26	5.80	.54	<i>Administration & Society</i>
3	7.00	7.50	.50	<i>American Journal of Political Science</i>
4	4.00	4.50	.50	<i>National Civic Review</i>
5	7.00	7.40	.40	<i>Journal of Politics</i>
6	5.73	6.10	.37	<i>Social Science Quarterly</i>
7	5.33	5.70	.37	<i>Far Eastern Survey</i>
8	6.20	6.50	.30	<i>Comparative Political Studies</i>
9	7.31	7.60	.29	<i>American Sociological Review</i>
10	6.32	6.60	.28	<i>Public Administration Review</i>
11	7.39	7.60	.21	<i>American Political Science Review</i>
12	6.81	7.00	.19	<i>Comparative Politics</i>
13	5.15	5.30	.15	<i>International Social Science Review</i>
14	7.37	7.50	.13	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>

TABLE A-1. *continued*

	Great Britain	United States	Difference	
15	7.84	7.90	.06	<i>World Politics</i>
16	6.34	6.40	.06	<i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>
17	6.39	6.40	.01	<i>Journal of Conflict Resolution</i>
18	6.15	6.10	-.05	<i>Public Policy & Administration</i>
19	5.80	5.70	-.10	<i>Political Behaviour</i>
20	6.33	6.20	-.13	<i>Social Forces</i>
21	6.09	5.90	-.19	<i>Journal of Interamerican Studies & World Affairs</i>
22	6.59	6.40	-.19	<i>Foreign Affairs</i>
23	6.00	5.80	-.20	<i>American Politics Quarterly</i>
24	6.56	6.30	-.26	<i>European Journal of Political Research</i>
25	6.38	6.10	-.28	<i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i>
26	6.79	6.50	-.29	<i>International Studies Quarterly</i>
27	5.71	5.40	-.31	<i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i>
28	6.05	5.70	-.35	<i>Journal of Peace Research</i>
29	7.15	6.80	-.35	<i>Journal of Political Economy</i>
30	6.37	6.00	-.37	<i>Polity</i>
31	6.47	6.10	-.37	<i>Canadian Journal of Political Science</i>
32	6.38	6.00	-.38	<i>Public Choice</i>
33	6.24	5.80	-.44	<i>Public Interest</i>
34	6.25	5.80	-.45	<i>Publius</i>
35	6.36	5.90	-.46	<i>Journal of International Affairs</i>
36	6.00	5.50	-.50	<i>Dissent</i>
37	7.52	7.00	-.52	<i>Slavik Review</i>
38	6.07	5.50	-.57	<i>American Review of Public Administration</i>
39	7.78	7.20	-.58	<i>Soviet Studies</i>
40	6.00	5.40	-.60	<i>Behavioural Science</i>
41	6.61	6.00	-.61	<i>Western Political Quarterly</i>
42	6.41	5.80	-.61	<i>Government & Opposition</i>
43	7.43	6.80	-.63	<i>British Journal of Political Science</i>
44	5.63	5.00	-.63	<i>Policy Studies Journal</i>
45	6.25	5.60	-.65	<i>International Interactions</i>
46	7.01	6.30	-.71	<i>Daedalus</i>
47	6.12	5.40	-.72	<i>Political Quarterly</i>
48	5.33	4.60	-.73	<i>Presidential Studies Quarterly</i>
49	6.77	6.00	-.77	<i>Politics & Society</i>
50	6.50	5.70	-.80	<i>Review of Politics</i>
51	8.14	7.30	-.84	<i>American Journal of International Law</i>
52	6.85	6.00	-.85	<i>Political Science Quarterly</i>
53	6.67	5.80	-.87	<i>Journal of Developing Areas</i>
54	5.20	4.30	-.90	<i>Journal of Black Studies</i>
55	7.17	6.20	-.97	<i>International Affairs</i>
56	8.07	7.10	-.97	<i>International Organisation</i>
57	5.00	4.00	-1.00	<i>Experimental Study of Politics</i>
58	7.64	6.60	-1.04	<i>China Quarterly</i>
59	6.54	5.50	-1.04	<i>Asian Survey</i>
60	7.65	6.60	-1.05	<i>Political Theory</i>
61	7.25	6.20	-1.05	<i>Law & Society Review</i>
62	6.33	5.20	-1.13	<i>Orbis</i>
63	6.05	4.90	-1.15	<i>Political Science</i>
64	7.37	6.20	-1.17	<i>Political Studies</i>
65	7.27	6.10	-1.17	<i>Urban Affairs Quarterly</i>
66	7.08	5.90	-1.18	<i>Policy Sciences</i>
67	7.00	5.80	-1.20	<i>Judicature</i>
68	6.71	5.40	-1.31	<i>Annals of the American Academy of Political Science</i>
69	6.62	5.30	-1.32	<i>Public Administration Quarterly</i>
70	7.75	6.40	-1.35	<i>Journal of Latin American Studies</i>
71	5.50	4.10	-1.40	<i>Simulation & Games</i>
72	7.75	5.60	-2.15	<i>Middle Eastern Studies</i>
73	6.75	4.40	-2.35	<i>Women & Politics</i>
74	8.15	5.80	-2.35	<i>Journal of Asian Studies</i>
Mean	6.56	6.02	-.54	All journals
Mean	7.14	6.32	-.82	U.K.-based journals
Mean	6.48	5.98	-.50	U.S.-based journals

TABLE A-2.
Differences in Journal Familiarity

	Great Britain	United States	Difference	
1	.11	.87	.76	<i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i>
2	.13	.78	.66	<i>Western Political Quarterly</i>
3	.28	.91	.63	<i>Journal of Politics</i>
4	.09	.69	.60	<i>Polity</i>
5	.05	.63	.58	<i>Presidential Studies Quarterly</i>
6	.27	.81	.54	<i>Annals of the American Academy of Political Science</i>
7	.04	.57	.53	<i>Social Science Quarterly</i>
8	.10	.59	.49	<i>American Politics Quarterly</i>
9	.12	.60	.49	<i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>
10	.11	.57	.47	<i>Journal of Conflict Resolution</i>
11	.38	.83	.45	<i>American Journal of Political Science</i>
12	.22	.66	.44	<i>Political Science Quarterly</i>
13	.11	.55	.44	<i>American Sociological Review</i>
14	.03	.47	.44	<i>Publius</i>
15	.15	.58	.42	<i>Public Administration Review</i>
16	.09	.51	.42	<i>Policy Studies Journal</i>
17	.34	.76	.42	<i>Foreign Affairs</i>
18	.07	.48	.41	<i>Public Interest</i>
19	.60	.99	.38	<i>American Political Science Review</i>
20	.25	.63	.38	<i>Daedalus</i>
21	.11	.49	.38	<i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i>
22	.14	.50	.36	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>
23	.09	.43	.34	<i>Administrative Studies Quarterly</i>
24	.29	.59	.31	<i>World Politics</i>
25	.11	.42	.31	<i>International Studies Quarterly</i>
26	.02	.33	.31	<i>Political Behaviour</i>
27	.02	.31	.30	<i>Law & Society Review</i>
28	.03	.33	.29	<i>Social Forces</i>
29	.04	.33	.29	<i>Policy Sciences</i>
30	.05	.33	.28	<i>Dissent</i>
31	.05	.33	.28	<i>Public Choice</i>
32	.04	.30	.26	<i>Urban Affairs Quarterly</i>
33	.15	.40	.25	<i>Orbis</i>
34	.04	.29	.25	<i>Public Administration Quarterly</i>
35	.15	.40	.24	<i>Review of Politics</i>
36	.08	.31	.24	<i>Journal of Peace Research</i>
37	.24	.46	.22	<i>Comparative Political Studies</i>
38	.02	.23	.21	<i>Journal of Developing Areas</i>
39	.10	.31	.21	<i>Politics & Society</i>
40	.05	.26	.21	<i>American Review of Public Administration</i>
41	.03	.22	.19	<i>Behavioural Science</i>
42	.01	.20	.19	<i>National Civic Review</i>
43	.04	.24	.19	<i>Journal of Political Economy</i>
44	.19	.38	.19	<i>International Organisation</i>
45	.01	.20	.19	<i>Judicature</i>
46	.11	.29	.18	<i>Administration & Society</i>
47	.00	.18	.17	<i>Law & Policy</i>
48	.39	.55	.16	<i>Comparative Politics</i>
49	.18	.34	.16	<i>Canadian Journal of Political Science</i>
50	.03	.19	.16	<i>American Journal of International Law</i>
51	.04	.20	.16	<i>International Social Science Review</i>
52	.00	.14	.14	<i>Southeastern Political Review</i>
53	.08	.21	.13	<i>Asian Survey</i>
54	.02	.13	.11	<i>International Interactions</i>
55	.02	.13	.11	<i>Journal of Black Studies</i>
56	.03	.13	.10	<i>Women & Politics</i>
57	.01	.11	.10	<i>Middle Eastern Studies</i>
58	.06	.16	.10	<i>Political Science</i>
59	.01	.10	.09	<i>Experimental Study of Politics</i>
60	.05	.13	.08	<i>Journal of Latin American Studies</i>
61	.01	.09	.08	<i>Far Eastern Survey</i>
62	.05	.12	.07	<i>Journal of Asian Studies</i>
63	.08	.15	.07	<i>China Quarterly</i>
64	.13	.20	.07	<i>Public Policy & Administration</i>
65	.04	.11	.07	<i>Journal of Interamerican Studies & World Affairs</i>
66	.21	.28	.07	<i>Political Theory</i>
67	.09	.16	.07	<i>Journal of International Affairs</i>
68	.02	.08	.06	<i>Simulation & Games</i>
69	.08	.07	.00	<i>Slavik Review</i>

TABLE A-2. *continued*

	Great Britain	United States	Difference	
70	.13	.09	-.04	<i>Soviet Studies</i>
71	.66	.58	-.08	<i>British Journal of Political Science</i>
72	.32	.22	-.10	<i>European Journal of Political Research</i>
73	.36	.26	-.10	<i>International Affairs</i>
74	.48	.24	-.25	<i>Political Quarterly</i>
75	.68	.33	-.35	<i>Government & Opposition</i>
76	.75	.25	-.50	<i>Political Studies</i>
Mean	14.2	37.2	23.0	All journals
Mean	39.0	25.0	-14.0	U.K.-based journals
Mean	10.9	38.8	27.9	U.S.-based journals

TABLE A-3.
Differences in Journal Impact

	Great Britain	United States	Difference	
1	8.95	14.14	5.19	<i>Journal of Politics</i>
2	9.69	13.74	4.05	<i>American Journal of Political Science</i>
3	6.35	10.09	3.75	<i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i>
4	8.11	11.77	3.66	<i>American Sociological Review</i>
5	5.95	9.56	3.61	<i>Social Science Quarterly</i>
6	7.43	10.71	3.28	<i>Western Political Quarterly</i>
7	11.84	15.09	3.25	<i>American Political Science Review</i>
8	6.94	10.15	3.21	<i>Polity</i>
9	7.10	10.27	3.18	<i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>
10	7.29	10.41	3.12	<i>Public Administration Review</i>
11	7.07	10.08	3.01	<i>Journal of Conflict Resolution</i>
12	6.87	9.85	2.98	<i>Administrative Studies Quarterly</i>
13	8.38	11.26	2.88	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>
14	6.58	9.22	2.64	<i>American Politics Quarterly</i>
15	10.08	12.60	2.52	<i>World Politics</i>
16	8.86	11.25	2.40	<i>Foreign Affairs</i>
17	6.43	8.51	2.08	<i>Publius</i>
18	7.10	9.08	1.98	<i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i>
19	6.70	8.61	1.91	<i>Public Interest</i>
20	5.61	7.51	1.90	<i>Presidential Studies Quarterly</i>
21	7.71	9.49	1.78	<i>Comparative Political Studies</i>
22	6.54	8.22	1.68	<i>Social Forces</i>
23	7.56	9.22	1.67	<i>International Studies Quarterly</i>
24	5.91	7.56	1.65	<i>Political Behaviour</i>
25	5.86	7.50	1.64	<i>Administration & Society</i>
26	8.37	9.97	1.60	<i>Political Science Quarterly</i>
27	8.77	10.24	1.48	<i>Daedalus</i>
28	6.13	7.53	1.40	<i>Policy Studies Journal</i>
29	9.47	10.87	1.40	<i>Comparative Politics</i>
30	4.03	5.40	1.37	<i>National Civic Review</i>
31	6.72	7.98	1.26	<i>Public Choice</i>
32	8.51	9.76	1.25	<i>Annals of the American Academy of Political Science</i>
33	5.38	6.39	1.00	<i>International Social Science Review</i>
34	6.33	7.33	1.00	<i>Dissent</i>
35	6.51	7.48	.97	<i>Journal of Peace Research</i>
36	7.47	8.42	.94	<i>Journal of Political Economy</i>
37	5.40	6.20	.80	<i>Far Eastern Survey</i>
38	7.37	8.14	.77	<i>Law & Society Review</i>
39	6.38	6.94	.56	<i>American Review of Public Administration</i>
40	7.66	8.20	.54	<i>Canadian Journal of Political Science</i>
41	7.50	7.96	.46	<i>Review of Politics</i>
42	7.39	7.85	.45	<i>Policy Sciences</i>
43	7.44	7.87	.43	<i>Politics & Society</i>
44	6.17	6.60	.43	<i>Behavioural Science</i>
45	6.96	7.33	.37	<i>Public Policy & Administration</i>
46	7.55	7.92	.37	<i>Urban Affairs Quarterly</i>
47	6.79	7.16	.36	<i>Journal of Developing Areas</i>
48	8.35	8.66	.31	<i>American Journal of International Law</i>
49	9.57	9.78	.21	<i>International Organisation</i>
50	6.33	6.53	.21	<i>Journal of Interamerican Studies & World Affairs</i>
51	7.29	7.31	.02	<i>Orbis</i>

TABLE A-3. *continued*

	Great Britain	United States	Difference	
52	6.35	6.33	-.02	<i>International Interactions</i>
53	6.91	6.86	-.05	<i>Public Administration Quarterly</i>
54	7.04	6.94	-.11	<i>Judicature</i>
55	6.95	6.83	-.12	<i>Journal of International Affairs</i>
56	7.07	6.68	-.39	<i>Asian Survey</i>
57	5.30	4.84	-.46	<i>Journal of Black Studies</i>
58	8.10	7.52	-.58	<i>Slavik Review</i>
59	5.03	4.39	-.64	<i>Experimental Study of Politics</i>
60	8.22	7.58	-.64	<i>China Quarterly</i>
61	6.44	5.70	-.74	<i>Political Science</i>
62	9.26	8.45	-.82	<i>Political Theory</i>
63	8.17	7.24	-.93	<i>Journal of Latin American Studies</i>
64	8.83	7.87	-.96	<i>Soviet Studies</i>
65	8.64	7.68	-.96	<i>European Journal of Political Research</i>
66	5.59	4.42	-1.16	<i>Simulation & Games</i>
67	12.35	10.75	-1.60	<i>British Journal of Political Science</i>
68	7.85	6.23	-1.62	<i>Middle Eastern Studies</i>
69	9.76	7.81	-1.95	<i>International Affairs</i>
70	6.94	4.98	-1.97	<i>Women & Politics</i>
71	8.55	6.50	-2.04	<i>Journal of Asian Studies</i>
72	9.08	6.69	-2.40	<i>Political Quarterly</i>
73	10.77	7.71	-3.05	<i>Government & Opposition</i>
74	12.87	7.73	-5.14	<i>Political Studies</i>
Mean	7.55	8.37	.82	All journals
Mean	9.85	7.90	-1.95	U.K.-based journals
Mean	7.23	8.44	1.21	U.S.-based journals

Note

*The authors would like to thank all who took time to respond to this survey, and in particular the Political Studies Association for facilitating this research, and Micheal Giles for providing the original data for the American survey.

References

- Crewe, Ivor, and Pippa Norris. 1991. *Survey of the Reputation of Journals and Periodicals: Pluralist and Consensus Models*. Paper for the PSA Annual Conference, April.
- Christenson, James A., and Lee Sigelman.

1985. "Accrediting Knowledge: Journal Stature and Citation Impact in Social Science." *Social Science Quarterly* 66: 964-75.
- Garand, James C. 1990. "An Alternative Interpretation of Recent Political Science Journal Evaluations." *PS: Political Science & Politics* XXIII: 448-51.
- Giles, Micheal, and Gerald Wright. 1975. "Political Scientists' Evaluations of Sixty-three Journals." *PS: Political Science & Politics* VIII: 254-57.
- _____, Francie Mizell, and David Patterson. 1989. "Political Scientists' Journal Evaluation Revisited." *PS: Political Science & Politics* XX: 613-17.
- Lester, James P. 1990. "Evaluating the Evaluators: Accrediting Knowledge and the Ranking of Political Science Journals." *PS: Political Science & Politics* XXIII, September: 445-47.
- McKay, David. 1988. "Why Is There a European Political Science?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* XXI, Fall: 1051-56.
- Robey, John. 1982. "Reputation vs. Citation: Who Are the Top Scholars in Political Science?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* XV: 199-200.

Political Scientists and Public Policy Research*

James L. Sundquist, *Senior Fellow Emeritus, Brookings Institution*

I am deeply honored to be chosen for the Pi Sigma Alpha award of this distinguished organization, as well as by Tom Mann's kind words. I'm here by a lucky circumstance that the rules for this award were changed; it was designed, I understand, to honor political scientists who entered public service and rose to become Comptroller General or Ambassador to the United Nations or otherwise distinguish themselves, but this year it was opened to people who made the transition the other way—from public service to political science—so I became eligible.

So I'm here by virtue of a lucky accident. In fact, I'm here because of a whole series of lucky accidents that enabled me to even become a political scientist at all.

The first accident was that I fought part of World War II in the Budget Bureau, of all places, and met there a wonderful gentleman named George Graham, who twenty years later was Director of the Governmental Studies program at Brookings. I went to see him (I was working on Capitol Hill at the time), to see if there was any chance I might go to work for him. Well, he must

have given it some thought, for the next time I saw him was three years later and he suddenly asked me—quite out of the blue—"How would you like to come to Brookings and write a book on Congress?" I mulled that over for all of two or three seconds before saying, "I'd love to. When can I start?" He said, "Of course, this has to be approved by the president of Brookings, Bob Calkins. I'll talk to him and call you." Pretty soon he called and told me, "Calkins says OK. Can you have lunch with me tomorrow and we'll talk about it further?"