POLITICAL STUDIES REVIEW: 2004 VOL 2, 293–313

A Global Ranking of Political Science Departments

Simon Hix

London School of Economics

Rankings of academic institutions are key information tools for universities, funding agencies, students and faculty. The main method for ranking departments in political science, through peer evaluations, is subjective, biased towards established institutions, and costly in terms of time and money. The alternative method, based on supposedly 'objective' measures of outputs in scientific journals, has thus far only been applied narrowly in political science, using publications in a small number of US-based journals. An alternative method is proposed in this paper – that of ranking departments based on the quantity and impact of their publications in the 63 main political science journals in a given five-year period. The result is a series of global and easily updatable rankings that compare well with results produced by applying a similar method in economics.

Rankings of academic institutions are key information tools for universities, public and private funding agencies, students and faculty. For example, to investigate whether and why European universities lag behind their competitors in the US, the European Economics Association commissioned research into the ranking of economics departments on a global scale (see, especially, Coupé, 2003).

A variety of different ranking methods have been used in the natural sciences and have started to emerge in the social sciences, especially in economics (see, for example, Scott and Mitias, 1996; Dusansky and Vernon, 1998). All methods have disadvantages and trade-offs. Nevertheless, the best methods tend to have three elements: (1) they rank institutions on a global scale rather than in a single country; (2) they use 'objective' measures of research outputs, such as publications in journals, rather than subjective peer evaluations; and (3) they are cheap to update, for example by allowing for mechanized annual updates.

However, no such global, objective or easily updated method exists in political science. This research aims to fill this gap by proposing and implementing a new method for ranking departments in this field. To this end, in the next section I review the existing methods in our discipline. In the third section I then propose and justify an alternative method, based on research outputs in the main political science journals in a particular five-year period. And in the fourth section I present the results of an analysis of the content of 63 journals between 1993 and 2002.

 Published by Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK and 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA

Existing Rankings of Political Science Departments

As in other disciplines, two main methods have been used to rank political science departments: peer assessments, and content analysis of scientific journals. However, both methods, as applied thus far, have their limitations.

Peer Assessments

The most widely used method for ranking political science departments is peer assessments – where senior academics are asked to evaluate the quality of other departments. For example, this method is used by the US National Research Council and the *U.S. News and World Report* to rank doctoral programs in the US (see *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 1996a, b), and in the Research Assessment Exercise in the UK for the allocation of central government research funding.

The problems with this method are well known. First, peer assessments are subjective, by definition. No ranking method is perfectly 'objective'. For example, the content of scientific journals is determined by the subjective judegments of journal editors and article reviewers. However, journal editors and article reviewers are experts on the subjects of the papers they publish or review. Also, peer evaluation in the journal publishing process is repeated thousands of times, which reduces bias. In contrast, rankings based on periodic peer assessments rely on a small sample of academics, who cannot possibly be experts in all areas of research produced by the institutions they rank. As a result, rankings based on peer assessments are less 'objective' than rankings based on the content analysis of journals (if a sufficiently large sample of journals is used).

The resulting biases of this subjectivity have been well documented. Because the sample of academics has only limited information about the output of all institutions, they are forced to base their judgements on other factors. This results in a bias towards large established departments and against new and up-and-coming departments (Katz and Eagles, 1996). The overall reputation of the university has an effect on the respondents' expected performance of a political science department – known as the 'halo effect' (Lowry and Silver, 1996; Jackman and Siverson, 1996).

Second, the peer assessment method is highly costly and time-consuming. This is because of the need either to survey a large number of senior faculty (as in the cases of the US National Research Council and the *U.S. News and World Report*) or to prepare and read the submissions of all the universities (as in the case of the Research Assessment Exercise). Hence, rankings based on peer assessments are invariably updated only every five years (in the case of the Research Assessment Exercise and the *U.S. News and World Report*) or even longer (in the case of the US National Research Council).

Third, all existing peer assessment rankings are nationally specific. If similar methods were used in different countries, a global ranking based on peer assessments could be produced. However, different methods tend to be used

in different countries. For example, in the *U.S. News and World Report*, departments are scored out of five in a number of criteria, and then averaged (with the top departments scoring between 4.7 and 4.9). In the Research Assessment Exercise, departments are scored in bands from 5* to 2 (with the top departments scoring 5*). As a result, relative performance on a global scale is difficult to establish.

Content Analysis of Scientific Journals

In a conscious effort to improve on these peer assessment results, political scientists have begun to develop more objective methods of ranking political science departments. Following the practice in other disciplines, the most popular method is the analysis of the content of the leading political science journals (see, for example, Welch and Hibbing, 1983). The assumption behind this method is that, in contemporary political science, the main output for research results is publication in a professional journal.

Publication of books is more common in political science than in economics. Hence, ideally, a ranking based on book publications as well as journal articles would produce the best results (see Rice *et al.*, 2002). However, analysing the content of books and the number of citations to particular book series is costly, since there is not a single database of book publications and book citations like the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) for journal publications. One solution could be to use peer assessments to rank book publishers (see, for example, Goodson *et al.*, 1999). But this would go against the aim of creating a ranking using only non-subjective assessments.

Also, a ranking based on book publications may have little added value, because there is probably a high correlation between the outputs of departments in books and journals. At the individual level, some political scientists prefer to write books while others prefer to write articles. However, top departments probably produce a lot of books as well as a lot of articles, whereas less-good departments probably produce less books and articles. Hence, the rankings resulting from these two measures should be similar, at least for the larger departments.

Consequently, most researchers have analysed journal publications rather than book publications. But there are problems with the way this method has been applied thus far. First, existing studies have counted only a small number of journals. Miller *et al.* (1996) only looked at the content of the *American Political Science Review* (*APSR*); Teske (1996) looked at *APSR*, the *Journal of Politics* (*JOP*), and the *American Journal of Political Science* (*AJPS*) (see Garand and Graddy, 1999); McCormick and Rice (2001) counted articles in *APSR*, *AJPS*, *JOP*, the *Western Political Quarterly* (*WPQ*) and *Polity*; and Ballard and Mitchell (1998) looked at *APSR*, *JOP*, *AJPS*, *World Politics*, *Comparative Politics*, the *British Journal of Political Science* (*BJPolS*), *WPQ*, *Polity* and *Political Science Quarterly*. But even nine journals is a rather limited sample of the main journals in political science. The SSCI contains 143 journals in the fields of political science, international relations and public administration. With modern

computer technology, there is no reason why all, or at least a larger and more representative sample, of these journals cannot be counted.

Second, and partly due to the limited sample of journals coded, the existing rankings based on the content of journals have tended to be biased towards institutions in the US. For example, although *APSR* is widely respected as the top political science journal, it is nonetheless the 'in-house' journal of the American Political Science Association. Not surprisingly, only 7 per cent of articles in *APSR* between 1996 and 1999 were by scholars based outside the US (Schmitter, 2002). This small number may be a fair reflection of the quality or quantity of research outside the US. However, studying the content of one journal inevitably risks a high degree of error.

Even in Ballard and Mitchell's (1998) study of nine journals, only one journal based outside the US was included (*BJPolS*). Not surprisingly, not a single non-American department appeared in their top 50. It might be the case that no department outside the US is good enough to be in the top 50. But one would be more inclined to accept this conclusion if this result was based on the content of a larger sample of journals and more journals based outside the US.

An Alternative Method

Building on existing bibliometric research, the method proposed here *ranks academic institutions on the basis of the quantity and impact of articles published in the main journals in political science in a given period*. To establish this ranking, decisions were made about the following: (1) what time period to use; (2) what to count as the 'main' political science journals; (3) what to count as a publication in a journal; (4) how to measure the impact ('quality') of a journal; (5) how to construct a ranking from this information; and (6) how to create a 'quasi-error' term.

Time Period

Creating annual rankings would have the advantage of being able to track short-term changes in the performance of departments. However, looking at the content of only one year of each journal would be a small sample size, and so would produce a high degree of measurement error. Conversely, a new ranking every ten years would be more accurate, but would not measure more subtle changes. As a result, counting articles on a rolling five-year basis would probably be the most effective method. This allows for a larger sample in each journal and allows a new ranking to be produced every year – in other words, 1993–1997, 1994–1998, and so on. This is also a similar time period to other rankings, such as the *U.S. News and World Report* and the Research Assessment Exercise.

The Main Political Science Journals

Four steps were taken to define the 'main' political science journals. Step one involved the full list of journals in the field in the SSCI, which contained 143

journals in political science, international relations and public administration in 2002.

Step two involved adding some missing journals to this list. The SSCI does not include all major political science journals. The Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) follows a careful procedure for selecting which journals to include in the SSCI.[1] However, several prominent international political science journals are not listed in the SSCI. For example, whereas the main journals of the British, German and Scandinavian political science associations are in the SSCI, the main journals of the French, Italian and Dutch associations are not. Also, several major sub-field journals were not included before 2002, such as the *Journal of Public Policy*, *European Union Politics, Nations and Nationalism*, *History of Political Thought*, the *Journal of Legislative Studies*, and *Democratization*. Adding these journals to the SSCI list makes a total of 152 journals.[2]

Step three involved setting and applying two simple criteria for divining the 'main' political science journals from this list of 152. First, many journals are in fact journals in other fields of social science, such as law, economics, geography, sociology, history, psychology, social policy, communications, philosophy, or management. For the sake of simplicity, a political science journal can be defined as a journal that is (a) edited by a political scientist and (b) has a majority of political scientists on its editorial board (in departments or institutes of political science, politics, government, international relations, public administration or public policy).

Second, many journals in the SSCI list have a marginal impact on the discipline of political science. For example, almost one third of the journals had less than 100 citations to articles published in any issue of these journals by the articles published in the over 8,000 other journals in the SSCI in 2002. Removing these non-political-science journals and journals that have only a marginal impact left 60 journals.

Step four, however, involved adding back three journals that have a low impact but are the national political science association journals of three countries: the *Australian Journal of Political Science*, *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* (published by the German political science association) and *Scandinavian Political Studies*. It is reasonable to include these journals despite their low impact, since the ISI had already decided that these are important journals. In other words, national political science association journals are included in the analysis either if they are in the SSCI or if they are not in the SSCI list but receive more than 100 citations per year.

This left 63 journals for the analysis, which are listed in Table 1. For the 54 journals in the SSCI, data on the content of these journals between 1993 and 2002 was purchased from the ISI. For the nine journals not in the SSCI and for the issues of the SSCI journals that are not in the database (for example, where a journal existed for a number of years prior to being included in the SSCI), the content was coded by hand. In total, the content of 495 annual volumes was collected electronically and the content of 117 volumes was collected by hand.

Table 1: Journals included in the Analysis

Journal	Volumes coded by hand	Volumes in SSCI	Impact Score
American Political Science Review		1993–2002	8.82
American Journal of Political Science		1993–2002	6.91
International Organization		1993–2002	5.21
Foreign Affairs		1993–2002	4.72
Journal of Politics		1993–2002	4.13
International Security		1993–2002	3.93
Journal of Conflict Resolution		1993–2002	3.72
World Politics		1993–2002	3.66
Journal of European Public Policy	1994–1996	1997–2002	3.34
International Studies Quarterly		1993–2002	3.28
Public Choice		1993–2002	3.22
Journal of Common Market Studies		1993–2002	2.94
British Journal of Political Science		1993–2002	2.84
Journal of Peace Research		1993–2002	2.82
Journal of Law Economics and Organization		1993–2002	2.80
Comparative Political Studies		1993–2002	2.79
Journal of Democracy	1993–1994	1995–2002	2.75
Europe-Asia Studies		1993–2002	2.64
European Union Politics	2000–2002		2.59
Political Research Quarterly		1993–2002	2.58
West European Politics	1993–1999	2000–2002	2.58
Political Studies		1993–2002	2.56
PS: Political Science and Politics		1993–2002	2.53
European Journal of Political Research		1993–2002	2.46
Public Administration		1993–2002	2.44
Party Politics		1995–2002	2.38
European Journal of International Relations	1995–1996	1997–2002	2.30
Comparative Politics		1993–2002	2.27
Electoral Studies		1993–2002	2.26
Post-Soviet Affairs		1993–2002	2.18
Review of International Studies	1993–1994	1995–2002	2.18
Security Studies	1993–1995	1996–2002	2.17
Politics and Society		1993–2002	2.14
Governance	1993–1994	1995–2002	2.09
Legislative Studies Quarterly		1993–2002	2.08
Political Communication	1993	1994–2002	2.08
Political Behavior	1993–1996	1997–2002	2.06
International Interactions		1993–2002	2.00
Journal of Theoretical Politics		1993–2002	2.00
American Politics Quarterly	2001–2002	1993–2000	1.99
Millennium-Journal of International Studies		1993–2002	1.96
Publius-The Journal of Federalism		1993–2002	1.93
Political Theory		1993–2002	1.91
Journal of Public Policy	1993–2002		1.85
International Affairs		1993–2002	1.82
Philosophy and Public Affairs		1993–2001	1.81
Political Science Quarterly		1993–2002	1.75
International Political Science Review		1993–2002	1.74
Democratization	1994–2002		1.70
Nations and Nationalism	1995–2002		1.70
Australian Journal of Political Science		1993–2002	1.69
Journal of Legislative Studies	1995–2003		1.69
Canadian Journal of Political Science		1993–2002	1.64
Political Quarterly		1993–2002	1.64
East European Politics and Societies		1993–2002	1.63
Scandinavian Political Studies	1993	1994–2002	1.60
Polity		1993–2002	1.53
Politische Vierteljahresschrift		1993–2002	1.52
Revue française de science politique	1993–2002		1.49
Cooperation and Conflict	1993–2002		1.45
History of Political Thought	1993–2002		1.40
Acta Politica	1993–2002		1.38
Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica	1993–2002		1.33

Note: All issues of journals between 1993 and 2002 were coded. So, if a year is missing in the table, either a journal had not been published yet, or a journal was not published in that particular year.

Counting Articles

Several different types of articles are published in these journals. All main articles and research notes were included, and all editorial comments, book reviews and short notes were excluded. I decided to treat each article or research note in the same journal as equivalent regardless of its length, because I see no justification for assuming that a shorter article is less important than a longer article in the same journal. There were just over 18,000 such publications in the 63 journals between 1993 and 2002.

Each article was then counted as follows: an article by a single author with a single institutional affiliation, or by two or more authors from a single institution, scored 1.0 for the institution; an article by two authors from two different institutions, or by a single author with two institutional affiliations, counted as 0.5 for each institution; an article by three authors or three institutions counted as 0.333 for each institution; and so on. This method is not ideal, as it undervalues collaborative research. However, the alternative is worse: in other words, counting multi-authored articles as having more value than single authored articles. Observations where an institutional affiliation could not be derived from the editorial information were excluded. This left a total of approximately 24,000 single observations for analysis.

Measuring Impact

Some articles are more significant than others. I assume that an article is as significant as the overall impact of the journal in which it is published. Two different articles in the same journal may have vastly different impacts on the field. Conversely, some articles may be cited because of the fame of the author. Hence, if one assumes that a journal applies a common standard for acceptance of a paper for publication, it is reasonable to assume that all articles in a particular journal are of approximately equal quality.

A common measure of the relative 'impact' of a journal is the average number of citations to a journal in a given period. For example, the ISI calculates an 'impact factor', which is the total number of citations by all other articles in the ISI database to all articles in a journal in the previous two years, divided by the number of articles in the journal in the previous two years.

Using a similar method, we could calculate the average annual citations to all articles in a journal in the ten-year period. However, because it takes time for an article to be noticed, recently published articles are less cited than articles published several years ago. Hence, simply counting the average annual citations would create a bias against recently established journals that have not had long enough to build up their stock of citations.

However, if we assume that the evolution in the number of citations follows the same functional form, a fixed-effect regression model of annual citations can be estimated. This would produce a constant for each journal that is a measure of its relative importance. But the common trend in citations for a particular journal is non-linear: there tends to be a plateau in the number of

citations for several years followed by a decline in the number of citations in the most recent years. Hence, the appropriate common functional form is a negative quadratic equation:

$$ANNUAL\_CITES_{jy} = \beta_1 JOURNAL_y - \beta_2 YEAR_{jy} - \beta_3 YEAR^2_{jy} + \varepsilon_{jy}$$

where *j* (journal) = 1, ... , 63; *y* (year) = 1, ... , 10; and *JOURNAL* is a vector of 63 binomial variables, one for each journal.

Estimating this model using ordinary least-squares regression produces the following results (*t*-statistics in parentheses): $\beta_2 = 17.944$ (2.65), $\beta_3 = 0.709$ (0.590), and 63 constants, ranging from a high of 882.49 citations per year for *APSR* to a low of 133.49 for the *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica* (*RISP*).[3] An 'impact score' for each journal was than produced from the constants by dividing each journal's constant by 100 (see Table 1). In other words, a paper in *APSR* is about as important as seven papers in *RISP*.

The journal 'impact scores' calculated by this method are highly correlated (0.757) with the SSCI 'impact scores' in 2002 for the 54 journals in both the SSCI and my list.[4] The high correlation between my index and the SSCI impact index is not surprising, as both methods are based on the number of citations to articles in journals in a given period. However, there are two advantages of my impact scores over the SSCI scores. First, my method allows for impact scores to be calculated for journals that are not included in the SSCI. Second, by assuming a common trend in the number of citations over time, my method corrects for an inherent bias against new journals in the SSCI method.

Finally, it should be noted that because journals that were not mainstream political science journals were removed from the SSCI list, the ranking does not include outputs published elsewhere in the social sciences. This may produce a bias against departments that try to contribute to general social science rather than the narrow discipline of political science. Nevertheless, the method used to calculate an impact score for each journal reintroduces a measure of the breadth of a contribution, as the impact score for a journal is calculated from all citations to articles in the journal from any journal in the SSCI.

Construction of the Ranking

Some people may be interested in the total output of a department, whereas others may be interested in the average quality of these outputs or the average productivity of a department. For example, the central administration of a university may wish to know the relative per capita productivity of a department, whereas a prospective graduate student may seek a large department with a lot of research-active staff.

So, five separate rankings were created from the data:

- *Rank 1 (Quantity)* – the total number of articles in the journals by scholars from a particular institution in a five-year period.

- *Rank 2 (Impact)* – the total number of articles in the journals by scholars from a particular institution in a five-year period multiplied by the 'impact score' of the journal in which the article was published.
- *Rank 3 (Quantity/Faculty Size)* – the total number of articles in the journals by scholars from a particular institution in a five-year period (as used to produce Rank 1) divided by the faculty size of the political science department of that institution.
- *Rank 4 (Impact/Faculty Size)* – the total number of articles in the journals by scholars from a particular institution in a five-year period multiplied by the 'impact score' of the journal in which the article was published (as used to produce Rank 2) divided by the faculty size of the political science department of that institution.
- *Overall Rank* – the average position of the institution in the other four ranks.

The overall ranking is consequently an unweighted sum of the other four rankings (compare with Coupé, 2003). Invariably, people will have different opinions about the relative importance of Ranks 1, 2, 3 and 4. Hence, the positions of the institutions in each of the four individual ranks are also reported so that an interested person can calculate a different overall rank using a different set of weighting of the other ranks.

The information on the size of a department was gathered from two sources. First, for the British universities, the data is the number of full-time staff submitted in the Politics and International Relations section of the 2001 Research Assessment Exercise. Second, for all other universities (including those British universities who did not make a submission for this section in 2001), we counted the number of full-time staff with a rank of full, associate or assistant professor (or equivalent) listed on a department's website in November to December 2003.[5] In other words, this includes only the number of staff in a political science department plus related institutes, or the number of political scientists in a department or faculty of social science. For example, according to the Harvard University website, the number of permanent faculty in the Department of Government plus the number of permanent faculty in the Kennedy School of Government who describe themselves as 'political scientists' is 87.

Several things are worth noting here. First, this method of counting the size of a department assumes that the number of political scientists in a particular institution remains constant, which clearly is not the case. Second, this method only counts academics in political science departments, whereas the method for counting research output counts anyone publishing in one of the journals from a particular institution, regardless of where they are based in an institution. For example, if someone from a business school, an economics department or a law department publishes in one of the journals, this person is counted as a political scientist, but is not included as a member of the political science faculty in their institution. However, although there may be people outside a political science department who do political science research, the

size of the political science department is probably a reasonable proxy for the size of the overall political science community in an institution.

A Quasi-Error

Finally, a 'quasi-error' in the overall rank of each institution was calculated. There are two sources of measurement error in this analysis. First, in counting the number of articles published by an institution, an article may have been missed. For example, in the computer data, an article may have been mislabelled as a minor note rather than a proper article, the institutional affiliation of an author may have been entered incorrectly (although each entry in the data was carefully checked), or an author who was listed as having no institutional affiliation may have been based in a particular academic institution. Second, it is extremely difficult to accurately measure the faculty size of a department. For example, different academic systems have different ways of describing their faculty (for example, many German universities only list their full professors). Also, information on the departments' websites is invariably out of date or inaccurate.

Using these two sources of error, a 'quasi-error' was worked out by calculating where an institution would have been placed in the overall ranking if the institution had produced one more/less article in a journal with a mean impact score (2.52) *and* if the department was 5 per cent smaller/larger than it had been measured.

For example, in 1998–2002, the London School of Economics, with a faculty size of 76, produced 143.31 articles with an impact of 338.87. This placed it 2nd in Rank 1 (Quantity), 4th in Rank 2 (Impact), 31st in Rank 3 (Quantity/Faculty Size), 57th in Rank 4 (Impact/Faculty Size), and 15th overall. If it had produced one more article in a mean-impact score journal and had 5 per cent less staff, its position would not have changed in Ranks 1 and 2, but would have risen to 24th in Rank 3, 51st in Rank 4, and 12th overall. Conversely, if it had one less article and 5 per cent more staff, it would have been 18th overall. So, the quasi-error at 15th was 12–18 (or plus/minus three places).

Results

Table 2 lists the 'Global Top 200' political science institutions on the basis of their output in the main political science journals in the five years between 1998 and 2002.[6] Anyone with a cursory knowledge of the discipline would recognize most of the names on the list.

One way of assessing the validity of the method is to compare the results to those using a similar method in economics (Coupé, 2003). In the political science rankings for 1998–2002, there was one department outside the US in the top 10, five in the top 20, fourteen in the top 50, thirty-six in the top 100, and 103 in the top 200. In the comparable ranking in economics, there were no departments outside the US in the top 10, one in the top 20, ten in the top 50, thirty-four in the top 100, and eighty-eight in the top 200.

One obvious criticism is that these rankings are biased towards English-speaking countries, since nine of the top 10, nineteen of the top 20, forty-eight of the top 50, ninety-one of the top 100, and 163 of the top 200 are from the US, the UK, Australia, Canada or Ireland. However, the equivalent rankings in economics are equally as dominated by Anglo-Saxon institutions: with all of the top 10, all of the top 20, forty-seven of the top 50, eighty-seven of the top 90, and 155 of the top 200 coming from these same five English-speaking countries. In other words, the dominance of institutions from these countries may simply be a reflection of the dominant position of English as the global language in the social sciences.

So, if one assumes that the global spread of good and bad departments is broadly similar in the disciplines of political science and economics, then the method outlined and applied here is as good as the most similar ranking in economics.

Table 3 shows the rank-order correlations between the five rankings, using the results for the top 200 in the 1998–2002 period. As would be expected given the calculation method, there are high correlations between Ranks 1 and 3 and between Ranks 2 and 4. However, the correlations suggest that each ranking method measures something different.

Finally, Table 4 shows the 'rolling' rankings for the six five-year periods between 1993 and 2002. One of the striking things here is the stability of the top three, with Stanford, Harvard and Columbia swapping places at the top of the list, and none of these institutions dropping below third. Only two other institutions remained in the top 10 throughout this period (Indiana and the University of California, San Diego), and thirty-six institutions remained in the top 50 throughout the period. The biggest climbers, who climbed more than thirty places between 1993–1997 and 1998–2002, were the State University of New York, Binghamton (from 117th to 19th), Aberystwyth (136th to 39th), Penn State (101st to 33rd), Geneva (104th to 43rd), Trinity College Dublin (96th to 40th), University College London (83rd to 46th), Illinois-Urbana Champaign (80th to 44th) and Georgetown (50th to 16th). Nevertheless, almost fifty per cent (twenty-four) of the institutions in the top 50 in 1998–2002 rose or fell less than ten places from their positions in 1993–1997.

Conclusion

A reasonably objective, easily updated and global ranking of departments in political science can be produced by borrowing a method used in other disciplines – that of measuring the research output of institutions in the main journals in the field in a given period, and controlling for the number of full-time staff in a department. This method produces a series of rankings that seem intuitively correct and compare well with the equivalent rankings in economics, in terms of the regional and national balance of institutions in the top 10, 20, 50, 100 and 200.

One possible problem with these rankings is the apparent English-language bias in the results, which undermines the aspiration to be truly 'global'.

Table 2: The Global Top 200 Political Science Departments, 1998–2002

Overall Rank	University	Country	Faculty Size	Quantity (1) No. of Articles	Rank	Impact (2) Articles* Impact	Rank	Quantity/Size (3) Articles/ Fac. Size	Rank	Impact/Size (4) Impact/ Fac. Size	Rank	Average of Ranks 1 to 4	Quasi-Error Best	Quasi-Error Worst
1	Columbia	USA	45	120.69	4	420.10	2	2.682	7	9.336	2	3.75	1	1
2	Harvard	USA	87	204.37	1	700.93	1	2.349	15	8.057	6	5.75	2	3
3	Stanford	USA	38	90.94	6	342.88	3	2.393	14	9.023	4	6.75	2	3
4	Ohio State	USA	43	84.95	10	327.87	5	1.976	24	7.625	9	12.00	4	5
5	EUI	Italy	17	62.08	17	157.97	30	3.652	2	9.292	3	13.00	5	5
6	UC, San Diego	USA	37	74.22	12	254.53	11	2.006	22	6.879	16	15.25	6	9
7	UC, Irvine	USA	32	71.34	13	214.71	17	2.229	18	6.710	19	16.75	6	8
8	Indiana	USA	33	67.49	16	224.68	16	2.045	21	6.808	17	17.50	7	12
9	Princeton	USA	49	87.50	7	319.40	7	1.786	39	6.518	22	18.75	6	12
10	Yale	USA	52	91.90	5	323.59	6	1.767	41	6.223	25	19.25	7	14
11	UC, Berkeley	USA	45	86.62	8	268.34	10	1.925	29	5.963	31	19.50	6	12
12	Michigan State	USA	29	57.00	24	204.69	19	1.966	25	7.058	13	20.25	8	15
13	Chicago	USA	39	70.98	14	238.39	13	1.820	35	6.113	28	22.50	9	18
14	UC, Los Angeles	USA	51	85.56	9	317.13	8	1.678	48	6.218	26	22.75	10	18
15	LSE	UK	76	143.31	2	338.87	4	1.886	31	4.459	57	23.50	12	18
16=	Georgetown	USA	43	77.91	11	233.42	14	1.812	36	5.428	40	25.25	13	18
16=	Essex	UK	23	55.83	25	140.44	34	2.427	13	6.106	29	25.25	13	18
18	MIT	USA	30	53.91	28	201.42	20	1.797	38	6.714	18	26.00	13	21
19=	ANU	Australia	25	61.53	18	127.51	43	2.461	10	5.100	45	29.00	19	21
19=	SUNY, Bimghamton	USA	16	42.00	50	120.86	48	2.625	8	7.554	10	29.00	19	21
19=	Oxford	UK	70	122.08	3	302.99	9	1.744	44	4.328	60	29.00	16	21
22	Birmingham	UK	20	49.08	33	115.82	52	2.454	11	5.791	35	32.75	19	27
23	Cambridge	UK	18	49.25	32	106.41	62	2.736	5	5.912	33	33.00	22	27
24	Florida State	USA	25	43.53	45	167.69	26	1.741	45	6.708	20	34.00	19	29
25=	Sheffield	UK	22	50.41	31	113.01	53	2.291	16	5.137	43	35.75	24	29
25=	Washington	USA	23	39.91	54	161.10	29	1.735	46	7.004	14	35.75	22	30
27	Michigan	USA	48	67.69	15	250.72	12	1.410	77	5.223	41	36.25	22	32
28=	Johns Hopkins	USA	21	43.03	47	122.48	47	2.049	20	5.832	34	37.00	24	32
28=	Texas A&M	USA	41	58.75	20	225.92	15	1.433	74	5.510	39	37.00	22	33
30	Emory	USA	32	48.83	35	181.00	23	1.526	61	5.656	37	39.00	24	36
31	Colorado	USA	22	42.41	49	123.39	45	1.928	28	5.609	38	40.00	25	34
32	American	USA	20	36.95	61	126.96	44	1.848	34	6.348	23	40.50	25	38
33	Pennsylvania	USA	25	40.06	53	150.62	32	1.602	53	6.025	30	42.00	30	39
34	Bristol	UK	14	38.31	59	83.04	78	2.736	5	5.931	32	43.50	31	38
35	UNC Chapel Hill	USA	37	53.45	29	177.51	24	1.445	72	4.798	50	43.75	30	41

36	George Washington	USA	44	59.18	19	205.19	18	1.345	87	4.663	52	44.00	31	43
37=	Cardiff	UK	10	30.33	75	74.52	90	3.033	4	7.452	11	45.00	33	39
37=	UW Madison	USA	39	57.94	22	167.32	27	1.486	69	4.290	62	45.00	31	42
39	Aberystwyth	UK	25	48.50	38	106.76	60	1.940	26	4.270	65	47.25	33	44
40=	TCD	Ireland	9	27.50	88	71.42	93	3.056	3	7.936	7	47.75	39	43
40=	Vanderbilt	USA	15	28.83	81	103.23	65	1.922	30	6.882	15	47.75	34	46
42	Cornell	USA	31	48.08	39	133.22	40	1.551	59	4.297	61	49.75	36	48
43	Geneva	Switzerland	12	30.17	76	74.58	89	2.514	9	6.215	27	50.25	39	48
44	Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	USA	40	52.28	30	182.68	22	1.307	97	4.567	55	51.00	39	48
45	Rice	USA	15	28.16	87	99.00	70	1.877	32	6.600	21	52.50	39	51
46	UCL	UK	5	25.67	96	51.75	117	5.134	1	10.350	1	53.75	46	50
47=	SUNY, Stony Brook	USA	15	24.33	102	109.52	55	1.622	51	7.301	12	55.00	44	51
47=	UC, Davis	USA	25	36.30	63	127.69	42	1.452	71	5.108	44	55.00	42	51
49=	Arizona	USA	22	35.25	67	108.51	57	1.602	53	4.932	48	56.25	45	52
49=	Virginia	USA	35	44.37	44	164.19	28	1.268	102	4.691	51	56.25	44	51
51	Duke	USA	44	55.73	26	170.44	25	1.267	103	3.874	75	57.25	45	51
52	Oslo	Norway	33	44.75	42	122.84	46	1.356	86	3.722	77	62.75	52	67
53	Claremont Graduate	USA	8	19.45	128	63.30	105	2.431	12	7.913	8	63.25	52	57
54	Pittsburgh	USA	29	41.33	51	112.75	54	1.425	76	3.888	73	63.50	52	62
55	Leiden	Netherlands	22	38.81	57	82.21	80	1.764	42	3.737	76	63.75	52	63
56	Iowa	USA	28	37.33	60	119.75	49	1.333	90	4.277	64	65.75	52	63
57	New Mexico	USA	16	23.67	104	100.74	68	1.479	70	6.296	24	66.50	52	68
58	New York	USA	38	47.58	40	135.96	38	1.252	107	3.578	88	68.25	52	68
59	Minnesota	USA	55	57.79	23	195.42	21	1.051	138	3.553	92	68.50	52	68
60	George Mason	USA	35	42.50	48	130.13	41	1.214	109	3.718	78	69.00	56	70
61	Hebrew, Jerusalem	Israel	29	43.33	46	100.61	69	1.494	67	3.469	96	69.50	52	70
62	Arizona State	USA	24	32.75	69	102.85	66	1.365	84	4.285	63	70.50	56	73
63	Hull	UK	21	35.75	65	75.76	87	1.702	47	3.608	86	71.25	55	73
64	Maryland	USA	45	48.97	34	156.67	31	1.088	130	3.482	95	72.50	55	73
65	Georgia	USA	19	29.00	80	79.90	83	1.526	61	4.205	67	72.75	56	74
66=	SUNY, Buffalo	USA	15	26.33	94	65.79	97	1.755	43	4.386	58	73.00	58	74
66=	Houston	USA	27	32.08	71	117.25	50	1.188	112	4.343	59	73.00	58	74
68	Northwestern	USA	31	32.56	70	144.52	33	1.050	139	4.662	53	73.75	58	73
69	Pennsylvania	USA	29	38.92	56	103.44	64	1.342	88	3.567	90	74.50	57	75
70	Cal Tech	USA	9	14.75	161	79.38	84	1.639	49	8.820	5	74.75	58	75
71=	Southern California	USA	18	25.33	99	82.17	81	1.407	78	4.565	56	78.50	62	80
71=	Warwick	UK	27	38.50	58	87.31	74	1.426	75	3.234	107	78.50	63	80
73	Tel Aviv	Israel	21	31.33	72	75.39	88	1.492	68	3.590	87	78.75	62	80
74	Mannheim	Germany	18	28.33	85	65.71	98	1.574	56	3.651	84	80.75	68	83
75	Strathclyde	UK	18	28.66	82	64.33	100	1.592	55	3.574	89	81.50	69	83

Table 2: The Global Top 200 Political Science Departments, 1998–2002: *Continued*

Overall Rank	University	Country	Faculty Size	Quantity (1) No. of Articles	Rank	Impact (2) Articles* Impact	Rank	Quantity/Size (3) Articles/ Fac. Size	Rank	Impact/Size (4) Impact/ Fac. Size	Rank	Average of Ranks 1 to 4	Quasi-Error Best	Worst
76	Missouri	USA	21	27.17	90	86.09	76	1.294	99	4.100	70	83.75	68	81
77	Washington	USA	45	46.98	41	137.04	36	1.044	140	3.045	119	84.00	71	83
78	Aarhus	Denmark	46	54.17	27	116.37	51	1.178	114	2.530	147	84.75	74	83
79=	North Texas	USA	29	30.95	74	107.74	58	1.067	133	3.715	79	86.00	74	86
79=	Sussex	UK	27	35.67	66	86.52	75	1.321	93	3.204	110	86.00	71	84
81	UW, Milwaukee	USA	20	25.33	99	82.22	79	1.267	103	4.111	69	87.50	71	85
82	Aberdeen	UK	17	26.42	93	58.72	110	1.554	58	3.454	97	89.50	74	88
83	Newcastle-Upon-Tyne	UK	14	22.83	108	51.42	119	1.631	50	3.673	82	89.75	76	92
84	UC Santa Barbara	USA	24	28.37	84	84.83	77	1.182	113	3.535	93	91.75	76	88
85	Glasgow	UK	14	21.25	114	51.62	118	1.518	63	3.687	81	94.00	81	100
86	Leicester	UK	13	21.00	119	47.52	127	1.615	52	3.655	83	95.25	81	102
87	Manchester	UK	31	36.08	64	87.43	73	1.164	118	2.820	131	96.50	84	95
88	Rochester	USA	29	28.65	83	101.34	67	0.988	150	3.494	94	98.50	82	96
89	Louisiana State	USA	23	25.50	97	77.40	85	1.109	122	3.365	99	100.75	85	103
90=	Birkbeck, London	UK	13	20.25	123	46.20	134	1.558	57	3.554	91	101.25	84	106
90=	Rutgers	USA	53	44.53	43	136.30	37	0.840	180	2.572	145	101.25	86	100
92	Syracuse	USA	40	39.03	55	106.62	61	0.976	152	2.666	139	101.75	86	102
93	Toronto	Canada	66	58.00	21	140.25	35	0.879	169	2.125	183	102.00	86	102
94	Kansas	USA	25	27.15	91	80.23	82	1.086	131	3.209	109	103.25	85	104
95	UC, Riverside	USA	11	14.62	163	56.06	114	1.329	92	5.096	46	103.75	85	105
96	Bradford	UK	17	23.17	106	52.81	116	1.363	85	3.106	116	105.75	87	107
97	Humboldt	Germany	17	22.25	111	56.11	113	1.309	96	3.301	104	106.00	86	106
98	Western Australia	Australia	8	15.50	152	31.88	174	1.938	27	3.985	72	106.25	87	109
99=	Edinburgh	UK	16	22.50	110	49.86	124	1.406	79	3.116	115	107.00	86	107
99=	Leeds	UK	28	31.00	73	74.40	91	1.107	124	2.657	140	107.00	89	107
101	Durham	UK	8	14.83	158	32.68	167	1.854	33	4.085	71	107.25	87	109
102	Alabama	USA	13	17.17	142	50.40	123	1.321	93	3.877	74	108.00	87	107
103	QMUL	UK	14	21.00	119	43.38	145	1.500	65	3.099	117	111.50	88	109
104	Dartmouth	USA	21	21.83	112	70.28	94	1.040	141	3.347	101	112.00	92	109
105	South Carolina	USA	36	30.17	76	103.61	63	0.838	182	2.878	129	112.50	96	107

106	Montreal	Canada	22	24.90	101	63.46	103	1.132	121	2.885	128	113.25	95	109
107	Tufts	USA	18	19.83	127	60.43	108	1.102	125	3.357	100	115.00	96	114
108	Max Planck	Germany	32	29.83	78	76.63	86	0.932	161	2.395	154	119.75	103	121
109	Texas, Austin	USA	59	41.33	51	133.38	39	0.701	222	2.261	168	120.00	103	117
110	Groningen	Netherlands	15	18.25	135	46.27	133	1.217	108	3.085	118	123.50	103	126
111	Southampton	UK	19	21.08	115	50.93	120	1.109	122	2.681	138	123.75	107	127
112=	Georgia State	USA	22	23.17	106	57.17	111	1.053	137	2.599	143	124.25	108	126
112=	Kentucky	USA	23	21.00	119	69.08	95	0.913	162	3.003	121	124.25	107	126
114	Liverpool	UK	16	18.75	130	47.31	129	1.172	115	2.957	125	124.75	107	129
115	British Columbia	Canada	29	27.33	89	66.94	96	0.942	159	2.308	162	126.50	108	131
116	Amsterdam	Netherlands	62	48.66	37	109.31	56	0.785	193	1.763	222	127.00	108	126
117	Manchester Metropolitan	UK	8	12.33	183	29.16	186	1.541	60	3.645	85	128.50	108	136
118	Notre Dame	USA	48	34.83	68	107.03	59	0.726	214	2.230	174	128.75	108	129
119	Denver	USA	6	10.83	199	25.18	212	1.805	37	4.197	68	129.00	107	133
120	SUMY, Albany	USA	25	23.83	103	61.18	106	0.953	157	2.447	152	129.50	110	133
121	Kent	UK	16	18.50	134	45.13	136	1.156	119	2.821	130	129.75	108	133
122	Exeter	UK	16	19.25	129	42.94	146	1.203	110	2.684	137	130.50	108	133
123	Helsinki	Finland	17	20.25	123	43.54	144	1.191	111	2.561	146	131.00	108	133
124=	Brown	USA	20	18.67	132	58.89	109	0.934	160	2.945	126	131.75	110	133
124=	West Virginia	USA	17	18.67	132	47.06	131	1.098	129	2.768	135	131.75	110	133
126	Nottingham	UK	21	21.08	115	50.78	121	1.004	145	2.418	153	133.50	110	134
127	Liverpool John Moores	UK	4	8.50	236	20.35	241	2.125	19	5.088	47	135.75	108	149
128=	CUNY	USA	50	36.33	62	95.90	71	0.727	212	1.918	201	136.50	117	134
128=	Lafayette	USA	9	13.00	177	29.04	188	1.444	73	3.227	108	136.50	108	143
130	Murdoch	Australia	7	12.50	182	22.85	223	1.786	39	3.264	105	137.25	110	143
131	East Anglia	UK	14	16.00	148	38.81	150	1.143	120	2.772	134	138.00	116	139
132	Melbourne	Australia	20	21.33	113	44.76	138	1.067	133	2.238	173	139.25	115	142
133	Konstanz	Germany	29	25.50	97	60.92	107	0.879	169	2.101	186	139.75	119	138
134	QUB	UK	22	20.81	122	49.31	126	0.946	158	2.241	172	144.50	122	143
135=	UCD	Ireland	13	13.50	173	38.50	152	1.038	142	2.962	123	147.50	126	147
135=	St Andrews	UK	11	14.50	165	28.97	189	1.318	95	2.634	141	147.50	122	151
137	Twente	Netherlands	12	15.17	155	29.81	184	1.264	106	2.484	149	148.50	124	156
138	Texas Technological	USA	21	18.75	130	47.24	130	0.893	167	2.250	169	149.00	131	151
139	Truman State	USA	8	11.00	197	25.07	213	1.375	81	3.134	113	151.00	126	158
140	Bremen	Germany	15	16.50	146	33.67	163	1.100	127	2.245	170	151.50	131	158

Table 2: The Global Top 200 Political Science Departments, 1998–2002: *Continued*

Overall Rank	University	Country	Faculty Size	Quantity (1) No. of Articles	Rank	Impact (2) Articles* Impact	Rank	Quantity/Size (3) Articles/ Fac. Size	Rank	Impact/Size (4) Impact/ Fac. Size	Rank	Average of Ranks 1 to 4	Quasi-Error Best	Worst
141	William and Mary	USA	13	12.67	180	38.76	151	0.975	154	2.982	122	151.75	130	152
142	Keele	UK	31	26.00	95	55.87	115	0.839	181	1.802	217	152.00	134	149
143	Simon Fraser	Canada	20	18.00	137	44.00	139	0.900	165	2.200	176	154.25	134	158
144	Boston	USA	33	23.33	105	64.04	101	0.707	221	1.941	199	156.50	135	158
145	NUST	Norway	18	15.83	150	41.57	147	0.879	169	2.309	161	156.75	134	159
146	Mississippi	USA	12	10.17	204	40.14	148	0.848	177	3.345	102	157.75	134	164
147	Nijmegen	Netherlands	16	15.91	149	34.62	161	0.994	149	2.164	177	159.00	134	161
148	Uppsala	Sweden	38	27.08	92	65.31	99	0.713	217	1.719	231	159.75	135	158
149	Nebraska	USA	15	12.25	184	43.58	143	0.817	187	2.905	127	160.25	135	160
150	Loyola	USA	14	14.20	166	31.76	175	1.014	143	2.269	166	162.50	135	168
151	Griffith	Australia	16	17.00	143	31.62	177	1.063	135	1.976	196	162.75	135	168
152	Iowa State	USA	27	16.83	144	63.75	102	0.623	252	2.361	157	163.75	142	168
153=	Florida	USA	47	29.83	78	73.26	92	0.635	246	1.559	244	165.00	144	167
153=	UWE	UK	13	13.17	176	30.42	181	1.013	144	2.340	159	165.00	137	171
155	Copenhagen	Denmark	38	28.25	86	57.16	112	0.743	207	1.504	257	165.50	143	167
156	Oklahoma	USA	35	22.83	108	63.40	104	0.652	238	1.811	213	165.75	143	167
157	Bern	Switzerland	17	14.83	158	36.23	157	0.872	173	2.131	181	167.25	141	171
158	Vienna	Austria	23	17.42	140	45.44	135	0.757	200	1.976	196	167.75	144	171
159	Illinois, Chicago	USA	22	14.67	162	50.50	122	0.667	233	2.295	164	170.25	143	174
160	New South Wales	Australia	17	15.33	153	32.11	173	0.902	164	1.889	204	173.50	147	177
161	Southern Illinois	USA	17	12.58	181	39.90	149	0.740	208	2.347	158	174.00	150	176
162	Nottingham Trent	UK	17	14.83	158	32.75	166	0.872	173	1.926	200	174.25	147	178
163	Sydney	Australia	20	17.33	141	35.17	159	0.867	175	1.759	225	175.00	148	174
164	Reed	USA	4	5.50	340	20.77	238	1.375	81	5.193	42	175.25	138	197
165	Portland State	USA	3	6.00	317	14.64	319	2.000	23	4.880	49	177.00	139	197
166	Stirling	UK	7	9.00	223	19.57	253	1.286	100	2.796	133	177.25	139	188
167	Tasmania	Australia	14	14.00	170	27.76	198	1.000	147	1.983	195	177.50	146	179
168	Reading	UK	16	13.37	175	32.64	168	0.836	183	2.040	189	178.75	150	180

169	Lancaster	UK	18	15.23	154	32.26	172	0.846	178	1.792	218	180.50	153	180
170=	Science-Po	France	85	48.83	35	91.03	72	0.574	277	1.071	342	181.50	160	175
170=	Bath	UK	19	14.58	164	35.18	158	0.767	198	1.852	206	181.50	157	183
172	INSEAD	France	4	5.50	340	18.52	267	1.375	81	4.630	54	185.50	143	206
173=	Bowdoin	USA	15	8.50	236	49.60	125	0.567	281	3.307	103	186.25	150	195
173=	TU Darmstadt	Germany	5	6.50	299	18.51	268	1.300	98	3.702	80	186.25	143	207
175	GIIS	Switzerland	5	7.58	267	15.64	308	1.516	64	3.128	114	188.25	143	207
176	Gothenburg	Sweden	18	14.17	167	31.71	176	0.787	191	1.762	223	189.25	159	195
177	Westminister	UK	8	9.33	216	18.46	271	1.166	117	2.308	162	191.50	155	207
178	De Montfort	UK	13	11.00	197	25.97	210	0.846	178	1.998	193	194.50	161	200
179	Lehigh	USA	7	6.83	291	22.35	227	0.976	152	3.193	112	195.50	153	208
180	Queensland	Australia	22	16.50	146	32.35	171	0.750	203	1.470	267	196.75	169	199
181	Lund	Sweden	34	21.00	119	44.86	137	0.618	253	1.319	287	199.00	172	204
182	Leuven (KUL)	Belgium	24	15.67	151	36.30	156	0.653	237	1.513	254	199.50	172	205
183	UCLAN	UK	6	7.00	283	17.75	279	1.167	116	2.958	124	200.50	153	217
184	Tubingen	Germany	6	8.00	248	14.88	317	1.333	90	2.480	150	201.25	159	226
185	Victoria	Canada	15	11.00	197	27.86	196	0.733	210	1.857	205	202.00	172	208
186	EU Viadrina	Germany	11	9.00	223	23.40	221	0.818	186	2.127	182	203.00	170	214
187	Bryn Mawr	USA	5	6.33	306	16.20	296	1.266	105	3.240	106	203.25	157	228
188	Florence	Italy	30	21.00	119	36.37	155	0.700	225	1.212	317	204.00	172	202
189	CEU	Hungary	31	18.17	136	43.91	140	0.586	269	1.416	273	204.50	173	205
190	Erlangen Nurnberg	Germany	2	4.50	389	11.52	381	2.250	17	5.760	36	205.75	159	231
191	Staffordshire	UK	8	7.83	257	18.97	261	0.979	151	2.371	155	206.00	165	228
192	Fern of Hagen	Germany	10	8.00	248	22.79	224	0.800	189	2.279	165	206.50	172	220
193	Connecticut	USA	33	17.50	139	47.33	128	0.530	291	1.434	269	206.75	177	208
194	York	UK	20	14.00	170	30.57	180	0.700	225	1.529	253	207.00	172	211
195	Bergen	Norway	16	11.92	186	26.11	207	0.745	206	1.632	235	208.50	175	215
196=	McMaster	Canada	19	12.83	179	29.49	185	0.675	231	1.552	245	210.00	177	217
196=	Southern Methodist	USA	15	10.50	202	27.21	202	0.700	225	1.814	211	210.00	175	215
198=	Carleton	Canada	35	19.90	126	43.70	142	0.569	280	1.249	308	214.00	179	211
198=	Juan March	Spain	4	5.50	340	13.77	337	1.375	81	3.443	98	214.00	165	251
200	Ulster	UK	9	8.17	244	18.50	269	0.908	163	2.056	188	216.00	172	240

Table 3: Correlations between the Ranks of the Top 200 Political Science Institutions, 1998–2003

	Rank 1	*Rank 2*	*Rank 3*	*Rank 4*
Rank 1 (Quantity)	–			
Rank 2 (Impact)	0.962	–		
Rank 3 (Quantity/Faculty Size)	0.429	0.405	–	
Rank 4 (Impact/Faculty Size)	0.507	0.583	0.896	–
Overall Rank	0.862	0.879	0.759	0.832

Method: Spearman's rank-order correlation.

However, English is the international language for the publication and citation of research in political science, as in other social sciences and the natural sciences. Because of the ease of reading, publishing in and teaching from these international journals, scholars in English-speaking universities are inevitably more closely integrated into the global discipline than scholars outside the English-speaking world. As a result, a ranking of departments using research published in the 'top' international journals in a field is inevitably not a fair representation of the quality of departments outside the English-speaking world.

One possible solution would be to include more non-English-language journals in the analysis. However, given the low number of citations to research published in non-English-language journals, it is hard to make a case for including some non-English journals while omitting others, or even for including non-English-language journals with low citations while excluding some journals with higher citations.

A second problem is that book publications are more common and important in political science than in economics. As discussed, if one assumes that a good department would produce a lot of articles as well as books, then only measuring journal publications may not make a difference to the ranking of institutions at the departmental level. Nevertheless, this hypothesis can only be checked if a similar ranking could be established using book publications, and the results of the two rankings are compared and perhaps integrated.

Despite these shortcomings, two major advantages of the method proposed here are that it would be (i) simple to mechanize and (ii) easy to add other journals or books to the dataset. If 'the discipline', perhaps via a committee of the International Political Science Association, could agree a set of English and non-English-language journals and book publishers that are the main vehicles for research output in the global discipline, it would not be too difficult to modify this method and establish a mechanized system for entry and updating of the dataset and for calculating new rankings every year. Ideally, each insti-

Table 4: The Rolling Global Top Fifty, 1997–2002

	1993–1997	*1994–1998*	*1995–1999*	*1996–2000*	*1997–2001*	*1998–2002*
1	Stanford	Stanford	Stanford	Stanford	Columbia	Columbia
2	Harvard	Harvard	Harvard	Harvard	Stanford	Harvard
3	Columbia	Columbia	= Columbia	Columbia	= Harvard	Stanford
4	Indiana	Indiana	Essex	EUI	EUI	Ohio State
5	= UC Berkeley	UC Berkeley	EUI	UC Berkeley	UC Berkeley	EUI
6	ANU	EUI	Indiana	UCSD	Ohio State	UCSD
7	Essex	Houston	UC Berkeley	Essex	UCSD	UC Irvine
8	Houston	Essex	UCSD	= Indiana	Indiana	Indiana
9	Iowa	UCSD	Ohio State	Ohio State	Princeton	Princeton
10	UCSD	Princeton	Yale	Yale	Yale	Yale
11	EUI	Yale	UCLA	Princeton	Michigan State	UC Berkeley
12	Princeton	UCLA	Princeton	Michigan State	= Chicago	Michigan State
13	Arizona	Ohio State	Oxford	Birmingham	MIT	Chicago
14	Warwick	Warwick	Michigan State	UC Irvine	= UCLA	UCLA
15	Chicago	ANU	Vanderbilt	UCLA	UC Irvine	LSE
16	Georgia	Birmingham	American	Chicago	Essex	Essex
17	Yale	Iowa	= UC Davis	Vanderbilt	Birmingham	= Georgetown
18	= Oxford	Chicago	UW Madison	= Washington U	Vanderbilt	MIT
19	UW Madison	UC Davis	Texas A&M	UW Madison	Johns Hopkins	Oxford
20	Johns Hopkins	= Michigan	= Houston	Oxford	Cambridge	= SUNY Binghamton
21	Pittsburgh	= Oxford	Johns Hopkins	UC Davis	SUNY Binghamton	= ANU
22	= UCLA	Arizona	Washington U	Cambridge	Oxford	Birmingham
23	Ohio State	Washington U	Chicago	Johns Hopkins	Georgetown	Cambridge
24	UC Davis	Georgia	Birmingham	Texas A&M	American	Florida State
25	Birmingham	UCol Boulder	UC Irvine	Bristol	= LSE	Sheffield
26	MIT	= UC Irvine	ANU	Sheffield	Florida State	= Washington U
27	Michigan	UW Madison	Warwick	= Georgetown	UW Madison	Michigan
28	Washington U	Michigan State	UCol Boulder	MIT	Texas A&M	Johns Hopkins
29	UCol Boulder	Vanderbilt	Georgia	ANU	Penn State	= Texas A&M
30	Michigan State	Johns Hopkins	Michigan	Florida State	= Emory	Emory
31	American	American	Bristol	American	= ANU	UCol Boulder
32	Florida State	MIT	Cambridge	= Warwick	UC Davis	American
33	Texas A&M	Cambridge	Georgetown	SUNY Binghamton	Michigan	Penn State
34	Pennsylvania	Texas A&M	Arizona	GWU	Washington U	Bristol
35	SUNY Stony Brook	Glasgow	= GWU	Houston	Sheffield	UNC Chapel Hill
36	UC Irvine	Leiden	Iowa	Georgia	Bristol	GWU
37	Strathclyde	SUNY Stony Brook	LSE	LSE	GWU	Cardiff
38	Cambridge	Pennsylvania	Sheffield	Cal Tech	Rice	= UW Madison
39	Leiden	LSE	Emory	SUNY Stony Brook	SUNY Stony Brook	Aberystwyth
40	Glasgow	Florida State	MIT	Michigan	Aberystwyth	Trinity (Dublin)
41	= LSE	GWU	Leiden	Rice	Trinity (Dublin)	= Vanderbilt
42	Cal Tech	Cal Tech	SUNY Stony Brook	Penn State	= Arizona	Cornell
43	UW Milwaukee	Pittsburgh	Florida State	= Emory	Georgia	Geneva
44	Arizona State	= South Carolina	UNC Chapel Hill	Iowa	Cardiff	Illinois
45	South Carolina	Strathclyde	Rice	Hebrew	= Cornell	Rice
46	Rice	Emory	New Mexico	Pennsylvania	UNC Chapel Hill	UCL (London)
47	GWU	= Georgetown	Pennsylvania	Arizona	Claremont	SUNY Stony Brook
48	Maryland	UC Riverside	Hull	Maryland	Geneva	= UC Davis
49	Vanderbilt	Sheffield	Maryland	UCol Boulder	Houston	Arizona
50	Georgetown	= Hull	Glasgow	Claremont	= UCol Boulder	= Virginia

Note: = means that an institution is in the same position as the institution listed immediately before it.

tution that wanted to be included in the rankings could be asked to provide accurate and up-to-date information about the size of their faculty.

(*Accepted*: 7 May 2004)

About the Author

Simon Hix, Department of Government, London School of Economics, Houghton Street, London, WC2A 2AE, UK; email: *s.hix@lse.ac.uk*; website: http://personal.lse.ac.uk/hix

Notes

Research for this paper was partially funded by The Nuffield Foundation (Grant No: SGS/00889/G). I would like to thank Gabriele Birnberg, Ryan Barrett and Bjorn Hoyland for data collection; Nancy Beyers at the Institute for Scientific Information for help with purchase of the Social Science Citation Index data; and Daniele Archibugi, Rodney Barker, Kenneth Benoit, Jeff Checkel, Tom Coupé, Philip Cowley, Pepper Culpepper, Nicole Deitelhoff, Vedran Dzihic, Matthew Gabel, Fabrizio Gilardi, Nils Petter Gleditsch, Robert Goodin, Justin Greenwood, Metin Heper, Karl Magnus Johansson, Peter Kurrild-Klitgaard, Iain McLean, Martin Lodge, Peter Mair, Paul Mitchell, Andrew Moravcsik, Cas Mudde, Michael Munger, Yannis Papadopoulos, Thomas Pluemper, Ben Reilly, Christian Reus-Smit, Gerald Schneider, David Shambaugh, Gunnar Sivertsen, Ulf Sverdrup, Alec Sweet, Jon Tonge, Erik Voeten, Albert Weale and the three *Political Studies Review* referees for comments on the research and previous versions of this paper.

1 See 'The ISI® Database: The Journal Selection Process': <http://www.isinet.com/isi/hot/essays/selectionofmaterialforcoverage/199701.html>.

2 I considered adding journals of other national political science associations (such as the journals of the Belgian, Swiss, Austrian, Irish and Japanese associations) and a number of other political science journals (such as *Aussenwirtschaft*). However, none of these journals met the threshold of at least 100 citations per year.

3 The adjusted R^2 for the model is 0.781.

4 Part of the difference between these scores and the SSCI scores is explained by the fact that my index is an average impact across several years, whereas the scores I have compared them against are only for the impact of a journal in 2002.

5 More detailed information about how this was calculated for each university can be obtained from the author.

6 Tables showing the top 400 in each five year period between 1993 and 2002 can be found on my website: <http://personal.lse.ac.uk/hix>.

References

Ballard, M. J. and Mitchell, N. J. (1998) 'The Good, the Better, and the Best in Political Science', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 31 (4), 826–8.

Coupé, T. (2003) 'Revealed Preferences: Worldwide Rankings of Economists and Economics Departments, 1969–2000', *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1 (4), <http://student.ulb.ac.be/~tcoupe/ranking.html>.

Dusansky, R. and Vernon, C. J. (1998) 'Rankings of U.S. Economics Departments', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12 (1), 157–70.

Garand, J. C. and Graddy, K. L. (1999) 'Ranking Political Science Departments: Do Publications Matter?', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 32 (1), 113–16.

Goodson, L. P., Dillman, B. and Hira, A. (1999) 'Ranking the Presses: Political Scientists' Evaluations of Publisher Quality', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 32 (2), 257–62.

Jackman, R. W. and Siverson, R. M. (1996) 'Rating the Rating: An Analysis of the National Research Council's Appraisal of Political Science Ph.D. Programs', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 29 (2), 155–60.

Katz, R. and Eagles, M. (1996) 'Ranking Political Science Departments: A View from the Lower Half', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 29 (2), 149–54.

Lowry, R. C. and Silver, B. D. (1996) 'A Rising Tide Lifts All Boats: Political Science Department Reputation and Reputation of the University', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 29 (2), 161–7.

McCormick, J. M. and Rice, T. W. (2001) 'Graduate Training and Research Productivity in the 1990s: A Look at Who Publishes', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 34 (3), 675–80.

Miller, A. H., Tien, C. and Peebler, A. A. (1996) 'Department Rankings: An Alternative Approach', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 29 (4), 704–17.

PS: Political Science and Politics (1996a) 'National Research Council Relative Rankings for Research-Doctorate Programs in Political Science', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 29 (2), 144–7.

PS: Political Science and Politics (1996b) 'U.S. News and World Report Ranking of Graduate Political Science Departments', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 29 (2), 148.

Rice, T. W., McCormick, J. M. and Bergmann, B. D. (2002) 'Graduate Training, Current Affiliation and Publishing Books in Political Science', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35 (4), 751–5.

Schmitter, P. (2002) 'Seven (Disputable) Theses Concerning the Future of "Transatlanticised" or "Globalised" Political Science', *European Political Science*, 1 (2), 23–40.

Scott, L. C. and Mitias, P. M. (1996) 'Trends in Rankings of Economics Departments in the U.S.: An Update', *Economic Inquiry*, 34, 378–400.

Teske, P. (1996) 'Rankings of Political Science Departments Based on Publications in the *APSR*, *JOP*, and *AJPS*, 1986–1995', State University of New York, Stony Brook, manuscript.

Welch, S. and Hibbing, J. R. (1983) 'What Do the New Ratings of Political Science Departments Measure?', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 16 (3), 532–40.