

UC San Diego

Articles

Title

Citation Rankings of Public Administration Journals

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9f15x5nr>

Journal

Administration & Society, 21(4)

ISSN

0095-3997 1552-3039

Author

Colson, Harold

Publication Date

1990-02-01

DOI

10.1177/009539979002100404

Peer reviewed

CITATION RANKINGS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION JOURNALS

Harold Colson

University of California, San Diego

Administration & Society

21:4 (February 1990):452-471

This version is the post-print author's final manuscript.

Published version: <https://doi.org/10.1177/009539979002100404>

ABSTRACT

This article employs standard citation analysis techniques to rank the research value of public administration journals. Although prestige is a suspect measure of quality, esteem surveys have been used to rate the perceived importance of journals in many fields (including public administration). By gauging actual consumption rather than estimated value, citation analysis offers a better method of assessing journal worth. The three citation rankings presented in this study confirm the importance of such prestigious journals as Public Administration Review, American Political Science Review, and Administrative Science Quarterly. In some cases, however, the citation hierarchies differ considerably from the esteem ratings.

This exploration helps fill a need for new hierarchies of journal value in the field of public administration. Earlier studies (Hamm and Vocino, 1977; Vocino and Elliott, 1982, 1984) have ranked the quality of public administration journals as perceived by some members of the American Society for Public Administration.¹ Like most prestige surveys, however, these three works are impaired by weak conceptual validity and poor methodological performance.² Given the serious pressure now placed on many academics to publish articles in premier journals, some more objective and meaningful ratings of journal worth in public administration would appear to possess considerable utility. Junior faculty could use the rankings to select the best venues for scholarly articles, while senior members could employ the hierarchies to evaluate the publishing accomplishments of tenure and promotion candidates. An improved assessment should also benefit journal editors, research administrators, collection development librarians, information analysts, and other persons who need quantitative measures of stratification among learned publications.

The problems associated with journal esteem surveys have helped lead many investigators to employ citation analysis as an alternative ranking method. Journal citation studies measure the frequencies at which different titles are cited within the literature of a discipline in order to evaluate their relative scholarly impacts. Based on the premise that authors recognize and cite pertinent and valuable works published by other

researchers, citation analysis is not a new approach to journal assessment, for the pioneering studies in the field were completed over fifty years ago.³ Only recently, however, have investigators been able to obtain significant quantities of citation data without examining large numbers of individual journal issues. Using the Journal Citation Reports that now accompany Science Citation Index and Social Sciences Citation Index, one can easily gather assorted citation figures on some 5700 domestic and foreign journals processed by the Institute for Scientific Information.⁴ Although no measures can fully express a trait as complex as quality, citation indicators are widely acknowledged to provide helpful and reasonably valid statements of worth in terms of research consumption.⁵ Given that scholarly journals exist in large part to disseminate research findings (Lindsey, 1978), citation use probably represents a more suitable indicator of quality than does group opinion.

The present work evaluates public administration journals with data gathered from SSCI Journal Citation Reports, which covers more than 1400 leading titles in political science, law, economics, sociology, psychology, anthropology, business, geography, education, and related fields. In order to help develop a broad portrait of the current structure of the journal literature in public administration, three different indicators of citation rank are considered. The resulting citation hierarchies are then compared with each other and with the prestige ratings assembled by Vocino and Elliott (1982, 1984).

Although these presentations do not form a comprehensive citation study, they do offer many fresh and instructive assessments of journal value in public administration.⁶

METHODS

One sample for this citation study consisted of 35 journals, which were selected on the basis of their 1) relevance to the subject of public administration and 2) coverage by SSCI Journal Citation Reports. An initial set of journals was drawn from the results of the most recent prestige survey conducted by Vocino and Elliott (1984). Asking respondents to rate 46 selected titles according to their average contributions to the field of public administration, Vocino and Elliott developed rankings of the top 20 journals in terms of prestige intensity (mean rating weight) as well as of prestige extensity (total number of ratings). These two lists contain a total of 25 different journals, all but five of which are covered by SSCI Journal Citation Reports. Other relevant titles were selected from the remainder of the prestige survey sample and from journal bibliographies prepared by Caiden et al. (1983), Rock (1979), and Simpson (1976). Some selection preference was given to public policy journals not surveyed by Vocino and Elliott. An appendix lists the 46 survey items and the 35 citation titles.

Citation data for each of the sample journals was obtained

from the six most recent (1981-1986) volumes of SSCI Journal Citation Reports. Citation scores are subject to certain annual fluctuations, so a fair ordering of journal rank requires more than one year of data. Two standard ISI indicators, citation rate and impact factor, were gathered for use in this study. Citation rate simply tallies the total number of citations received by a journal during a particular year. Because citation rate favors older and larger journals over newer and smaller ones, most bibliometric studies control for age and size by including some measure of citations received per article published. One such indicator is the impact factor, which expresses the average number of citations given in a particular year to each article published in a journal during the two previous years. For example, assume that the mythical Western Review of Public Administration published a total of 40 articles in 1984 and 1985. If these articles received 80 citations from the ISI journals in 1986, then the impact factor score for this journal would be 2.000. Because citation rate and impact factor gauge different aspects of bibliometric performance, all journals do not perform equally well in both realms. Some scholarly journals with long publishing histories have relatively high citation rates and relatively low impact factors. Certain professional journals, on the other hand, stand rather high in impact factor and rather low in citation rate. Using both indicators will thus help offer a competent presentation of the citation characteristics of the 35 sample titles.

The two ISI citation indicators employed in this study are based on data extracted from a massive variety of domestic and foreign journals. Although SSCI Journal Citation Reports contains only some 1400 titles, all 7000 journals in the combined ISI database are used to calculate citation scores. In 1986, therefore, ISI processed approximately 10.5 million references from over one million articles to develop its citation rate and impact factor figures. Such broad coverage is quite beneficial, for the interdisciplinary nature of much current research means that journals in one field may be utilized by authors from several other fields. On the other hand, the ISI journal base includes works from so many different areas that the aggregated indicators may not reflect actual citation patterns within individual disciplines. Just because a journal is cited frequently by the thousands of ISI journals does not necessarily mean that it is also cited heavily by the handful of core public administration journals.

In order to analyze citation activity within particular disciplines, one must go beyond the broad ISI measures. Fortunately, SSCI Journal Citation Reports facilitates the development of such field-specific indicators by listing the journals that cite and are cited by each of its covered titles. For example, the 1984 "Citing Journal Listing" indicates that Administration and Society cited Public Administration Review 25 times in 1984. Other journals that received large numbers of citations were Administration and Society (18), Journal of

Applied Psychology (16), Administrative Science Quarterly (14), Personnel Psychology (9), Academy of Management Review (8), American Political Science Review (8), and Policy Studies Journal (7). Likewise, the 1984 "Cited Journal Listing" notes that Administration and Society was cited by itself 18 times in 1984. Other journals that cited Administration and Society were Public Administration Review (11), Policy Studies Journal (5), Journal of the American Planning Association (4), Administrative Science Quarterly (3), and Social Work (3). The "Citing Journal Listing" and the "Cited Journal Listing" do not record every reference, but one can develop a reasonably complete portrait of citation activity within a set of journals by comparing the two listings.

A third (and field-specific) citation indicator was thus developed by tallying the citations made by Administration and Society, American Review of Public Administration, International Journal of Public Administration, Public Administration Quarterly (formerly Southern Review of Public Administration), and Public Administration Review from 1981 to 1986. These figures were gathered from the appropriate SSCI Journal Citation Reports and from the five source journals, which were chosen because they provide basic coverage of general public administration scholarship. Unlike some journals in the original sample, these works do not have citation bases that are cluttered with references that accompanied articles on such largely peripheral topics as political philosophy, international relations, business management,

economic theory, or social psychology. Neither do these journals restrict their publishing ranges to cover only such public administration specialties as public personnel management, public finance, or public policy. Although no set of journals can be considered fully representative of an entire field, these five titles should provide valuable insights regarding current journal consumption patterns in public administration.⁷ Other researchers (Billings and Viksnins, 1972; Buss and McDermott, 1976; Poole and Regoli, 1981; Mabry and Sharplin, 1985; Sharplin and Mabry, 1985) have utilized similar techniques to generate field-specific lists of important journals.

RESULTS

Table 1 ranks the sample journals according to mean citation rate. Table 2 lists the same titles by mean impact factor.⁸ Although citation rate and impact factor measure different aspects of journal use, Table 1 and Table 2 exhibit considerable similarities. Certain journals, particularly Administrative Science Quarterly, American Political Science Review, Harvard Business Review, and Academy of Management Journal, dominate the rankings. Administrative Science Quarterly and American Political Science Review rank first and second in both citation rate and impact factor, while Harvard Business Review and Academy of Management Journal stand in the top five of both categories. Other journals that achieve

consistently high scores are Industrial and Labor Relations Review, American Journal of Political Science, Public Administration Review, and Journal of Human Resources. Australian Journal of Public Administration and International Journal of Public Administration hold the lowest ranks, placing 34th and 35th in both citation rate and impact factor. The overall stability between the two tables is demonstrated by a strong ($\rho = .88$, $p < .001$) rank order correlation. Only two journals, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (13) and Public Administration and Development (14), have citation rate and impact factor rankings that vary by more than eight ordinal positions.

Table 3 lists the 35 periodicals that received the most citations from the five public administration journals.* Public Administration Review stands as the top journal, garnering more citations (1357) than the next ten titles combined. Indeed, Public Administration Review is so dominant that it holds 25.1 percent of the citations received by all 35 periodicals (1357 out of 5404). Other top scorers include Administrative Science Quarterly, American Political Science Review, Administration and Society, and Journal of Policy Analysis and Management. Two magazines (National Journal and Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report) and two newspapers (New York Times and Washington Post) join 31 journals to form the list of leading public administration periodicals.

The ISI citation indicators and the field-specific citation

indicator express different aspects of journal performance. Because the ISI figures are based on data drawn from a very large array of learned journals, Table 1 and Table 2 tend to favor works with broad academic and professional appeal. Table 3, on the other hand, rewards periodicals that possess specific relevance to current scholarship in public administration. Considering these factors, it is not very surprising to find that certain journals receive substantially divergent rankings from the two kinds of measures. For example, Harvard Business Review, Academy of Management Journal, and American Journal of Political Science outrank Administration and Society, Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, and Public Personnel Management in both citation rate and impact factor. In the field-specific rankings, however, these positions are reversed. Likewise, Public Administration Review stands a mere sixth in citation rate and an even lowlier ninth in impact factor. In the field-specific rankings, however, Public Administration Review vaults over its erstwhile superiors to take the top position. Although Table 1 and Table 2 offer useful insights regarding the overall scholarly use of the 35 sample journals, Table 3 constitutes a better indicator of actual journal utilization in public administration.

Comparing the prestige indicators and the ISI citation indicators reveals similarities and differences between the two sets of rankings. Table 4 lists the top public administration journals in terms of prestige intensity and prestige extensity (Vocino and Elliott, 1984). The table also

indicates the rank of each title according to citation rate and impact factor. For the most part, very prestigious journals (e.g., Harvard Business Review, Public Administration Review, American Political Science Review, American Journal of Political Science, Administrative Science Quarterly) also perform well in terms of citation rate and impact factor. In several cases, however, titles that rank relatively high in prestige value stand rather low in actual citation performance (or vice versa). Journals such as Public Personnel Management, Public Finance, and International Journal of Public Administration exemplify this discrepancy phenomenon, which is widespread enough to help produce low rank order correlations between the subjective and objective indicators of journal quality in public administration. Earlier studies (Christenson and Sigelman, 1985; McDonough, 1975; Buss and McDermott, 1976) have found moderate to high correlations between prestige rank and citation rank in political science ($\rho = .57$, $n = 56$), sociology ($\rho = .53$, $n = 61$), economics ($\rho = .87$, $n = 70$), and psychology ($\rho = .45$, $n = 64$). Table 5 presents the correlations between the prestige rankings developed by Vocino and Elliott (1982) and the ISI citation rankings contained in Table 1 and Table 2. Ranging from a high of .42 (prestige extensity-citation rate) to a low of .27 (prestige intensity-impact factor), these correlations are among the lowest ever found in a social science discipline.¹⁰ Perhaps only in education (Smart, 1983) has a lower correlation ($\rho = .21$, $n = 64$) been reported.

The field-specific citation indicator and the prestige survey offer some contrasting assessments of journal quality in public administration. One manifestation of these differences is the fact that only 19 of the 46 titles surveyed by Vocino and Elliott in 1981 appear in Table 3. In other words, the latest survey did not cover 16 of the 35 most frequently cited periodicals in the field of public administration. Among the major omissions from the prestige list are Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, Academy of Management Review, American Sociological Review, Harvard Law Review, Journal of Applied Psychology, and Public Budgeting and Finance, for each of these journals receives much greater citation use than such survey titles as Public Management, Management Review, Public Administration Times, Nation's Cities, Public Finance, or Science. Further differences are revealed by comparing prestige rank with field-specific rank. Table 6 and Table 7 present the top public administration journals in terms of prestige intensity and prestige extensity (Vocino and Elliott, 1984). Next to the prestige rank of each title is its field-specific citation rank (if any) as reported in Table 3. Once again, high perceived value does not always entail frequent citation use, for each table contains seven prestigious titles that failed to make the top 35 in the field-specific category. Still other journals (e.g., Harvard Business Review, American Journal of Political Science, Journal of the American Planning Association) have field-specific rankings that stand

much lower than their prestige rankings. Table 6 and Table 7 also indicate that Public Administration Review, Administrative Science Quarterly, and Administration and Society are cited in the literature of public administration at a higher level than that at which they are perceived to contribute to the field.¹¹

CONCLUSIONS

Citation counting offers a worthy alternative to prestige sampling as a means of evaluating journal quality. Instead of measuring relative importance as estimated by survey respondents, citation indicators gauge actual use as recorded by scholarly publications. Although bibliometric analysis has long served to identify key works in other academic disciplines, the three citation measures employed in this study provide the first direct consumption ratings of journal value in public administration. Ranking 35 selected journals according to ISI citation rate and ISI impact factor reveals the dominance of Administrative Science Quarterly, American Political Science Review, Harvard Business Review, and Academy of Management Journal. Tallying the citations made by five core public administration journals shows Public Administration Review, Administrative Science Quarterly, American Political Science Review, Administration and Society, and Journal of Policy Analysis and Management to hold the top positions. In numerous cases, these citation rankings do not agree with the reputation

hierarchies compiled by Vocino and Elliott (1982, 1984). Some journals rank relatively high in perceived value yet stand rather low in actual use. Other titles perform much better in citation terms than they do in prestige terms. Considering these differences, one should not presume the prestige rankings to be the definitive assessments of journal merit in public administration. Whether used to appraise scholarly achievements or to identify publishing opportunities, the citation figures presented in this article hold at least as much meaning as the collective opinions of the ASPA survey respondents.

NOTES

1. Based on data gathered from questionnaires sent to 1400 members of the American Society for Public Administration in 1975, 1978, and 1981, these articles form part of a substantial body of literature on the perceived value of scholarly and professional journals. Using similar survey techniques, other researchers have formulated prestige rankings for sociology (Glenn, 1971), political science (Giles and Wright, 1975), economics (Hawkins et al., 1973), psychology (Mace and Warner, 1973; Koulack and Keselman, 1975), education (Luce and Johnson, 1978), criminal justice (Fabianic, 1980; Shichor et al., 1981), geography (Lee and Evans, 1984), accounting (Howard and Nikolai, 1983), finance (Coe and Weinstock, 1983), management (Coe and Weinstock, 1984), and marketing (Fry et al., 1985; Luke and Doke, 1987).

2. Many observers have undermined the conceptual foundations of prestige surveys by raising doubts about the validity of subjective opinions as measures of journal quality (Boor, 1973; Gynther, 1973; Levin and Kratochwill, 1976; Levine, 1977; Adams and Peery, 1980; Poole and Regoli, 1981; Weisheit and Regoli, 1984). Other limitations stem from the fact that journal esteem surveys frequently obtain low response rates. Although rates as high as 80 percent (Mace and Warner, 1973), 72 percent (Fabianic, 1980), and 69 percent (Hawkins et al., 1973) have been recorded, one is just as likely to find figures like 42 percent (Shichor et al., 1981), 36 per cent (Koulack and Keselman, 1975), and 30

percent (Luke and Doke, 1987). The three ASPA mailings generated response rates of 36 percent (1975), 34 percent (1978), and 30 percent (1981), figures that make them among the least successful journal prestige surveys ever published. Moreover, the poor survey response is compounded by a low response rate per journal, a phenomenon that can be seen in the results of the 1978 survey (Vocino and Elliott, 1982). Because all respondents did not evaluate every journal, each title was rated by an average of only 128.8 persons (9.2 percent of the original sample). Nearly one third of the journals were rated by fewer than 100 persons.

3. Gross and Gross (1927), Allen (1929), and McNeely and Crosno (1930) produced the earliest journal citation studies.

4. First published in 1977, SSCI Journal Citation Reports have provided comparative data for the objective assessment of journals in such varied disciplines as anthropology (Rounds, 1982; Garfield, 1983), education (Smart and Elton, 1981; Smith and Caulley, 1981), psychology (Rushton and Roediger, 1978; Buffardi and Nichols, 1981; Smart and Elton, 1982; Haynes, 1983), communication (Reeves and Borgman, 1983), economics (Liebowitz and Palmer, 1984), and criminology (Stack, 1987).

5. Garfield (1972) offers a standard introduction to the use of ISI citation figures as journal evaluation tools. He cautions that low consumption does not necessarily denote low value, for

some important publications are produced and utilized for reasons other than the communication of original research studies.

6. These new rankings grow out of the first analysis of journal citations in the field of public administration to appear in over two decades. Although there are several citation studies of the political science literature (Martin, 1952; Stewart, 1970; Robinson, 1973), only one previous work (Intrama, 1968) analyzes reference patterns in public administration journals. Gathering every fifth citation listed in Administrative Science Quarterly, American Political Science Review, International Review of Administrative Sciences, Public Administration (London), and Public Administration Review between 1964 and 1966, Intrama examined the types, subjects, languages, and ages of the cited materials. Limited at the outset by its small and rather unrepresentative sample, this work is now also somewhat dated, for the public administration field has undergone major changes since 1966 (McCurdy, 1986). Some recent articles (Bowman and Hajjar, 1978a, 1978b; McCurdy and Cleary, 1984; Perry and Kraemer, 1986; White, 1986; Stallings and Ferris, 1988) do investigate the prevailing topical and methodological traits of the literature of public administration, but a full analysis of current citation patterns has been lacking for many years.

7. These five journals also formed part of the sample used by Legge and Devore (1987) to assess the productivity of programs in

public administration and public affairs. The other public administration journals were Bureaucrat and National Civic Review. The articles in these journals generally have few or no reference citations. SSCI Journal Citation Reports does not cover American Review of Public Administration or Public Administration Quarterly, so their citations had to be counted directly from the original articles. The citations made by Administration and Society, International Journal of Public Administration, and Public Administration Review were tabulated from the SSCI Journal Citation Reports totals and from the journals themselves. The latest issue of American Review of Public Administration had a cover date of Summer/Fall 1983.

8. ISI does not aggregate citation figures for journals with multiple titles. The citation rates of American Journal of Political Science (formerly Midwest Journal of Political Science), Administration and Society (formerly Journal of Comparative Administration), Journal of the American Planning Association (formerly Journal of the American Institute of Planners), Journal of Policy Analysis and Management (formerly Policy Analysis and Public Policy), and Public Administration and Development (formerly Journal of Administration Overseas) thus understate their true scores. The impact factor score of Journal of Policy Analysis and Management (which began in 1981) was developed by including the scores of Policy Analysis and Public Policy. Some journals in the sample were not listed in all six volumes of SSCI Journal Citation Reports.

9. These totals show the combined citation figures of journals with multiple titles. Some legal serials also received large numbers of citations from the five public administration journals. The top scorers were United States Reports (687), Federal Reporter (282), Federal Supplement (142), Federal Register (76), and United States Code (72). Papers presented at the annual meetings of the American Society for Public Administration (60) and the American Political Science Association (58) were also cited frequently.

10. Working with a set of 59 sociology journals, Gordon (1982) found rank order correlations of .60 (prestige intensity-citation rate), .46 (prestige intensity-impact factor), .53 (prestige extensity-citation rate), and .34 (prestige extensity-impact factor). Poole and Regoli (1981) reported a correlation of .75 ($n = 24$) between prestige intensity rank and field-specific citation rank in criminology. The correlation between prestige intensity rank (Mace and Warner, 1973) and impact factor rank (Rushton and Roediger, 1978) in psychology is .68 ($n = 44$).

11. Some differences between the field-specific citation ratings and the prestige ratings may be related to their variant source populations. Bowman and Hajjar (1978a) have noted that most articles in public administration journals are written by academics rather than practitioners. On the other hand, most respondents to the ASPA esteem surveys have characterized themselves as practitioners. Perhaps this

occupational disparity helps account for the high prestige-low citation phenomenon associated with professional periodicals like Public Management, Management Review, Public Administration Times, Nation's Cities, and Harvard Business Review. It may also help explain the high citation-low prestige trait connected with such scholarly journals as Administrative Science Quarterly and Administration and Society.

REFERENCES

- ADAMS, G.L. and J.C. PEERY (1980) "If you can name it, I can rate it." *Amer. Psychologist* 35: 109-110.
- ALLEN, E.S. (1929) "Periodicals for mathematicians." *Science* 70: 592-594.
- BILLINGS, B.B. and G.J. VIKSNINS (1972) "The relative quality of economics journals: an alternative rating system." *Western Economic J.* 10: 467-469.
- BOOR, M. (1973) "Unfamiliarity breeds disdain." *Amer. Psychologist* 28: 1012-1013.
- BOWMAN, J.S. and S.G. HAJJAR (1978a) "The literature of American public administration: its contents and contributors." *Public Administration Rev.* 38: 156-165.
- (1978b) "English-language journals in public administration: an analysis." *Public Administration* 56:203-225.
- BUFFARDI, L.C. and J.A. NICHOLS (1981) "Citation impact, acceptance rate, and APA journals." *Amer. Psychologist* 36: 1453-1456.
- BUSS, A.R. and J.R. McDERMOTT (1976) "Ratings of psychology journals compared to objective measures of journal impact." *Amer. Psychologist* 31: 675-678.
- CAIDEN, G.E., R.A. LOVERD, T.J. PAVLAK, L.F. SIPE, and M.M. WONG (1983) *American public administration: a bibliographical guide to the literature.* New York: Garland.
- CHRISTENSON, J.A. and L. SIGELMAN (1985) "Accrediting knowledge: journal stature and citation impact in social science." *Social Sci. Q.* 66: 964-975.
- COE, R. and I. WEINSTOCK (1983) "Evaluating the finance journals: the department chairperson's perspective." *J. of Financial Research* 6: 345-349.
- (1984) "Evaluating the management journals: a second look." *Academy of Management J.* 27: 660-666.
- FABIANIC, D.A. (1980) "Perceived scholarship and readership of criminal justice journals." *J. of Police Sci. and Administration* 8: 15-20.
- FRY, E.H., C.G. WALTERS, and L.E. SCHEUERMANN (1985) "Perceived quality of fifty selected journals: academicians and practitioners." *J. of the Academy of Marketing Sci.* 13 (Winter/Spring): 352-361.

- GARFIELD, E. (1972) "Citation analysis as a tool in journal evaluation." *Science* 178: 471-479.
- (1984) "Anthropology journals: what they cite and what cites them." *Current Anthropology* 25: 514-519.
- GILES, M.W. and G.C. WRIGHT (1975) "Political scientists' evaluations of sixty-three journals." *PS* 8: 254-256.
- GLENN, N.D. (1971) "American sociologists' evaluations of sixty-three journals." *Amer. Sociologist* 6: 298-303.
- GORDON, M.D. (1982) "Citation ranking versus subjective evaluation in the determination of journal hierarchies in the social sciences." *J. of the Amer. Society for Information Sci.* 33: 55-57.
- GROSS, P.L.K. and E.M. GROSS (1927) "College libraries and chemical education." *Science* 66: 385-389.
- GYNTHNER, M.D. (1973) "On Mace and Warner's journal rankings." *Amer. Psychologist* 28: 1013.
- HAMM, W. and T. VOCINO (1977) "Evaluation of 41 journals by ASPA members." *Bureaucrat* 5: 439-446.
- HAWKINS, R.G., L.S. RITTER, and I. WALTER (1973) "What economists think of their journals." *J. of Political Economy* 81: 1017-1032.
- HAYNES, J.P. (1983) "An empirical method for determining core psychology journals." *Amer. Psychologist* 38: 959-961.
- HOWARD, T.P. and L.A. NIKOLAI (1983) "Attitude measurement and perceptions of accounting faculty publication outlets." *Accounting Rev.* 58: 765-776.
- INTRAMA, N. (1968) "Some characteristics of the literature of public administration." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana Univ.
- KOULACK, D. and H.J. KESELMAN (1975) "Ratings of psychology journals by members of the American Psychological Association." *Amer. Psychologist* 30: 1049-1053.
- LEE, D. and A. EVANS (1984) "American geographers' rankings of American geography journals." *Professional Geographer* 36: 292-300.
- LEGGE, J.S. and J. DEVORE (1987) "Measuring productivity in U.S. public administration and public affairs programs." *Administration and Society* 19: 147-156.
- LEVIN, J.R. and T.R. KRATOCHWILL (1976) "The name of the journal fame game: quality or familiarity?" *Amer. Psychologist* 31: 673-674.

- LEVINE, C.H. (1977) "On evaluating journals." *Bureaucrat* 5: 77-82.
- LIEBOWITZ, S.J. and J.P. PALMER (1984) "Assessing the relative impacts of economics journals." *J. of Economic Literature* 22: 77-88.
- LINDSEY, D. (1978) *The scientific publication system in social science*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LUCE, T.S. and D.M. JOHNSON (1978) "Rating of educational and psychological journals." *Educational Researcher* 7 (November): 8-10.
- LUKE, R.H. and E.R. DOKE (1987) "Marketing journal hierarchies: faculty perceptions, 1986-87." *J. of the Academy of Marketing Sci.* 15 (Spring): 74-78.
- MABRY, R.H. and A.D. SHARPLIN (1985) "The relative importance of journals used in finance research." *J. of Financial Research* 8: 287-296.
- MACE, K.C. and H.D. WARNER (1973) "Ratings of psychology journals." *Amer. Psychologist* 28: 184-186.
- MARTIN, G.P. (1952) "Characteristics of the literature used by authors of books on political topics." M.A. thesis, Univ. of Chicago.
- MCCURDY, H.E. (1986) *Public administration: a bibliographic guide to the literature*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- MCCURDY, H.E. and R.E. CLEARY (1984) "Why can't we resolve the research issue in public administration?" *Public Administration Rev.* 44: 49-55.
- MCDONOUGH, C.C. (1975) "The relative quality of economics journals revisited." *Q. Rev. of Economics and Business* 15: 91-97.
- MCNEELY, J.K. and C.D. CROSNO (1930) "Periodicals for electrical engineers." *Science* 72: 81-84.
- PERRY, J.L. and K.L. KRAEMER (1986) "Research methodology in the Public Administration Review, 1975-1984." *Public Administration Rev.* 46: 215-226.
- POOLE, E.D. and R.M. REGOLI (1981) "Periodical prestige in criminology and criminal justice." *Criminology* 19: 470-478.
- REEVES, B. and C.L. BORGMAN (1983) "A bibliometric evaluation of the core journals in communication research." *Human Communication Research* 10: 119-136.

- ROBINSON, W.C. (1973) "Subject dispersion in political science: an analysis of references appearing in the journal literature, 1910-1960." Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Illinois.
- ROCK, M.G. (1979) A handbook of information sources and research strategies in public administration. San Diego: Institute of Public and Urban Affairs, San Diego State Univ.
- ROUNDS, J. (1982) "Theory and applied anthropology: an empirical approach." Human Organization 41: 167-170.
- RUSHTON, J.P. and H.L. ROEDIGER (1978) "An evaluation of 80 psychology journals based on the Science Citation Index." Amer. Psychologist 33: 520-523.
- SHARPLIN, A.D. and R.H. MABRY (1985) "The relative importance of journals used in management research: an alternative ranking." Human Relations 38: 139-149.
- SHICHOR, D., R.M. O'BRIEN, and D.L. DECKER (1981) "Prestige of journals in criminology and criminal justice." Criminology 19: 461-469.
- SIMPSON, A.E. (1976) Guide to library research in public administration. New York: Center for Productive Public Management, John Jay College of Criminal Justice.
- SMART, J.C. (1983) "Perceived quality and citation rates of education journals." Research in Higher Education 19: 175-182.
- SMART, J.C. and C.F. ELTON (1981) "Structural characteristics and citation rates of education journals." Amer. Educational Research J. 18: 399-413.
- (1982) "Consumption factor scores of psychology journals: scientometric properties and qualitative implications." Scientometrics 4: 349-360.
- SMITH, N.L. and D.N. CAULLEY (1981) "The evaluation of education journals through the study of citations." Educational Researcher 10: 11-12.
- STACK, S. (1987) "Measuring the relative impacts of criminology and criminal justice journals: a research note." Justice Quarterly 4: 475-484.
- STALLINGS, R.A. and J.M. FERRIS (1988) "Public administration research: work in PAR, 1940-1984." Public Administration Rev. 48: 580-586.
- STAMPS, L.E. and L.A. FEHR (1980) "Journal ratings revisited: a closer scrutiny of impact factors." Amer. Psychologist 35: 1048-1049.

- STEWART, J. (1970) "The literature of politics: a citation analysis." International Library Rev. 2: 329-353.
- VOCINO, T. and R.H. ELLIOTT (1982) "Journal prestige in public administration: a research note." Administration and Society 14: 5-14.
- (1984) "Public administration journal prestige: a time series analysis." Admin. Sci. Q. 29: 43-51.
- WEISHEIT, R.A. and R.M. REGOLI (1984) "Ranking journals." Scholarly Publishing 15: 313-325.
- WHITE, J.D. (1986) "Dissertations and publications in public administration." Public Administration Rev. 46: 227-234.

APPENDIX

Prestige Survey Titles	Citation Study Titles
Academy of Management Journal	Academy of Management Journal
Administration and Society	Administration and Society
Administrative Science Quarterly	Administrative Science Quarterly
American Journal of Political Science	American Journal of Political Science
American Political Science Review	American Political Science Review
Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science	Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science
Bureaucrat	Australian Journal of Public Administration
California Management Review	California Management Review
Canadian Public Administration	Canadian Public Administration
Civil Service Journal	Canadian Public Policy
Harvard Business Review	Harvard Business Review
Human Relations	Human Relations
Industrial and Labor Relations Review	Industrial and Labor Relations Review
International Journal of Public Administration	International Journal of Public Administration
International Review of Administrative Sciences	Journal of the American Planning Association
Journal of the American Planning Association	Journal of Applied Behavioral Science
Journal of Applied Behavioral Science	Journal of Human Resources
Journal of Criminal Law	Journal of Policy Analysis and Management
Journal of Health and Human Resources Administration	Journal of Politics
Journal of Human Resources	Policy Sciences
Journal of Politics	Policy Studies Journal
Management Review	Polity
Maxwell Review	Public Administration (London)
Midwest Review of Public Administration	Public Administration and Development
National Civic Review	Public Administration Review
Nation's Cities	Public Finance
News and Views	Public Finance Quarterly
Policy Studies Journal	Public Interest
Polity	Public Personnel Management
Public Administration (London)	Public Welfare
Public Administration Review	Publius
Public Administration Times	Social Science Quarterly
Public Finance	State Government
Public Finance Quarterly	Urban Affairs Quarterly
Public Interest	Western Political Quarterly
Public Management	
Public Personnel Management	
Public Welfare	
Publius	
Science	
Southern Review of Public Administration	
Social Science Quarterly	
State Government	
State Government Administration	
Urban Affairs Quarterly	
Western Political Quarterly	

TABLE 1

Rank Order of Sample Journals Based on Mean Citation Rate, 1981-1986

Title	Citation Rate
1. ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE QUARTERLY*	1845.33
2. AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW	1742.50
3. HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW	1444.50
4. ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL	944.83
5. HUMAN RELATIONS	884.33
6. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW	592.17
7. INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS REVIEW	562.67
8. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE	500.33
9. JOURNAL OF HUMAN RESOURCES	488.33
10. JOURNAL OF POLITICS	437.50
11. SOCIAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY	390.83
12. ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY	385.67
13. PUBLIC INTEREST	379.33
14. JOURNAL OF APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE	307.00
15. WESTERN POLITICAL QUARTERLY	205.83
16. Policy Sciences	161.50
17. CALIFORNIA MANAGEMENT REVIEW	161.00
18. JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION	159.67
19. URBAN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY	141.83
20. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management	132.00
21. Canadian Public Policy	100.75
22. POLICY STUDIES JOURNAL	100.17
23. POLITY	88.67
24. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (London)	88.50
25. ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIETY	77.00
26. PUBLIC FINANCE	76.50
27. PUBLIC FINANCE QUARTERLY	72.50
28. CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	66.17
29. PUBLIC WELFARE	65.67
30. PUBLIC PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	62.33
31. PUBLIUS	54.00
32. Public Administration and Development	31.60
33. STATE GOVERNMENT	29.33
34. Australian Journal of Public Administration	13.00
35. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	5.50

Source: SSCI Journal Citation Reports.

*Capital letters denote journals surveyed by Vocino and Elliott (1984).

TABLE 2

Rank Order of Sample Journals Based on Mean Impact Factor, 1981-1986

Title	Impact Factor
1. ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE QUARTERLY*	2.378
2. AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW	1.795
3. INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS REVIEW	1.637
4. ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL	1.469
5. HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW	1.242
6. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE	1.245
7. PUBLIC INTEREST	1.033
8. JOURNAL OF HUMAN RESOURCES	.892
9. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW	.672
10. JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION	.633
11. JOURNAL OF POLITICS	.602
12. Policy Sciences	.566
13. HUMAN RELATIONS	.505
14. SOCIAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY	.481
15. JOURNAL OF APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE	.479
16. URBAN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY	.463
17. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management	.443
18. Public Administration and Development	.374
19. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (London)	.362
20. Canadian Public Policy	.356
21. ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIETY	.347
22. WESTERN POLITICAL QUARTERLY	.340
23. CANADIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	.336
24. CALIFORNIA MANAGEMENT REVIEW	.297
25. ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY	.286
26. PUBLIC FINANCE QUARTERLY	.262
27. POLICY STUDIES JOURNAL	.231
28. POLITY	.212
29. PUBLIC WELFARE	.201
30. PUBLIUS	.179
31. PUBLIC PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	.161
32. STATE GOVERNMENT	.133
33. PUBLIC FINANCE	.123
34. Australian Journal of Public Administration	.097
35. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	.035

Source: SSCI Journal Citation Reports.

*Capital letters denote journals surveyed by Vocino and Elliott (1984).

TABLE 3

Periodicals Most Cited by Public Administration Journals, 1981-1986

Title	Total Citations
1. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW*	1357
2. ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE QUARTERLY	277
3. AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW	247
4. ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIETY	157
5. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management	121
6. New York Times	109
7. Washington Post	92
8. PUBLIC PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	91
9. HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW	88
10. Academy of Management Review	80
11. POLICY STUDIES JOURNAL	77
12. American Sociological Review	74
PUBLIC INTEREST	74
14. BUREAUCRAT	73
15. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION QUARTERLY	72
16. Harvard Law Review	68
17. Journal of Applied Psychology	66
18. JOURNAL OF POLITICS	64
19. Public Budgeting and Finance	63
20. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE	61
21. ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL	60
National Journal	60
URBAN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY	60
24. Policy Sciences	54
25. JOURNAL OF APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE	53
Management Science	53
27. Political Science Quarterly	51
28. National Tax Journal	48
29. AMERICAN REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	47
30. American Journal of Sociology	46
31. SOCIAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY	43
Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report	43
33. PUBLIUS	42
34. JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION	40
35. Review of Public Personnel Administration	39

Source: SSCI Journal Citation Reports, Administration and Society, American Review of Public Administration, International Journal of Public Administration, Public Administration Quarterly, Public Administration Review.

*Capital letters denote journals surveyed by Vocino and Elliott (1984).

TABLE 4

Prestige Rank Compared to ISI Citation Rank*

Journal Title	Prestige Intensity	Impact Factor	Citation Rate
Harvard Business Review	1	5	3
Public Administration Review	2	9	6
American Political Science Review	3	2	2
American Journal of Political Science	4	6	8
Administrative Science Quarterly	5	1	1
Annals of the American Academy	6	21	12
Public Personnel Management	7	27	27
Journal of Politics	8	11	10
Academy of Management Journal	9	4	4
Public Interest	10	7	13
Journal of the American Planning Association	11	10	17
Industrial and Labor Relations Review	12	3	7
Public Finance	13	29	23
Social Science Quarterly	14	13	11
Administration and Society	15	17	22
Policy Studies Journal	16	23	19

Journal Title	Prestige Extensity	Impact Factor	Citation Rate
Harvard Business Review	1	5	3
American Political Science Review	2	2	2
American Journal of Political Science	3	6	7
Administrative Science Quarterly	4	1	1
Annals of the American Academy	5	20	11
Public Personnel Management	6	26	26
Journal of Politics	7	10	9
Public Interest	8	7	12
Administration and Society	9	16	21
Journal of the American Planning Association	10	9	16
Public Finance	11	28	22
Policy Studies Journal	12	22	18
Urban Affairs Quarterly	13	14	17
International Journal of Public Administration	14	29	29
Journal of Applied Behavioral Science	15	13	13

Source: Vocino and Elliott (1984) and Tables 1-2.

*Ranks are based on the titles common to the prestige lists and the ISI sample.

TABLE 5

Correlations Between Prestige Rank and Citation Rank

	Citation Rate	Impact Factor
Prestige Intensity (n = 29)	.33**	.27***
Prestige Extensity (n = 28)	.42*	.37**

* p < .05; ** p < .10; *** p < .2.

TABLE 6

Prestige Intensity Rank Compared to Field-Specific Citation Rank

Journal Title	Intensity	Field-Specific
Harvard Business Review	1	9
Public Administration Review	2	1
American Political Science Review	3	3
American Journal of Political Science	4	20
Administrative Science Quarterly	5	2
Public Management	6	-
Annals of the American Academy	7	-
Management Review	8	-
Public Personnel Management	9	8
Science	10	-
Journal of Politics	11	18
Academy of Management Journal	12	22
Public Interest	13	12.5
Journal of the American Planning Association	14	34
Industrial and Labor Relations Review	15	-
Public Finance	16	-
Social Science Quarterly	17	31.5
Public Administration Times	18	-
Administration and Society	19	4
Policy Studies Journal	20	11

Source: Vocino and Elliott (1984) and Table 3.

TABLE 7

Prestige Extensivity Rank Compared to Field-Specific Citation Rank*

Journal Title	Extensivity	Field-Specific
Public Administration Times	1	-
Harvard Business Review	2	8
American Political Science Review	3	2
American Journal of Political Science	4	19
Bureaucrat	5	13
Administrative Science Quarterly	6	1
Public Management	7	-
Nation's Cities	8	-
Annals of the American Academy	9	-
Public Personnel Management	10	7
Management Review	11	-
Journal of Politics	12	17
Public Interest	13	11.5
Administration and Society	14	3
Journal of the American Planning Association	15	33
Public Finance	16	-
Policy Studies Journal	17	10
Urban Affairs Quarterly	18	21
International Journal of Public Administration	19	-
Journal of Applied Behavioral Science	20	24.5

Source: Vocino and Elliott (1984) and Table 3.

*The field-specific citation rank of each title has been adjusted to compensate for the necessary absence of Public Administration Review from the extensivity rankings.