

Ranking Universities for Scholarship in Public Administration Research 2006–2010

Adam M. Williams, Derek R. Slagle, and Darrin Wilson

Florida Atlantic University

ABSTRACT

There is a need to assess the scholarly activity of the field of public administration at the institutional level as it continues to develop as a separate, autonomous discipline and to evaluate academic and university reputation, impact, and directions of the public administration scholarly community. The authors surveyed public administration journals based upon criteria from Thompson Reuters Journal Citation Reports to determine productivity, quality, and overall institutional impact and then created an index. The study is based on previous attempts to rank universities in the field of public administration while drawing influence from the ranking systems found within other social science disciplines. The analysis shows what universities published in top public administration journals over a five-year period, 2006–2010, according to these criteria. Discussions of the implications on teaching and research in public administration and public affairs are also considered.

KEYWORDS:

public administration research, research productivity, comparative analysis, index modeling

In comparison to previous research to develop a ranking system within public administration, this work aims to differentiate itself on the basis of its methodological inputs. This ranking system, in an attempt to determine productivity, quality, and overall impact, included criteria used by the Thompson Reuters Journal of Citation Reports and its editorial staff. The rankings we generated include both domestic and international universities and represent multiple departments at the institutional level contributing to the scholarship in the field of public administration.

Ranking and indexing within the field of public administration, and other related disciplines, is

a highly debated and controversial topic for the field and its classification. Any given ranking system will have obvious inherent limitations and subjectivity concerning the outcomes on an academic level. Previous studies, as well as this one, have within their design and methodology both positives and negatives that lend to this controversy and debate.

Concomitantly, there is a need to focus on institutional quality and research productivity in public administration for a variety of reasons: (a) the focus of research as a priority in academia; (b) emergent autonomy and recognition of public administration as a separate field with semi-autonomous or organizational

status; (c) pragmatic expansion of resources and reputation of the individual universities; and (d) reported dichotomy between research and teaching within academic institutions (Clark, 1997). Moreover, though research productivity does not equate to quality of education, the measures can be used to better inform prospective students about research outcomes on the institutional level (Kraemer & Perry, 1989; White, Adams, & Forrester, 1996). Research has been conducted by numerous public administration scholars through various methodologies to assess the following areas:

- Collaboration and productivity (Corley & Sabharwal, 2010)
- Institutional reputation and ranking of programs with educational programs (Brewer, Douglas, Facer, & O'Toole, 1999; Douglas, 1996; Forrester, 1996; Legge & Devore, 1987; Morgan, Meier, Kearney, Hays, & Birch, 1981; Morgan & Meier, 1982)
- Doctoral program research productivity (Adams & White, 1994; Cleary, 1992, 2000; McCurdy & Cleary, 1984; White, 1986)
- Faculty productivity (Farber, Powers, & Thompson, 1984; Rodgers & Rodgers, 2000; Schroeder, O'Leary, Jones, & Poocharoen, 2004)

The impact and the nature of research guiding the field of public administration has also been documented over the last three decades (Houston & Delevan, 1990; Lan & Anders, 2000; Perry & Kraemer, 1986; Stallings & Ferris, 1988; Wright, Manigault, & Black, 2004).

The main assessment methods are either through reputation among scholars or through publication data, often the number of journal articles published (Kalaitzidakis, Mamuneas, & Stengos, 2003, 2011; Laband & Piette, 1994). This is because knowledge and research are shared in a variety of ways within the academic community through book publications, conferences, and journals. Of those, peer-reviewed journal publications serve as the best indication of overall scholarly productivity and quality, because journals often contain "cutting-edge research and the ideas of the profession that are

shared within the scholarly community" (Watson, Hassett, & Handley, 2005, p. 53).

Citation-based rankings have often been cited as an approach when designating values of particular journals. The most widely used citation-based ranking system in academia is the Thompson Reuters Journal Citation Report, or JCR (Bernick & Krueger, 2010; Coupe, 2003; Kalaitzidakis et al., 2003, 2011). According to Bernick and Krueger (2010), there has not been a comprehensive analysis of relative ranking of journals for the field of public administration since Forrester and Watson (1994); in the interim, the field has relied primarily on those impact scores.

This study serves as an extension of previous work on the assessment of scholarly activities within the field of public administration by combining reported methodologies, in broadening the scope of journals included, the use of citation reports based on factors, and departure from more subjective measures such as surveys and elite opinions often used. Furthermore, this research will seek to detail the potential for understanding scholarship as both a mechanism for impact and a basis for future teaching and research within the field.

DATA

To properly address abstract concepts such as productivity and quality regarding an institutions' research, the pertinent data will need to be derived from a previously cited source such as the Thompson Reuters JCRs. In the context of the analysis, *institutional scholarly productivity* is defined as "the publication output affiliated with the academic institution." Although quality may be a sensitive and contentious term for many academics, there is a necessity in the academic community to differentiate quality from productivity. In this analysis, quality is then an outcome related to the use of impact factor as its measure, as supported through the literature.

Data collection will take place using a code sheet template to protect against inter-coder reliability issues. Relevant data will consist of

Table 1.
Variable List

Variable	Variable Code	Variable Description
Journal Name	JN	Numerical label for the journal
Publication Year	PY	The year in which the article was published
Article Number	AN	Position of the article in the journal
Author Name	AUT	Name of the author
Number of Authors	NOA	Total number of authors listed
Author Position	AP	Author's position in the list of authors if article has more than one author
Type of Organization	OTP	Variable describes the types of organization the author is a member (i.e., university, governmental agency, or research institution)
Organizational Affiliation	OAF	Name of the organization or university listed with the given author
Career Status	CRS	Author's official title
Scope	SCP	0-Domestic (within the United States) 1-International
Number of Pages	PGS	Total number of pages credited to the article
Special Issue	SPI	Dummy variable describing whether the article appears in a special issue of the journal
Journal Editor Affiliation	JEA	Descriptive variable of the organizational affiliation of the main editor of the journal for the publication year
Journal Impact Factor	JIS	Impact Factor score according to Journal Citation Reports for the given year of publication
Immediacy Index	IMI	The Journal Citation Report variable indicating the immediate impact of the journal
Published Articles	PUA	Number of published articles for the journal for the given year
Citation Half-Life	CHL	Journal Citation Report variable identifying the time impact of the journal for the given year
Average Pages for Journal Year	JAP	Average number of pages in an article for a specific journal in a given year

variables, which have been previously calculated, and those that require direct observation. Variables, as listed in Table 1, originate from information found in the JCRs produced by Thomson Reuters or through direct observation within specific academic journals.

Variables directly affiliated with JCRs include citation half-life, immediacy index, and the journal impact factor. These three variables are based on studies, conducted annually by Thomson Reuters that analyze the frequency

and relationships of articles being cited within particular journals. Through a rigorous process, the editors at Thomson Reuters choose these journals as determinants of which publications are ranked as most impactful in the various fields of both social and physical sciences. The journals included in this study are those selected by Thomson Reuters as being most influential in the field of public administration for the years indicated. These journals represent a partial variety of areas, because scholars might potentially debate what constitutes a public ad-

TABLE 2.
Journals Present in Journal Citation Reports, 2006–2010

Journal Number	Journal Name	Years Ranked
1	<i>Administration & Society</i>	2006–2010
2	<i>Administration in Social Work</i>	2006–2010
3	<i>American Review of Public Administration</i>	2006–2010
4	<i>Amme Idaresi Drgisi*</i>	2009–2010
5	<i>Australian Journal of Public Administration</i>	2006–2010
6	<i>Canadian Public Administration</i>	2006–2010
7	<i>Canadian Public Policy</i>	2006–2010
8	<i>Civil Szemle*</i>	2009–2010
9	<i>Climate Policy</i>	2006–2010
10	<i>Contemporary Economic Policy</i>	2006–2010
11	<i>Environment & Planning C-government & Policy*</i>	2006–2010
12	<i>Gestion y Politica Publica*</i>	2009–2010
13	<i>Governance</i>	2006–2010
14	<i>Innovar-Revista de Ciencias Administrativas y Sociales*</i>	2010
15	<i>International Public Management Journal</i>	2010
16	<i>International Review of Administrative Sciences</i>	2006–2010
17	<i>Journal of Accounting & Public Policy</i>	2010
18	<i>Journal of European Public Policy</i>	2006–2010
19	<i>Journal of European Social Policy</i>	2008–2010
20	<i>Journal of Homeland Security & Emergency Management</i>	2008–2010

* Journals not accessible using subscribed databases.

** No issues published after 2005.

ministration journal. Additionally, other fields in the social sciences have used the JCRs as a basis for determining which journals to focus on when comparing research in their own field. For the reasons just outlined, the JCR was used, and subsequently its measures were included in determining measures such as quality and productivity. Table 2 provides the list and numerical distinction—as labeled for present research—for the journals relevant to public administration. The table also provides the years, beginning with 2006, for which the particular journals were included in the ranking.

An individual case is classified as a single journal article. *Articles* are defined as “peer-reviewed

publications that are considered to be an original manuscript focusing on conceptual scholarship.” These articles do not include opinion pieces, editorials, book reviews, or special invitations for individual scholars to respond or discuss a given topic. For each journal article, the investigators observed variables in measuring page lengths, authors’ institutional affiliation, and journal editor affiliation. All levels of career status were included and recorded for the authors (professor, assistant professor, associate, student, and other university position); government and private organizations were recorded but not included in this analysis. For those authors with multiple institutional affiliations, the first

TABLE 2. (continued)
Journals Present in Journal Citation Reports, 2006–2010

Journal Number	Journal Name	Years Ranked
21	<i>Journal of Policy Analysis & Management</i>	2006–2010
22	<i>Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory</i>	2006–2010
23	<i>Journal of Social Policy</i>	2006–2010
24	<i>Local Government Studies</i>	2007–2010
25	<i>Philosophy & Public Affairs</i>	2006–2010
26	<i>Policy & Politics</i>	2006–2010
27	<i>Policy Sciences</i>	2006–2010
28	<i>Policy Studies Journal</i>	2006–2010
29	<i>Public Administration</i>	2006–2010
30	<i>Public Administration & Development</i>	2006–2010
31	<i>Public Administration Review</i>	2006–2010
32	<i>Public Interest**</i>	2007
33	<i>Public Management Review</i>	2007–2010
34	<i>Public Money & Management</i>	2006–2010
35	<i>Public Personnel Management</i>	2007–2010
36	<i>Revista del Clad Reforma y Democracia*</i>	2010
37	<i>Review of Policy Research</i>	2010
38	<i>Review of Public Personnel Administration</i>	2010
39	<i>Social Policy Administration</i>	2009–2010
40	<i>Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences</i>	2010

* Journals not accessible using subscribed databases.

** No issues published after 2005.

institution was recorded as the primary affiliation. Whether an article was single author or published with coauthors was also noted. Journals were accessed using online e-library portals; for journals with restricted access, e-mails were sent to journal editors requesting access to the issues in reference. To further prevent inter-coder bias, uniform coding (see Table 1) was used. Furthermore, if variables required use of any discretion, the value was left blank for analysis.

For the time frame, because 2010 is the most recent JCR edition for the time of observation, data were collected from a five-year span between 2006 and 2010. Collection took place

only for the journals that can be found for a given report year. Thus the journals in Table 2 were recorded only for the years when they were presented in the reports. A five-year time frame was used to compensate for author mobility, promotion and tenure, and department turnover as well as for the length of time it may take for a journal to review, accept, and publish work (Kalaitzidakis et al., 2003, 2011; Towe & Wright, 1995). of the investigators recorded 1,078 academic institutions and 7,677 observations over the five-year time period (Table 3). The change over time can be attributed to the change in the number of journals included in the reports, as seen in Table 2.

METHODOLOGY

To properly analyze institutions for their productivity and quality, we created a complex index using the variables described in Table 1. We constructed the index as an additive, graduated index for a five-year period and developed individual indices for both quality and productivity. Each institution is given a score for each year of the five-year period and then aggregate scores are used to generate a final index for “institutional impact.” We briefly explain each of the individual indices—productivity and quality. Next, we demonstrate the calculation of a single-year index for institutional impact. Finally, we explain the five-year institutional impact index.

First, to create the index for quality, measures from both the article output— ART_{ij} —for a given institution, i , in a journal, j , for time t and the journal impact score are calculated. Here is the calculation for a single journal in a given year, t :

$$ART_{ijt} = (NOA_i/NOA_a)_{jt}$$

where

ART_{ijt} = Total articles credited to an institution in a journal at time t .

NOA_i = Number of authors for the same institution.

NOA_a = Number of authors for a given article.

$$JIS_{jt} = CIT_{jt}/(PUA_{jt-1} + PUA_{jt-2})$$

where

JIS_{jt} = Journal impact score for a given journal at time t (see following note).

CIT_{jt} = Times an article from the journal in year t was cited elsewhere.

PUA_{jt} = Number of published articles for the journal for a given year.

Note. The JIS variable is equivalent to the Impact Factor developed by the Journal Citation Reports (JCR). In the methodological section, the formula for its creation is presented to display the relationship between index calculations from this piece and the Impact Factor. This is not to be considered a new calculation, but it is important for demonstrating the process developed to generate this new ranking system.

$$Q_{it} = \sum(JIS_{jt} * ART_{ijt})_t$$

where

Q_{it} = Quality index score for an institution at time t .

The index score for each institution becomes a multiplicative score based on the articles an institution is credited with for a given journal and the journal impact score. Furthermore, a sum of all of these multiplicative scores for the same year is taken to generate the final quality index score— Q_{it} .

Second, the productivity index uses a measurement of article pages and an average page rate for a journal at a given time t (Coupe, 2003; Kalaitzidakis et al., 2003, 2011). To generate this index, the following calculations were taken:

$$PGS_{ijt} = \sum(PGS_a/NOA_{ia})_{jt}$$

where

PGS_{ijt} = Total pages credited to an institution for a journal at time t .

PGS_a = Pages for a given article.

NOA_{ia} = Number of authors for the same institution in a given article.

$$JAP_{jt} = (\sum(PGS_a)_{jt})/PUA_{jt}$$

where

JAP_{jt} = Average pages of an article for a journal at time t .

TABLE 3.
Number of Observations and Institutions, 2006–1010

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
Observations	1,159	1,323	1,568	1,627	1,955	7,677
Institutions Credited	421	442	493	507	568	1,078

$\sum(PGS_{aj})_t$ = Sum of pages in published articles for a given journal at time t .

$$P_{it} = \sum(PGS_{jit}/JAP_{jt})_t$$

where

P_{it} = Productivity score for an institution at time t .

Calculation for productivity is a division of the pages an institution is credited with for a given journal over that journal’s average pages per article. The sum of these calculations for all journals in a given year will provide the institutional productivity score— P_{it} .

Once each of the two indices is generated, it is possible to make comparisons between institutions regarding their productivity and quality for a single year. Both indices are in article units, but different weighting measures will illustrate a completely different result. Productivity becomes an output measure with reference to pages, and quality is based on an outcome measure regarding the content within those pages. This approach allows for distinction between institutions that produce in journals at various tiers. Further discussion about the analysis can be found in the analytical sections that follow.

As stated previously, a combination of these two indices would lead to the greater calculation of an institutional impact index— I_i . One calculation is necessary before creating the general index. This calculation creates a temporal institutional impact index for a single time t :

$$I_{it} = P_{it} + Q_{it}$$

Once this impact index is generated based on the productivity and quality scores for an institution in a given year, the final impact score may be calculated using a sum based on a graduated index over the previous five years. Thus, the final institutional impact index can be reflected on the following graduated calculation:

$$I_i = I_{it} + .8I_{i(t-1)} + .6I_{i(t-2)} + .4I_{i(t-3)} + .2I_{i(t-4)}$$

In the following analytical sections, we present results from the various indices. These results demonstrate the difference between institutions having greater productivity, quality, and impact on research in the field of public administration. We conclude this paper with a short discussion about the potential implications of these analyses.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS

For the purpose of this research, the following discussion focuses on the different breakdowns of productivity, quality, and annual impact rankings for each of the five years. These breakdowns assess the consistencies or outlying years of institutions and the influence on quality and productivity rankings. The tables provided—Tables 4 through 6—consist of the top 50 institutions based on the results from the final Institutional Impact (I_i) scores found in Table 7. In this section, we also discuss some observations.

An initial review of the rankings identified three main observations. First, rankings in productivity, although remaining mostly consistent, do fluctuate with respect to the total productivity value—Total P —even if one year of low productivity exists. Table 4 demonstrates that the top institutions for overall productivity (P_i)—especially the top 20—had to continue

TABLE 4.
Annual Breakdown of Institutional Productivity Rankings

Organization	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	P Total (P)	P Rank
University of Georgia	1	2	9	1	5	65.38	1
London School of Economics and Political Science	2	3	7	8	2	56.32	2
University of Manchester	4	4	11	2	12	46.54	3
Cardiff University	24	16	2	10	1	46.41	4
University of Birmingham	8	1	4	15	15	45.31	5
University of Wisconsin, Madison	3	6	3	14	13	43.21	6
Erasmus University	14	12	18	6	4	42.54	7
The Australian National University	11	15	1	9	22	38.37	8
American University	31	14	15	7	6	37.56	9
Indiana University	29	22	8	12	7	36.58	10
University of Oxford	27	8	30	16	11	34.03	11
University of Washington	5	9	33	20	24	33.77	12
University of Toronto	15	55	28	21	17	29.60	13
University of California, Berkeley	12	83	17	28	14	29.09	14
Texas A&M University	9	76	61	5	35	28.78	15
Georgia State University	23	5	99	43	18	28.76	16
Florida State University	34	13	21	23	32	28.03	17
University of Kansas	52	10	37	17	67	26.35	18
University of Michigan	10	78	60	75	9	25.51	19
Rutgers University	7	46	14	66	61	25.48	20
University of London	6	133	67	3	138	25.46	21
University of Warwick	43	31	27	4	202	25.36	22
Harvard University	33	43	118	33	8	25.09	23
Aarhus University	88	54	64	18	16	24.71	24
University of Edinburgh	18	25	6	401	44	24.13	25

* NP represents a year in which an institution had no publications in the journals observed

producing solid outputs in order to hold higher ranking. On the other hand, as Table 5 shows, institutions having dramatically poor years in quality rankings were not harmed as much in their overall quality (Q_i) scores.

A second observation regards the breakdown of international—non-U.S.—and American institutions. Upon initial review of the overall productivity (P_i) and quality (Q_i) scores as well as the final institutional impact (I_i) scores, we consistently observed a set of four American

institutions and six international institutions. These institutions were also found to remain highly consistent throughout the years in both quality and productivity rankings. Nine of the top 10 institutions in the final impact (I_i) scores found in Table 7 were in the top 10 for both quality and productivity.

Finally, it can be said that down years in overall impact rankings were mitigated as time progressed. An example is within the top 10. Institutions that were outside of the top 20

TABLE 4. (continued)
Annual Breakdown of Institutional Productivity Rankings

Organization	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	P Total (P)	P Rank
Free University, Amsterdam	36	24	5	136	43	24.13	26
City University of Hong Kong	47	77	311	11	10	23.96	27
Syracuse University	16	19	79	97	19	23.74	28
Arizona State University	48	29	20	26	68	23.00	29
Utrecht University	65	34	43	65	20	21.98	30
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	83	63	134	19	30	21.05	31
Monash University	97	40	26	58	45	20.55	32
New York University	25	53	29	106	60	20.34	34
University of Southern California	63	23	40	31	88	19.72	35
Columbia University	81	21	45	39	71	19.71	36
University of Oslo	20	36	24	107	133	19.68	37
Leiden University	30	26	19	177	76	19.64	38
Bocconi University	107	101	23	135	26	18.38	42
University of Sydney	62	158	36	34	56	18.29	43
The University of Queensland	70	123	38	78	27	18.17	44
George Mason University	94	51	92	44	42	18.16	45
University of Konstanz	76	356	13	22	164	18.07	46
University of Missouri, Columbia	21	81	91	69	57	17.99	47
University of Oklahoma	93	279	62	35	25	17.95	48
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	131	70	25	131	39	17.52	49
SUNY, Albany	109	18	31	104	114	16.65	51
University of Bern	111	35	NP	67	29	15.64	57
George Washington University	243	340	41	85	21	15.48	58
King's College London	NP	183	55	13	233	14.37	70
University of Exeter	401	91	121	56	46	13.67	75

* NP represents a year in which an institution had no publications in the journals observed

were able to move forward by improving their overall ranking in recent, consecutive years. This is largely due to the weighted nature of the index. However, it is important to note that recent success did not lead to a top ranking, but would assist only in upward movement. Therefore, consistency institutions would almost always keep a higher ranking over time.

ANALYTICAL CONCLUSIONS

Six preliminary analytical conclusions can be reached concerning the indexing, the impact

factor, and the relevance to academic institutions from this research. First, the nature of institutional productivity is much more dynamic over time. According to results from Table 4, productivity is highly subject to underproductive years. This finding illustrates that the productivity portion of the index is subject to the output—number of pages compared to the average page length of a journal—an institution will have. Furthermore, it shows that institutions receiving more credit for their work are more likely to enhance their

TABLE 5.
Annual Breakdown of Institutional Quality Rankings

Organization	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Q Total (Q)	Q Rank
University of Georgia	1	1	9	1	3	76.64	1
London School of Economics and Political Science	2	3	2	9	1	65.18	2
University of Wisconsin, Madison	3	4	1	3	4	61.34	3
American University	41	6	14	2	7	46.12	4
Cardiff University	19	11	19	16	2	44.97	5
Indiana University	18	16	6	4	8	44.70	6
University of Birmingham	10	2	17	25	15	43.59	7
University of Manchester	5	7	24	5	17	40.60	8
University of Oxford	20	10	22	15	9	39.11	9
Erasmus University	17	42	27	11	6	38.35	10
Harvard University	26	41	104	10	5	34.49	11
University of California, Berkeley	22	71	11	23	10	33.33	12
The Australian National University	32	19	13	12	28	33.27	13
New York University	15	13	8	131	14	32.53	14
University of Washington	7	14	32	22	23	32.06	15
University of Kansas	43	5	45	7	47	31.95	16
Aarhus University	39	29	30	18	12	30.64	17
Texas A&M University	6	115	42	6	48	30.13	18
SUNY, Albany	28	12	10	24	54	30.01	19
Rutgers University	9	23	18	35	34	29.28	20
Syracuse University	13	9	62	94	13	28.18	21
Georgia State University	14	8	61	39	36	27.16	22
Florida State University	44	32	25	19	30	27.00	23
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	36	63	102	8	29	25.98	24
Utrecht University	69	22	37	56	11	25.68	25

* NP represents a year in which an institution had no publications in the journals observed.

** Q Total (Q) is not a weighted measure like the final impact score (I), but an aggregate of quality scores for each year, 2006–2010.

productivity scores. This measure would include more single-author pieces or inner-institutional collaborations rather than network collaborations. Contrarily, institutional quality is a more static measure. Because this measure revolves around articles and the journal in which they are published, institutions with a higher propensity to publish in the highest ranking journals—based on their impact factor—are more likely to continue doing so and to have their work remain relevant over time.

A third conclusion revolves around the balance found in the institutional rankings for international and American institutions. Although some perceptions of a national bias are understood due to the tendency for journals to publish from particular institutions, the findings using this index do not demonstrate an inherent bias. With this said, the inclusion of more international journals obviously will increase the citations of international universities (and affect how specific countries and

TABLE 5. (continued)
Annual Breakdown of Institutional Quality Rankings

Organization	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Q Total (Q _i)	Q Rank
University of Michigan	4	78	40	73	24	25.40	26
University of Edinburgh	30	24	3	427	55	24.65	27
Free University, Amsterdam	54	35	5	116	51	23.95	28
University of Oslo	8	39	15	69	101	23.76	29
Arizona State University	40	34	21	26	90	23.25	30
University of Toronto	11	95	49	63	32	22.02	31
Columbia University	33	17	83	37	49	21.88	32
University of London	16	79	82	17	112	21.73	33
Leiden University	55	26	12	124	66	21.50	34
University of Konstanz	70	230	7	21	163	21.22	35
University of Southern California	45	15	105	44	45	20.80	36
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	110	33	20	113	33	20.52	37
George Mason University	97	18	136	41	25	20.42	38
University of Missouri, Columbia	12	76	79	70	44	20.23	39
University of Warwick	78	46	68	14	261	19.45	41
University of Exeter	340	47	121	27	26	18.97	42
University of Oklahoma	75	152	29	80	27	18.80	44
King's College London	NP	96	35	13	152	18.68	45
City University of Hong Kong	82	117	329	29	20	17.69	46
University of Bern	218	28	NP	59	19	16.39	50
University of Sydney	81	239	55	66	50	15.29	57
Bocconi University	138	304	53	156	22	14.64	60
Monash University	169	66	57	51	85	14.38	64
The University of Queensland	166	139	46	154	46	13.95	69
George Washington University	254	281	94	86	21	13.85	70

* NP represents a year in which an institution had no publications in the journals observed.

** Q Total (Q_i) is not a weighted measure like the final impact score (I_i), but an aggregate of quality scores for each year, 2006–2010.

universities are represented). This factor could serve as a possible limitation. However, though it may serve as a possible delimitation, this ranking serves as the initial attempt to expand beyond domestic rankings to an international level. The productivity rankings include a solid mix of institutions from all over the world. Also, the index itself is sensitive to consistency. If institutions continue to publish in higher ranking journals and produce yearly, they will stay atop the ranking index.

With respect to the index and in accordance with the relationship to consistency, it demonstrates the index is able to account for variances in output (P_i) and outcome (Q_i) measures while also valuing recent scholarly publications. As mentioned previously, an institution having greater output does not show a dramatic rise in the rankings unless it continues over multiple years.

Fifth, the use of an impact factor does provide relevant measures with respect to indexing and

TABLE 6.
Institutional Impact Annual Ratings

Organization	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
University of Georgia	1	1	8	1	3
London School of Economics and Political Science	2	3	2	10	2
Cardiff University	21	12	10	14	1
University of Wisconsin, Madison	3	4	1	5	8
American University	31	9	14	3	5
Erasmus University	14	22	23	8	4
Indiana University	26	21	7	6	7
University of Manchester	4	5	20	2	15
University of Birmingham	9	2	9	20	14
University of Oxford	24	8	25	16	9
The Australian National University	19	15	5	11	28
Harvard University	29	43	113	18	6
University of California, Berkeley	17	75	12	24	10
Aarhus University	57	40	41	17	12
University of Washington	5	10	27	22	26
Texas A&M University	7	85	52	4	40
University of Kansas	46	7	37	12	54
Florida State University	36	19	24	19	31
Georgia State University	16	6	75	37	25
Utrecht University	74	27	36	63	11
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	48	58	114	13	30
University of Toronto	11	61	30	31	22
Syracuse University	12	13	72	99	13
New York University	18	23	13	113	23
University of Michigan	6	76	51	74	16

ranking institutions. But it is crucial to understand that impact factor is not the sole measure for ranking institutions. Using the impact factor as a measure of quality only partially accounts for the true impact an institution might have on the field.

Finally, institutional impact as a measure of productivity and quality has been demonstrated as a tool for the future direction pursued by the field of public administration. Institutions and their research agendas generate that direction. Studying which insti-

tutions are leading the field is more relevant than merely a perception-based observation. It provides a picture of the landscape of public administration in the past, present, and toward the future. Rankings are not meant to be a power position, but a means of illustrating the issues that drive the future of public administration.

As we have demonstrated, the indexing undertaken by this research was conducted to provide a breakdown of the institutions and their various rankings—productivity, quality,

TABLE 6. (continued)
Institutional Impact Annual Ratings

Organization	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Rutgers University	8	32	19	48	45
City University of Hong Kong	60	87	333	21	17
Free University, Amsterdam	42	31	4	119	44
Arizona State University	41	34	21	25	79
SUNY, Albany	49	14	18	47	71
University of London	10	103	74	9	126
University of Warwick	54	41	40	7	227
University of Edinburgh	25	24	3	430	49
University of Oklahoma	81	208	39	54	29
George Mason University	88	30	112	40	33
Columbia University	47	20	62	33	55
University of Konstanz	77	292	11	23	160
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	121	48	22	117	37
University of Southern California	53	17	69	38	57
University of Exeter	387	59	121	34	34
Bocconi University	120	169	28	134	27
Leiden University	37	26	15	146	68
King's College London	NP	129	44	15	175
George Washington University	258	325	63	84	20
University of Bern	155	33	NP	66	24
University of Sydney	73	190	50	49	51
Monash University	124	49	33	57	63
University of Oslo	13	39	17	81	120
University of Missouri, Columbia	15	80	85	70	48
The University of Queensland	102	128	42	103	35

and impact—over time. Further use of this index can be expanded to include the impact of authors, gender changes, networks, and graduate student research over time.

DISCUSSION

In discussing the impact of this study, we first wish to point out some potential limits behind the research. Furthermore, we examine the potential impact on teaching and research within the field as it pertains to the research endeavors of academic institutions. Finally, we present some thoughts on future research.

Delimitation

We recognize that studying research productivity and quality in academia has several limitations. Although we have tried to take guidance from previously published research in this area, we also recognize that there is no tried-and-true method of studying this topic.

A potential limitation we recognize is that books are not included in this measure. Books in the field of public administration significantly affect the quality of research done in the field. However, the breadth and depth of books

TABLE 7.
Institutional Impact Final Rankings (Weighted)

Rank	Organization	Weighted I Score (li)
1	University of Georgia	86.99
2	London School of Economics and Political Science	76.49
3	Cardiff University	66.34
4	University of Wisconsin, Madison	64.68
5	American University	59.42
6	Erasmus University	57.33
7	Indiana University	57.14
8	University of Manchester	54.22
9	University of Birmingham	52.45
10	University of Oxford	49.45
11	The Australian National University	46.23
12	Harvard University	44.22
13	University of California, Berkeley	42.49
14	Aarhus University	39.92
15	University of Washington	39.32
16	Texas A&M University	37.75
17	University of Kansas	37.21
18	Florida State University	36.30
19	Georgia State University	33.82
20	Utrecht University	33.73
21	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	33.70
22	University of Toronto	33.03
23	Syracuse University	32.25
24	New York University	32.22
25	University of Michigan	31.86
26	Rutgers University	31.85
27	City University of Hong Kong	31.57
28	Free University, Amsterdam	29.77
29	Arizona State University	28.89
30	SUNY, Albany	28.46
31	University of London	28.44
32	University of Warwick	28.37
33	University of Edinburgh	28.18
34	University of Oklahoma	27.12
35	George Mason University	26.74
36	Columbia University	26.52
37	University of Konstanz	25.76

TABLE 7. (continued)
Institutional Impact Final Rankings (Weighted)

Rank	Organization	Weighted I Score (li)
38	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	25.72
39	University of Southern California	25.69
40	University of Exeter	25.12
41	Bocconi University	24.41
42	Leiden University	24.12
43	King's College London	24.07
44	George Washington University	23.91
45	University of Bern	23.64
46	University of Sydney	23.60
47	Monash University	23.41
48	University of Oslo	23.11
49	University of Missouri, Columbia	23.07
50	The University of Queensland	23.00
51	The University of Hong Kong	22.93
52	The Ohio State University	22.53
53	University College Dublin	22.45
54	University of Sussex	21.44
55	University of Copenhagen	21.05
56	University of Gothenburg	20.56
57	De Montfort University	19.98
58	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven	19.80
59	University of Illinois, Chicago	19.69
60	University of Colorado, Boulder	19.55
61	University of Twente	19.02
62	University of Ulster	18.83
63	University of Arizona	18.83
64	University of Amsterdam	18.61
65	Griffith University	18.60
66	University of York	18.56
67	European University Institute	18.30
68	Stockholm University	18.22
69	University of Sheffield	18.18
70	University of Nottingham	18.18
71	Yale University	18.03
72	Durham University	17.71
73	North Carolina State University	17.55
74	University of Kent	17.46

TABLE 7. (continued)
Institutional Impact Final Rankings (Weighted)

Rank	Organization	Weighted I Score (li)
75	University of Bath	17.12
76	University of Cambridge	17.00
77	University of Bremen	16.94
78	University of North Carolina, Charlotte	16.93
79	Babes-Bolyai University	16.92
80	University of Mannheim	16.88
81	University of South Carolina	16.74
82	University of Maryland, College Park	16.28
83	Tilburg University	16.17
84	Roskilde University	16.11
85	University of Texas, Dallas	15.86
86	University of British Columbia	15.81
87	University of Alabama, Birmingham	15.80
88	University of Essex	15.76
89	Delft University of Technology	15.65
90	Ghent University	15.59
91	University of Colorado, Denver	15.40
92	University of Central Florida	15.39
93	Simon Fraser University	15.34
94	University of Connecticut	15.16
95	Duke University	15.06
96	University of Haifa	14.99
97	Georgetown University	14.95
98	University of Montreal	14.68
99	Swedish National Defence College	14.67
100	University of Liverpool	14.58

published in any measured time frame would be too extensive for any study of research in any field. Another reason that we did not include books is the lack of a clear and standard ranking and tracking system such as the Journal Citation Reports (JCRs). Because of this limitation, we thought it best not to exclude books when doing this research.

Another potential limitation in this article is the lack of other journals that cover public

administration and yet are not included in the JCRs and that therefore are not in this article. Many excellent journals are geared toward public administration and subfields of public administration, such as public budgeting, public finance, public procurement, and public administration theory. Many great journals found in other social science fields such as sociology, education, political science, and economics also have a clear and distinctive impact on the field of public administration.

Due to the interdisciplinary nature of public administration, it can be hard to determine which journals make an impact and which ones do not in this field. Additionally, we felt it was not our place to declare or decide which journals were worthy enough to be included in this study. The listing of journals used was selected based on criteria from third-party editors through their selection process and determined criteria. Though imperfect, our listing does classify journals typically considered purely public administration as well as journals from other fields of study that arguably influence public administration. JCRs have been used in similar studies in other social science fields, so we must claim that some members of the academic community accept this resource.

Another limitation we would like to address is the focus on institutions rather than individual authors. We absolutely agree that individuals, not academic institutions, do research. However, for several reasons, we chose to classify institutions instead of individuals for this piece (please also see the future research section). First, academic institutions hire individuals, and in many cases the institution has intellectual property claims to the research done by the individuals. Second, published academic studies of this nature done in other social science fields, as mentioned in our literature review, have focused on institutions rather than individuals. Third, general rankings of academic research such as the Carnegie Foundation classification of research activity and the United Kingdom Government Research Assessment Exercise is done at the university level rather than the individual level.

In this paper, we attempt to rank universities for research in public administration, not public administration programs per se. Universities in other disciplines could potentially publish in public administration journals and therefore rank according to the criteria. Regardless, having other disciplines publishing could potentially be telling about

the future directions of public administration and the subsequent impact of other areas of study on the field of public administration.

As mentioned, we recognize that a study like this has several limitations. However, we have attempted to address all of the limitations we were able to foresee.

Research and Teaching

There has been a long-standing debate about the potential for success in research *and* teaching in higher education. The assumption has been that a trade-off exists between research and teaching (Astin & Chang, 1995). This trade-off is generated by an opportunity cost related to personal time management skills. Assuming that if a person researches more, he or she will be forced to teach less thus creates a dilemma with respect to institutional emphasis on either teaching *or* research. But the question truly becomes, are both endeavors possible (Astin & Chang, 1995; Clark, 1997)?

In contrast to the traditional assumption, a more progressive stance on institutional research is that it provides an alternative teaching method. According to Clark (1997), "If a line [dichotomous presentation] must be drawn, it must be drawn between research-based teaching and learning...and teaching and learning centered on codified material and lacking an inquiring attitude" (p. 252). This view presents research as a forward-thinking endeavor by which institutions might now generate academic curriculum. Thus, it can be said that the institutions ranked highly in research productivity and research quality are actually advancing the field in its curriculum, not just its theory.

Concurrently, the curriculum is also being shifted across the entire field. Although institutions will typically be the first to present their own scholars' findings,¹ the field will also begin to shift as these findings become more prominent. In the case of this research, the

prominence of such research can be seen through the institutional ranking. Granted, individual authors will receive credit for their work, but the institution as a whole can become the champion of the research by incorporating it into the teaching of its students (Clark, 1997). It can be said that an institutional and program curriculum strongly reflects the research conducted within that institution.

Therefore, with respect to research and teaching, this research aims to demonstrate the genuine potential for research within the field as more than a reputation-builder—but also a teaching tool. Although we do not mean to discount programs focusing on teaching, we believe that research within public Administration and public affairs must be honored for its ability to dictate future scholarship and future education within academic institutions.

Future Research

Although this study can give us a snapshot of the research being done in the field of public administration, there is still more to understand and examine. In the future, we hope to advance several other research projects based on this data. One is the study of collaboration between institutions and individuals in the United States as well as between the United States and other countries. As communication and transportation technology has advanced, so has researchers' ability to collaborate with others beyond their local community. Another future research project being explored is the descriptive makeup of public administration scholars who are publishing based on race, nationality, gender, faculty position, student affiliation, and geographic makeup. Additionally, future work can include not only academic institutions but also governmental and not-for-profit organizations as well as business and private organizations publishing within the field. Finally, as discussed previously with the implications on teaching and curriculum, this study might become a foundation for the examination of teaching public administration and public

affairs at research-heavy institutions as well as those that are more teaching-focused.

NOTE

- 1 In the case of public administration and public affairs programs, some examples include Policy Diffusion (Barry and Barry) at Florida State and Institutional Analysis and Design (Ostrom) at Indiana.

REFERENCES

- Adams, G. B., & White, J. D. (1994). Dissertation research in public administration and cognate fields: An assessment of methods and quality. *Public Administration Review*, 54(6), 565–576.
- Astin, A. W., & Chang, M. J. (1995). Colleges that emphasize research and teaching: Can you have your cake and eat it too? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Education*, 27(5), 45–50.
- Bernick, E., & Krueger, S. (2010). An assessment of journal quality in public administration. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 33(2), 98–106.
- Brewer, G. A., Douglas, J. W., Facer, R. L. II, & O'Toole, L. J. Jr. (1999). Determinants of graduate research productivity in doctoral programs of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 59(5), 373–382.
- Clark, B. R. (1997). The modern integration of research activities with teaching and learning. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68(3), 241–255.
- Cleary, R. E. (1992). Revisiting the doctoral dissertation in public administration: An examination of the dissertations of 1990. *Public Administration Review*, 52(1), 55–61.
- . (2000). The public administration doctoral dissertation reexamined: An evaluation of the dissertations of 1998. *Public Administration Review*, 60(5), 446–455.

- Corley, E. A., & Sabharwal, M. (2010). Scholarly collaboration and productivity patterns in public administration: Analysing recent trends. *Public Administration*, 88(3), 627–648.
- Coupe, T. (2003). Revealed performances: Worldwide rankings of economists and economic departments, 1990–2000. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1(6), 1309–1345.
- Douglas, J. W. (1996). Faculty, graduate student, and graduate productivity in public administration and public affairs programs, 1986–1993. *Public Administration Review*, 56(5), 433–440.
- Farber, M. P., Powers, P., & Thompson, F. (1984). Assessing faculty research productivity in graduate public policy programs. *Policy Sciences*, 16(3), 281–289.
- Forrester, J. P. (1996). Public administration productivity: An assessment of faculty in PA programs. *Administration and Society*, 27(4), 537–566.
- Forrester, J. P., & Watson, S. S. (1994). An assessment of public administration journals: The perspective of editors and editorial board members. *Public Administration Review*, 54(5), 474–482.
- Houston, D. J., & Delevan, S. M. (1990). Public administration research: An assessment of journal publications. *Public Administration Review*, 50(6), 674–681.
- Kalaitzidakis, P., Mamuneas, T. P., & Stengos, T. (2003). Rankings of academic journals and institutions in economics. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1(6), 1346–1366.
- . (2011). An updated ranking of academic journals in economics. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 44(4), 1525–1538.
- Kraemer, K. L., & Perry, J. L. (1989). Institutional requirements for academic research in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 49(1), 9–16.
- Laband, D., & Piette, M. (1994). The relative impact of economic journals. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 22(1), 77–88.
- Lan, Z., & Anders, K. K. (2000). A paradigmatic view of contemporary public administration research: An empirical test. *Administration and Society*, 32(2), 138–165.
- Legge, J. S. Jr., & Devore, J. (1987). Measuring productivity in U.S. public administration and public affairs programs 1981–1985. *Administration and Society*, 19(2), 147–156.
- McCurdy, H. E., & Cleary, R. E. (1984). Why can't we resolve the research issue in public administration? *Public Administration Review*, 44(1), 49–55.
- Morgan, D. R., & Meier, K. J. (1982). Reputation and productivity of public administration/affairs programs: Additional data. *Public Administration Review*, 42(2), 171–173.
- Morgan, D. R., Meier, K. J., Kearney, R. C., Hays, S. W., & Birch, H. B. (1981). Reputation and productivity among U.S. public administration and public affairs programs. *Public Administration Review*, 41(6), 666–673.
- Perry, J. L., & Kraemer, K. L. (1986). Research methodology in the public administration review 1975–1984. *Public Administration Review*, 46(3), 215–226.
- Rodgers, R., & Rodgers, N. (2000). Defining the boundaries of public administration: Undisciplined mongrels versus disciplined purists. *Public Administration Review*, 60(5), 435–445.
- Schroeder, L., O'Leary, R., Jones, D., & Poocharoen, O. (2004). Routes to scholarly success in public administration: Is there a right path? *Public Administration Review*, 64(1), 92–105.
- Stallings, R. A., & Ferris, J. M. (1988). Public administration research: Work in PAR, 1940 to 1984. *Public Administration Review*, 48(1), 580–587.
- Towe, J. B., & Wright, D. J. (1995). Research published by Australian economics and econometrics departments: 1988–93. *The Economic Record*, 71(1), 8–17.
- Watson, D. J., Hassett, W. L., & Handley, D. M. (2005). The ASPA journals: Who is publishing? *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 11(1), 53–60.

White, J. D. (1986). Dissertations and publications in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 46(3), 227–234.

White, J., Adams, G. B., & Forrester, J. P. (1996). Knowledge and theory development in public administration: The role of doctoral education and research. *Public Administration Review*, 56(5), 441–452.

Wright, B. E., Manigault, L. J., & Black, T. R. (2004). Quantitative research measurement in public administration: An assessment of journal publications. *Administration and Society*, 35(6), 747–764.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Adam M. Williams is a PhD candidate at Florida Atlantic University specializing in public procurement research. His research focus is on exploring innovative procurement strategies and decision making. In Fall 2014, he will begin his appointment as an assistant professor with Kennesaw State University.

Derek R. Slagle is a PhD candidate in the School of Public Administration at Florida Atlantic University. He is also a researcher at the University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, where his focus is on public policy and injury prevention/health promotion initiatives. His primary research focus is on epistemology, inquiry, and research methods in public administration.

Darrin Wilson is a PhD candidate in the School of Public Administration at Florida Atlantic University. His research focuses on local economic development, local government budgeting, and their interaction. His teaching assignments have included quantitative methods and program evaluation.