

Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

Amadu Jacky Kaba

Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work, Seton Hall University, South Orange, USA
Email: kabaamad@shu.edu

Received 21 December 2014; accepted 27 March 2015; published 9 April 2015

Copyright © 2015 by author and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

This study examines the profile of the contributors of full-length articles to the *American Sociological Review* (ASR) in 2010. Examining over a dozen variables, the study compared the findings with both the 2010 regular issues of the *American Economic Review* (AER) and the *American Political Science Review* (APSR). Although substantial gender and racial inequalities are observed in all three journals and the disciplines that own those journals, the ASR tends to have more gender and racial representations. Some explanations are provided for this finding. For example, in 2010 women accounted for 29 (36.3%) of the 80 contributors of all full-length articles to the ASR, but only 28 (12.6%) out of 222 contributors to the AER, and 11 (13.9%) of 79 contributors to the APSR. Among other findings in the data are that the ASR tends to publish articles of scholars based in North America. Scholars in a selected group of private and public institutions in the United States tend to have more influence in the pages of the ASR. The most common degree earned by contributors to the ASR is the Ph.D., with over 9 out of every 10 of them having at least one. The North-east and Midwest regions of the United States awarded almost two-thirds of all degrees earned by contributors to the ASR, and the South awarded only 7 (8.7%) of all degrees. The Northeast and Midwest also employed 53% of the contributors to the ASR.

Keywords

Sociology, Economics, Political Science, Journals, Employment, Degree Attainment, Gender, Race, Prestige, Elitism, Region

1. Introduction

Scholarly journals play a very important role in academia. Publishing in a particular journal or in certain journals can serve as a means to explain many important facts about individuals in society. For example, just ob-

servicing the table of contents, including the names of authors of full-length articles in a particular scholarly journal can lead one to make a good guess as to the types of institutions (and their prestige levels) the author or authors might be employed at or their actual job titles/positions; the type of institutions (and their prestige levels) where they earned their highest or terminal degrees; the education level of their parents; their socioeconomic status in society; their nationality or country of residence; their gender, ethnicity, religious background, and race; or whether they are among the most cited scholars in their disciplines and in other disciplines.

Within the higher education system of the United States, in the social sciences, one could extract these three sister academic fields or disciplines, economics, political science and sociology and make the claim that a significant number of the scholars in all three disciplines tend to fit the descriptions above because the top rated journal for each, *American Economic Review* (AER), *American Political Science Review* (APSR), and the *American Sociological Review* (ASR) have enormous influence in their disciplines, in and outside of the social sciences, and in society in general (Allen, 2003; Baldi, 1998; Bott and Hargens, 1991; Burris, 2004; Eliason, 2008; Hargens, 1991; Hesli and Lee, 2011; Jacobs, 2005, 2007, 2011; Kaba, 2013a: pp.1-4; 2013b: pp. 54-55; Keith and Babchuk, 1998; Lyytinen et al., 2007; Oromaner, 1977, 1986; Paxton and Bollen, 2003: pp. 73-74; Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft, 2006; Stephan, 2012).

Pertaining to the *American Sociological Review*, Jacobs (2005) points out that since 1936, the ASR has been the American Sociological Association's official journal, replacing the *American Journal of Sociology* in this capacity. Articles published in the ASR going back to its first volume, "... have helped to shape the discipline" (p. 1). Oromaner (1977) points out that sociologists in academia tend to publish in different scholarly journals. Many of these journals are more prestigious, while others are less prestigious. Some of these journals are within the discipline of sociology, while others are interdisciplinary. Some of these journals are regional, while others are national. Some of these journals are more specialized, while others are general. Yet, among all these different types of journals, three "core" journals in sociology tend to stand out among the rest: the *American Sociological Review* (ASR), the *American Journal of Sociology* (AJS), and *Social Forces* (SF). They tend to be the most prestigious and most cited within American sociology. Publishing an article (s) in any of these journals can contribute significantly to one's career and personal life, partly because of the satisfaction of knowing that as much as 70% to 80% of other papers submitted to them are rejected. One can also become known to other sociologists or social scientists, and most importantly to employers. "Finally, such publications may be a necessary or even sufficient condition for employment, promotion, and increased monetary rewards" (p. 34; also see Oromaner, 1986). According to Eliason (2008), the primary mission of scholars or academics is research. Universities make it part of their mission seek and amass new knowledge. For an individual or a college or university to advance in academia, they must publish. For a scholar to seek and keep a good reputation in academia, he or she must publish articles in scholarly journals or books (p. 51).

The scholars who publish in these three journals are not just very influential in academia, but they also have enormous influence over the United States federal government and the international community and in some instances tend to leave academia for a particular period and take high level positions in the federal government or international organizations. For example, sociologist David R. Harris, who was a professor at Cornell University, and has published articles in the ASR, worked for the first administration of President Barack Obama from 2010 to 2011, serving as the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Services Policy at the US Department of Health and Human Services. As of July 1, 2012, Dr. Harris is Provost and Senior Vice President at Tufts University. Economist Joseph E. Stiglitz, a University Professor at Columbia University, and 2001 Nobel Prize winner in Economics, who has published at least 43 full-length articles in the *American Economic Review* by 2012, served as "Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers (Member of Cabinet), 1995-1997" for President Bill Clinton. In political science, the late political scientist and Distinguished University Professor at Indiana University, Elinor Ostrom (1933-2012), who died in the summer of 2012, and who published several articles in both the *American Political Science Review* and the *American Economic Review*, was a 2009 Nobel Prize winner in economics. She pointed out in her Curriculum Vitae in a section entitled: "Consulting and Overseas Activities" the following contributions she made to entities in the United States and abroad: that she made many visits to Norway and Sweden; conducted field research in Nepal, Nigeria, Kenya, Australia, Bolivia, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Philippines, Poland, and Zimbabwe; worked on a decentralization project in Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Bangladesh from 1988 to 1991; consultant to the US Congress' Office of Technology Assessment; consultant to the state of California from 1973 to 1974; conducted research at the Center for Interdisciplinary Research, Univer-

sity of Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany, from January to August in 1981, and also from January to August in 1988¹.

This study examines the profile of contributors of full-length articles to the *American Sociological Review* in 2010. Why only the ASR in 2010 and not from 2005 to 2010 or from 2000 to 2010, etc.? The answer is that my original intent was to examine the profiles of contributors of full length articles to the *American Economic Review* (AER), *American Political Science Review* (APSR), and the *American Sociological Review* (ASR) combined for the year 2010 and attempt to explain any similarities and differences among them. These three social science disciplines (Economics, Political Science and Sociology) share so many similar characteristics that many studies have focused on either all three of them (or their three top journals) or any two of them, or refer to them (Agarwala and Teitelbaum, 2010; Burris, 2004: pp. 257-260; Butler et al., 2008; Ginther and Kahn, 2004: pp. 208-209; Hargens, 1991: p. 347; Jacobs, 2007: pp. 105, 128; Nelson and Brammer, 2010; Paxton and Bollen, 2003). In addition, it is very common for the scholars in these three disciplines to publish in any of these three journals. For example, sociologist Lawrence Bobo at Harvard University has published articles in both the ASR and the APSR. Economist Ebonya Washington at Yale University has published articles in both AER and APSR. Economist William Darity Jr., at Duke University has published articles in both the AER and ASR. Political scientist Bruce Russett at Yale University has published articles in both AER and APSR (at least 12 articles in APSR by August 2012). Also, as already noted above, the late political scientist, Elinor Ostrom published articles in both the AER and APSR.

However, after over 2500 hours of compiling and computing various relevant data of over a dozen variables on all of the more than 620 contributors of full-length articles to these three journals in 2010, I realized that a single study would be too large since I am the only or sole scholar doing all of this self-funded research. So I decided to break them up into three different studies focusing on each journal and will make some comparisons for selected variables when necessary, such as gender, race, geographic location, etc., starting with this current study.

The primary reason for conducting this study is to give the general public an idea of the profile or academic or professional background of the contributors to these three influential journals and for the public to make sense of what these findings mean. Another important reason for doing this study is to share my findings with my young students and inspire them to set higher academic goals for themselves. Finally, this study attempts to explain to the general public that while there is still a very visible gender gap in sociology, including publishing in the ASR and other top sociology journals, compared to economics and political science, women and minorities are gradually progressing in the discipline of sociology.

This study begins by presenting some theoretical perspectives on both gender and racial inequalities in higher education, including in these three disciplines and their three top journals. Next, the methodology, data reliability, and limitations section is presented. Next the study presents the findings or results and some analysis. Finally the study presents a discussion and conclusion section to make some sense of the findings or results.

2. Theoretical Perspectives

There are many important similarities among the factors responsible for both gender and racial inequalities in education, the economy, politics, etc. As a result, one can utilize any number of conceptual or theoretical perspectives to serve the dual purposes to explain both gender and racial inequalities. In this section, five such mostly interrelated theoretical perspectives are utilized to explain these two important inequalities. They are: Human Capital Theory; Social Capital Theory; Cultural Capital Theory; Reproduction Theory; and Identity Theory.

2.1. Human Capital Theory

The Human Capital theory has been utilized to explain why individuals, families, groups or categories of people or whole societies, nations and continents are more economically successful than others. This theory focuses more on educational attainment or acquiring specialized skills. Individuals that invest in education or specialized skills tend to get rewards from such investments. Hesli and Lee (2011) point out that: “human capital addresses

¹Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Elinor “Lin” Ostrom (August 7, 1933-June 12, 2012). Indiana University. Retrieved on January 27, 2013 from: <http://www.indiana.edu/~workshop/people/lostromcv.htm>.

any contextual or individual attributes that could potentially influence the quality of an individual's research skills or training" (p. 393). Human capital theory has been noted to be a contributing factor as to why women and minorities, especially Blacks publish fewer articles in top ranked scholarly journals, such as the *American Sociological Review*, *American Economic Review* and the *American Political Science Review* (Kaba, 2013a: pp. 5-10). Discussing gender inequality in US colleges and universities, Goltz (2005) points out that research has found that it is due to the "...differences in men and women's investments in human capital, such as experience and education..." (p. 764). Pertaining to minorities, Hesli and Lee (2011) write that: "... questions are sometimes raised about whether an individual's status as a minority within academia (e.g., being a member of an underrepresented ethnic or racial group...) affects his or her ability to publish or likelihood of publishing ..." (p. 339; also see Kaba, 2013a: pp. 5-10).

2.2. Social Capital Theory

Social Capital theory is related to Human Capital theory in that, those with Human Capital in the form of high levels of education or specialized skills, are in a position to either form or join exclusive networks, which provide members with certain important benefits. In the case of publication in top scholarly journals, co-authorship among White males or majority of White males comprising the editorial boards of these top journals is a result of social capital.

Martin (2009) explains social capital as the different family and community institutions that encourage the attainment of education. Parents and their children experience quality interactions "... and intergenerational closure—when parents maintain close contacts with the parents of their children's friends and classmates—as forms of social capital that provide information channels, norms, trust, and effective sanctioning" (p. 186). Huang et al. (2009) note that social capital is an advantage that one acquires from being part of social affiliations or networks. Being part of particular networks can result in important benefits "This means that the higher the number of relationships consisting of prestigious ranking, such as experienced and trustworthy partakers, the more valuable the relationship" (p. 7; also see Kaba, 2013a: pp. 5-10). Pertaining to gender and advancement in the professoriate, Hesli et al. (2012) point out that theorists have claimed that as a result of the lack of access to the college related and social networks where one finds employment knowledge or information, women have less of the resources that are necessary to be able to attain tenure and promotion. These resources include "information and knowledge about institutional norms, expectations, and opportunities; access to and influence on key decision makers; certification and endorsement of an individual's qualifications; and emotional support and recognition" (p. 477; Kaba, 2013: pp. 5-10).

2.3. Cultural Capital Theory

This brings us to Cultural Capital theory, which is also related to both human capital and social capital. On November 10, 2013, Tim Teeman (2013) writes an article in the *New York Times* about a late prominent American intellectual and author named Gore Vidal. In the article, Teeman writes: "On the ceiling of the Hollywood Hills home were paintings by Paolo de Matteis, an 18th-century Baroque artist, which Mr. Vidal had hung in La Rondinaia, his home in Ravello, Italy... A study room contained Mr. Vidal's work, neatly shelved: the 25 novels and the 26 nonfiction works, including his celebrated and controversial essays. (He also wrote 14 screenplays and eight stage plays.)" (p. 1). Tim Teeman is attempting to illustrate that the late Gore Vidal had accumulated a substantial amount of cultural capital and in the article his nephew who was interviewed, is perceived to have benefited from his uncle's cultural capital.

According to Yamamoto and Brinton (2010), absorbing cultural capital at an early age can further improve the human capital of an adolescent. Parents in the upper-middle class in the United States have been known to give a lot of cultural opportunities to their children in elementary school. This then contributes to the advantages that those children have in education. Yamamoto and Brinton (2010) add that recent qualitative studies have showed "... that kindergarteners and first graders from high socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds are more likely to participate in cultural activities and cultural lessons..." (p. 67; also see Kaba, 2013a: pp. 5-10). Cheng (2006) claims that cultural goods are taught to be made up of tangible and intangible things of cultural importance, such as buildings of a society's heritage, particular sites or locations "... works of arts (e.g., paintings, sculptures), literature and music, etc. There is a stock of cultural goods, denoted as cultural capital, which is in-

herited from the past and there is an ongoing process of creating new cultural goods...” (p. 264; also see Kaba, 2013a: pp. 5-10). Kingston (2001) points to research claiming that the cultural characteristics or behaviors of the dominant class within society tend to influence schools, whereby these schools respond to or reflect this class. This means that school children coming from elite families are thoroughly socialized at home to the culture of their class and tend to exhibit the habits or frame of mind that are already institutionalized in schools are rewarded by the schools for their cultural position. As a result, cultural capital can be “institutionalized, i.e., widely shared, high status cultural signals (attitudes, preferences, formal knowledge, behaviors, goals, and credentials) used for social and cultural exclusion” (p. 89; also see Kaba, 2013a: pp. 5-10). Kraaykamp and Eijck (2010) note that studies that have examined cultural reproduction have measured the: “... effects of parental cultural capital in its institutionalized (education) as well as its embodied (cultural participation or taste) state on children’s educational attainment” (p. 209; also see Kaba, 2013a: pp. 5-10). Summarizing the relationship among these three theories from a gender point of view, Leahey et al. (2008) note that:

“...social scientists have identified a male advantage in various forms of capital—human, social and cultural—that are relevant to professional careers. Relative to women, men have different types of human capital, including different content to their degrees and more specialized training.... With regard to social capital, men have not only better social networks, but tend to invoke them more freely than women... and this also helps explain variation in men’s and women’s career patterns. Women and men also possess different amounts and perhaps kinds of what we now call cultural capital... and cultural proficiency is critical to workers’ occupational futures” (pp. 1273-1274; also see Hilmer and Hilmer, 2007; Kaba, 2013a: pp. 5-10).

Discussing Black Americans seeking law degrees and their transition to the law profession, Feagin and Sikes (1994) point out that they experience a social barrier, which causes them to be treated differently later in their profession. This is due to their lack of connections and access to the kind of social knowledge needed to succeed. “Many white employers may not even realize that a black candidate has been excluded from the cultural socialization necessary to make it in the profession” (p. 142; also see Kaba, 2013a: pp. 5-10).

The word inheritance is central in these three theories. Parents, communities, networks, etc. can transmit their statuses to those who come after them. This is part of what is happening in these three disciplines of sociology, economics and political science, including their three top journals, whereby younger White males are nurtured by their older group members and they in turn inherit their privileged positions in academia. One way this nurturing happens is through the award of various types of grants and research assistantships in doctoral programs. For example, women and Black Americans in particular are among those most impacted when it comes to the primary funding of the 2012 doctoral degree recipients in the United States. Of 1935 Black doctorate degree recipients in 2012, 10.9% were awarded teaching assistantships; 20.8% of Whites; 18.2% of those who are more than one race; 18.1% of Hispanics; 16.2% of Asians; 22.7% of temporary visa holders; and 19.5% of US citizens and permanent residents. It was 20.5% each of men and women.

For research assistantships or traineeships, only 13% of Blacks were awarded; 12.4% of American Indians or Alaskan Natives; 31.8% of Asians; 24.3% of Whites; 23.2% of those who are more than one race; 17.7% of Hispanics; 49.1% of temporary visa holders; and 23.7% of US citizens and permanent residents. It was 36.8% of men and 25.6% of women.

For fellowships or grants, it was 32.2% of Blacks; 37.3% for Hispanics; 37.1% of those who are more than one race; 36.1% of American Indians or Alaskan Natives; 36% of Asians; and 28.9% of Whites. For women, it was 29.2%, and 26.1% for men.

However, when it comes to using their own resources to pay for their education, Black Americans paid the highest proportion: 39.4%; 36.1% of American Indians or Alaskan Natives; 23.7% of Hispanics; 21.3% of Whites; 18.3% of those who are more than one race; 12% of Asians; 21.7% of US citizens and permanent residents; and 3.5% of temporary visa holders².

2.4. Reproduction Theory

Reproduction theory also pertains to inheritance. Specifically, it pertains to any particular group (gender, class, race, etc.) within society inheriting or occupying positions once held by their members before them. In the con-

²Source: Compiled by author from “TABLE 35. Doctorate recipients’ primary source of financial support, by broad field of study, sex, citizenship, race, and ethnicity: 2012 (Percent),” Doctorate Recipients from US Universities: 2012. Retrieved on January 26, 2014 from: http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/sed/2012/data_table.cfm.

text of publishing in these three journals, this theory could be at play too. This is because the female scholars and minority scholars today, especially Blacks, are experiencing a very similar situation as their group members before them 10 years to 70 years ago, who too could barely publish or not publish at all in these three journals. So in graduate school, post-doctoral fellowships, or as instructors or assistant professors, they are aware that their papers are highly unlikely to be accepted in these three top journals, and will rather find other outlets respectable enough, and that may have actually been established to cater to their research. In an article on gender, education and feminist reproduction theory, Dillabough (2003) explains Bourdieu's (1998) belief about masculine domination in society by writing that he:

"...believed that questions about the nature of masculine domination can be identified to greater or lesser degrees in all social fields. However, he also argued that masculine domination is the most influential in social institutions in which the maintenance of the social order is a key national project. Consequently, he pointed particularly to education as a central ideological site for the reproduction of gender inequality. For nearly three decades, feminist reproduction theorists have been centrally concerned with the ways in which our "categories of understanding" about sex and gender reproduce a fundamentally constant, if fluctuating, gendered division of labor, embodied in public consciousness and asserted through class relations in education" (p. 376).

Dillabough (2003) continues by pointing to research claiming that: "... despite the assertion of liberal claims of access and equal opportunity, white middle-class girls and boys continue to dominate higher echelons of academic achievement and the labor market" (p. 377). Ballantine and Hammack (2012) also note of how: "...working class students learn to cope with boredom in schools, which enables them to endure a life of boredom on the job. They learn through the hidden curriculum that they are 'written off' in the education system..." (pp. 212-213). This can be observed in the level of education of the 2012 doctorate degree earners in the United States, whereby higher proportions of women and minorities, especially Black Americans have relatively high college debt and their parents also tend to have relatively low rates of college degrees. The mean cumulative (Undergraduate & Graduate) debt of the 2012 doctoral recipients in the United States showed that Black Americans have the highest amount of debt, \$54,132; \$43,150 for American Indians or Alaskan Natives; \$34,176 for Hispanics; \$30,743 for those who are more than one race; \$25,992 for Whites; and \$14,866 for Asians. A gender breakdown shows that it was \$24,120 for women and \$19,203 for men³.

Black Americans who earned their doctorates in 2012 were among those groups whose parents have lower rates of bachelor's and advanced degrees, and high rates of only high school diploma or less. The same is also observed for women. For example, 43.2% and 37.7% of the fathers and mothers, respectively of Black doctoral degree recipients in 2012 had high school diplomas or less; 19.5% and 22.3% of Whites; 19.7% and 25.8% of those who are more than one race; 21% and 32.4% for Asians; 37.8% and 44.7% of American Indians or Alaskan Natives; and 37.4% and 39.7% of Hispanics. It was 24.3% and 29.1% for women and 25.8% and 33.4% for men.

For bachelor's degrees, 15.4% and 16.9% of the fathers and mothers, respectively of Black American doctoral degree recipients in 2012 had earned one; 25.1% and 28.3% of Whites; 27.8% and 30.3% of Asians; 21.5% and 24.2% of those who are more than one race; 24.4% and 19.1% of American Indians or Alaskan Natives; and 19.7% and 20.6% of Hispanics. It was 26.2% and 27.4% for women and 26.6% and 27.4% for men.

For advanced degrees, 21.3% and 22% of the fathers and mothers, respectively of Black American doctoral degree recipients in 2012 had earned one; 43% and 32.5% of those who are more than one race; 41.5% and 30.9% of Whites; 41.6% and 24.9% of Asians; 28.4% and 22.3% of Hispanics; and 14.4% and 13.8% of American Indians or Alaskan Natives. For women, it was 35.4% and 26.3%, and 35.6% and 24.2% for men⁴.

2.5. Identity Theory

Finally, Identity theory, which could be said to be similar to Reproduction theory, is a contributing factor to the lack of women and minorities as authors in these three sister top journals. According to Hogg et al. (1995): "Identity Theory...explains social behavior in terms of the reciprocal relations between self and society" (p.

³Source: Compiled and computed by author from "TABLE 40. Education-related debt of doctorate recipients, by sex, citizenship, race, and ethnicity: 2012," Doctorate Recipients from US Universities: 2012. Retrieved on January 26, 2014 from: http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/sed/2012/data_table.cfm.

⁴Source: Compiled by author from "TABLE 33. Educational attainment of doctorate recipients' parents, by sex, citizenship, race, ethnicity, and broad field of study: 2012," Doctorate Recipients from US Universities: 2012. Retrieved on January 26, 2014 from: http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/sed/2012/data_table.cfm.

256). Hogg et al. (1995) add that identity theory "...address the social nature of self as continued by society, and eschew perspectives that treat self as independent of and prior to society...regard the self as differentiated into multiple identities that reside in circumscribed practices (e.g., norms, roles)..." (p. 255). Bertrand (2010) presents a definition of identity "...as one's sense of self, or one's sense of belonging to one or multiple social categories. One's identity encompasses a clear view about how people that belong to that category should behave" (pp. 1572-1573; also see Stets and Carter, 2011; Troyer, 2005).

In the context of publishing in these three journals, gender comes into play whereby men and women are supposed to focus on gender specific professions. Minorities, especially Blacks, are expected to know their place and enter into appropriate professions. This is the reason why women are still discriminated against in their efforts to become president of the United States or US Senator, and why a half Black president, Barack Obama is still not recognized by many as a legitimate president of the United States. So there are White males who dominate the pages of these three top journals or their editorial boards, who might believe that women and minorities do not belong in them: that they would feel a loss of their masculinity or manhood if they co-authored with women or allow women to publish in these three top journals; or that by allowing Blacks and other minorities to publish in them, the journals will lose their "pure" or "superior" White racial character.

Katsurada and Sugihara (2002) write: "According to the gender schema theory... people's gender typing is the result of gender-schematic processing. Gender-schematic persons tend to process information, including information about themselves, according to the culture's definitions of masculinity and femininity" (p. 250). This gender schema theory claims that there is an interconnectedness of phenomena that are related to gender: "... gender-personality type, gender attitudes, and gender-related behaviors" (p. 250; also see Lester, 2008). Katsurada and Sugihara (2002) point to research that claims that: "...masculine men tended to have discriminatory attitudes toward women more frequently than others, but such a tendency was not found among feminine women" (p. 250). Bertrand (2010) explains gender identity and occupational segregation and the issue of women enlisting in the Marines:

"...we put ourselves in the shoes of a woman Marine. Because Marines are essentially all viewed as men, a woman in this occupation may feel discomfort as her decision to become a Marine is in conflict with the behavioral prescription for her gender category (only men, not women are Marines). This could explain why women have been slow at entering male professions, despite financial incentives to do so. Moreover, male Marines may feel the need to tease or mistreat the woman Marine, as accepting her as a co-worker threatens their own gender identity, which reinforces woman's reticence to enter this male profession. Note that in this last implication, the identity model can be regarded as a micro-foundation for reduced form discrimination models,... which assumes that people from one group have a dislike for working with people from another group..." (p. 1573).

All five of these theories explained above could be observed in the various statistics compiled, computed and presented in this study. These five theories could help explain why by 2010 so few women published in these three journals even though they have made substantial progress in educational attainment, and in the case of sociology, despite being regarded as the "female discipline" compared to the other two disciplines of economics and political science. The same claim can be made of minorities too, especially Blacks, despite the tremendous gains they have made in educational attainment in recent decades.

3. Methodology, Data Availability and Limitations of the Study

Some information in this methodology section are the same as the methodology sections of the sister studies on the 2010 *American Economic Review* (Kaba, 2013a: pp. 11-13), and the 2010 *American Political Science Review* (Kaba, 2013b: pp. 56-57). I decided to conduct this study in early January 2012. Until early October 2012, I intended to compare the similarities and differences of the profile of the contributors of full-length articles in all 2010 issues of the *American Economic Review* (AER), the *American Political Science Review* (APSR), and the *American Sociological Review* (ASR) combined. Oromaner's (1977) study of three prominent sociology journals (*American Sociological Review*, *American Journal of Sociology* and *Social Forces*) focused on full length articles: "All full-length articles appearing during 1960 in the three core journals were selected for analysis" (p. 35). However, after over 2500 hours spent compiling and computing the data for all 2010 issues of these three journals, I realized that doing them all in one study would be too large. So I decided to break them into three different studies and compare or contrast them. The findings in this particular study are compared with the findings in the other two sister studies (limited only to the regular issues) since they utilize the same variables.

I created over a dozen variables. They are: gender/sex; racial/cultural background; job title/position; institution/organization of employment; department/unit of employment; US and world regions of employment; US state/country of employment; numbers and types of highest or terminal degrees earned; academic major or field of earned highest or terminal degree; institution of graduation with highest or terminal degree; US state/country where earned highest or terminal degree institutions are located; US and world region where earned highest or terminal degree institutions are located; and year of highest or terminal degree attainment.

There are 80 contributors and none of them published more than one article for all six issues of the 2010 *American Sociological Review*. For the Race variable, I utilized the racial classifications of groups in the United States, but for any scholar or professor with Native American and White ancestry (such as Spanish ancestry from Spain or European), I classified her or him as Mestizo. As for the definition of the term Mestizo, [Burchard et al. \(2005\)](#) claim that "...intermarriage between Spanish Christians and Native Americans, the progeny of which were called *Mestizos*..." (p. 2162). Pertaining to who is White, Black and Asian in the United States, individuals with blood ancestry from Europe and selected Asian nations and regions, such as the Middle East (such as Arab nations including those in North Africa, Israel, Iran, Turkey, Central Asia etc.) are categorized as White, while anyone with visible Black African heritage or blood is Black. Also, individuals from Asian nations such as China, North and South Korea, Bangladesh, Japan, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and all Southeast Asian nations are categorized as Asian ([Gans, 2012](#); [Glazer, 2001](#); [Kaba, 2008a: pp. 73-75, 2010, 2011a, p. 3, 2011b; Morning, 2000, 2005](#); "[Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity](#)," 1995; [Yancey, 2003](#)). According to the United States Office of Management and Budget, "The term "Black" in Directive No. 15 refers to a person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa." For who is White: "In Directive No. 15, the "White" category includes persons having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East" ("[Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity](#)," 1995). It is useful to note that these classifications are for this study only and do not claim that this is how these contributors and professors self-identify.

For the institution or organization of employment and job titles/positions of all of the contributors, I continued to update many of them until early November 2012. The reason is that these contributors tend to move from one institution or organization to another and also move up in rank through promotions during the academic year. I combined contributors who do not directly work for academic departments and post-doctoral fellows under the category of Researcher/Post Doctoral Fellow (Post Doc.).

For the category of Lecturer, it includes an instructor at a college or university in the United States, or the equivalent of an assistant or associate professor in the United Kingdom or elsewhere.

For the department or organization of employment, I combined all of the different types of names of the entities where they teach. For example, they include: Department, College, Faculty, Group, Division, School, Center, Unit, etc (also see study by [Price, 2009: p. 333](#) who utilized "Department/Unit"). [So the emphasis here is the entity in which they teach, not what they are teaching.](#) After considerable thought, I also included the department of enrollment of the 6 graduate students (4 women and 2 men) in this section. The primary reason is that I could not be certain that these 6 graduate students do not do part-time work for those departments, including working on research projects for the entire department or for specific professors or serving as teaching assistants with a salary. It is very common for graduate students, especially Ph.D. students to do research work for pay with their professors because this is one important way for those professors to learn first-hand about their temperament, behavior, level of discipline or seriousness, skill level, and ability to work with others or in a group. In addition, these students are usually full-time, which means that their enrollments in those departments become their full-time job. The employment data focus on primary positions held.

The region of employment data is for the four official geographic regions of the United States (Midwest, Northeast, South, and West; see [Appendix A](#)) and the United Nations classifications of countries and regions of the world (see [Appendix B](#)). For the US states, Washington, D.C. is counted as a state equivalent.

For the earned degrees section, I only utilized the highest degree or terminal degree of the contributors. For example, there are graduate students who published full-length articles in *ASR* in 2010, but still officially have only a bachelor's degree, or contributors who are not graduate students, but have a bachelor's degree or a masters' degree. That is why the phrase "highest or terminal degree" is utilized. For this study, each of the 80 contributors has one highest or terminal degree.

The institutions where these degrees are earned are also compiled and computed. The states and regions in the United States and countries and regions in the world of these institutions are also compiled and computed. Fi-

nally, I also compiled and computed the year that each degree is earned. The years ranged from 1968 to 2012.

To obtain the data for all of the variables, I conducted extensive research including the curriculum vitae (CVs) of the contributors on their institutions'/organizations' websites, personal websites, newspaper and magazine articles about them, their Wikipedia pages, dissertations, etc. It is possible that all of the data compiled on these contributors may not be accurate. However, I spent thousands of hours as the only or sole scholar or researcher to carefully compile and compute these data for all three journals and I checked and rechecked them several times for the best possible accuracy. Some studies on rankings of economics departments or economics journals in the past several years, for example, have also utilized the internet to compile data. For example, in a study ranking economics departments in the world, Amir and Knauff (2008) note that their "data were collected in April 2006 directly from the Web sites of the relevant departments" (p. 185; also see Hilmer and Hilmer, 2010).

4. Findings/Results and Analysis

4.1. Gender/Sex, Race, and Title/Rank of Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

Tables 1-3 present data on the gender and racial/cultural composition and job titles or positions of contributors

Table 1. Gender/Sex of contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010 (all six issues) N = 80.

Gender/Sex	Number	%
Male	51	63.7
Female	29	36.3
Both Sexes	80	100

Source: Compiled and computed by author based on data provided by the *American Sociological Review*, 2010. Volume 75, Issues 1 to 6. <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/by/year/2010>; Articles also accessed on ProQuest Academic Search Engine.

Table 2. Gender/Sex of contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010 (all six issues) N = 80.

Race	% of			% of			Total	Total	%
	Male	%	Total	Female	%	Total			
White	44	86.3	55	25	86.2	31.3	69	86.3	
Eastern Asian	5	9.8	6.3	4	13.8	5	9	11.3	
Southern Asian	1	2	1.3	0	0	0	1	1.3	
Black	1	2	1.3	0	0	0	1	1.3	
Total	51	100.1	63.9	29	100	36.3	80	100.2	

Source: Compiled and computed by author based on data provided by the *American Sociological Review*, 2010. Volume 75, Issues 1 to 6. <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/by/year/2010>; Articles also accessed on Pro Quest Academic Search Engine. Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table 3. Job Titles/Positions of contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010 (all six issues) N = 80.

Job Title/Position	% of			% of			Total	Total	%
	Male	%	Total	Female	%	Total			
Full Professor	23	45.1	28.8	4	13.8	5	27	33.8	
Associate Professor	9	17.6	11.3	6	20.7	7.5	15	18.6	
Assistant Professor	13	25.5	16.3	10	34.5	12.5	23	28.8	
Lecturer	3	5.9	3.8	2	6.9	2.5	5	6.3	
Instructor	0	0	0	1	3.5	1.25	1	1.3	
Researcher/Post Doc	1	2	1.3	2	6.9	2.5	3	3.75	
Graduate Student	2	3.9	2.5	4	13.8	5	6	7.5	
Total	51	100	64	29	100	36.3	80	100	

Source: Compiled and computed by author based on data provided by the *American Sociological Review*, 2010. Volume 75, Issues 1 to 6. <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/by/year/2010>; Articles also accessed on ProQuest Academic Search Engine. Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

of full-length articles to all 6 issues of the *American Sociological Review* in 2010. Whether compared to its two closer sister disciplines, economics and political science, and all other disciplines in and out of the social sciences, women continue to be underrepresented in sociology, especially in the publication of articles in the *American Sociological Review*. However, compared to economics and political science, women are significantly more represented. For example, [Ginther and Khan \(2004\)](#) point out in their study that “Among all science and social science disciplines analyzed, gender differences in the probability of promotion and the duration to tenure are the largest in economics” (p. 208). Pertaining to the production of Ph.D. graduates, [DiFuccia et al. \(2007\)](#) point out that “...with the exception of psychology, sociology produces the most women with terminal degrees” (p. 4).

Examining gender, race and bachelor’s and terminal degree attainment rates in these three disciplines, sociology awards the highest proportions. For example, according to [Nelson and Brammer \(2010\)](#), in the United States, in 2005, female “B.S. recipients” accounted for 31.5%, 51%, and 70.5% in economics, political science and sociology, respectively (pp. 14-16). According to [Nelson and Brammer \(2010\)](#), in 2005, White males accounted for 49.7%, 38.2% and 19.5% of B.S. recipients in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively (p. 17). Pertaining to the rates of Underrepresented Minorities (UMRs) and Asians, according to [Nelson and Brammer \(2010\)](#), in 2005, URMs accounted for 13.1%, 20.8% and 28.7% of “B.S. Recipients” in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively (p. 5). In 2005, Blacks accounted for 6.4%, 10.3% and 17% of B.S. degrees in economics, political science and sociology, respectively; for Hispanics, 6.3%, 9.7%, and 10.7% in economics, political science and sociology, respectively; for Native Americans, 0.4%, 0.7%, and 1% in economics, political science and sociology, respectively; and for Asians, 18%, 7%, and 6.9% in economics, political science and sociology, respectively ([Nelson and Brammer, 2010: pp. 6, 12](#)).

Examining terminal degree attainment rates in the United States, [DiFuccia et al. \(2007\)](#) note that: “The proportion of female doctorates [in sociology] between 1970 and 1997 increased by 152%, from 21.5% to 53.1%. Economics (29.4%) and political science (34.2%) grant far fewer women the PhD...” (p. 4). In 2001, there were 236 males and 330 females who earned doctorate degrees in sociology; 665 males and 260 females earned doctorate degrees in economics; and 444 males and 214 females earned doctorate degrees in political science. By 2011, those figures increased to 254 for males and 402 for females who earned doctorates in sociology; 737 males and 387 females earned doctorates in economics; and 390 males and 296 females earned doctorates in political science⁵. In 1973, 445 sociology Ph.D.s were awarded to males, and 154 Ph.D.s were awarded to females ([DiFuccia et al., 2007: p. 14](#)).

According to [Nelson and Brammer \(2010\)](#), for Ph.D. recipients, from 1996 to 2005, White males accounted for 55.1%, 51%, and 29.9% in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively (p. 17). [Nelson and Brammer \(2010\)](#) note that in 2005 URMs represented 10.7%, 13.9%, and 19.2% of Ph.D. recipients in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively (p. 5).

For Blacks, from 1996 to 2005, they accounted for 3.9%, 8%, and 9.5% of Ph.D. recipients in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively; for Hispanics, 4.3%, 4%, and 5.9% in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively; for Native Americans, 0.2%, 0.7%, and 1% in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively; and for Asians, 13.6%, 5.2%, and 6.6% in economics, political science and sociology, respectively ([Nelson and Brammer, 2010: pp. 6, 12](#)). In 2011, of the 489 doctorates awarded in political science and government to citizens and permanent residents in the United States, Whites accounted for 374 (76.5%); Asians, 36 (7.4%); Blacks, 28 (5.7%); Hispanics, 24 (4.9%); those who are two or more races, 10 (2%); other or unknown race, 13 (2.7%); and American Indian and Alaskan Native, 4 (0.8%). In 2011, of the 509 doctorates awarded in sociology to citizens and permanent residents in the United States, Whites accounted for 367 (72%); Asians, 31 (6.1%); Blacks, 40 (7.9%); Hispanics, 47 (9.2%); those who are two or more races, 18 (3.5%); other or unknown race, 4 (0.8%); and American Indian and Alaskan Native, 2 (0.4%). In 2011, of the 429 doctorates awarded in economics/econometrics to citizens and permanent residents in the United States, Whites accounted for 313 (73%); Asians, 63 (14.7%); Blacks, 17 (4%); Hispanics, 24 (5.6%); those who are two or more races, 6 (1.4%); other or unknown race, 5 (1.2%); and American Indian and Alaskan Native, 1 (0.2%)⁶.

Women and minorities also tend to be more represented among faculty in sociology than in political science

⁵Table 17. Doctorate Recipients, by Sex and Major Field of Study: 2001-11,” 2012. Doctorate Recipients from US Universities: 2011. Retrieved on December 15, 2012 from: http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/sed/2011/data_table.cfm.

⁶Table 22. Doctorate Recipients, by Citizenship, Race/Ethnicity, and Subfield of Study: 2011,” 2012. Doctorate Recipients from US Universities: 2011. Retrieved on December 15, 2012 from: http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/sed/2011/data_table.cfm.

and economics. According to Nelson and Brammer (2010), in Fiscal Year 2007, female professors in the United States accounted for 15.1%, 25.5%, and 39.7% of economics, political science, and sociology, respectively in the Top 50 departments. In the Top 100 departments, in Fiscal Year 2007, female assistant professors accounted for 30.8%, 37% and 56.1% of economics, political science, and sociology, respectively; for associate professors, females accounted for 20.3%, 29.3%, and 45.7% in economics, political science, and sociology respectively; and for full professors, females accounted for 8.7%, 17.6%, and 28.2% in economics, political science, and economics respectively; and for all professors, females accounted for 16.3%, 26.1% and 39.8% in economics, political science and sociology, respectively in the Top 100 departments (pp. 14-16).

According to Nelson and Brammer (2010), in Fiscal Year 2007, White males accounted for 69%, 65.3%, and 48.7% of all faculty in Top 100 departments in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively; for assistant professors, White males accounted for 46.2%, 51.2%, and 30.1% in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively; for associate professors, White males accounted for 65.2%, 61.4%, and 43% in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively; and for full professors White males accounted for 80.1%, 76.2%, and 61.3% in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively (p. 17). According to Nelson and Brammer (2010), in Fiscal Year 2007, Whites accounted for 71.4%, 65.7%, and 50.2% of all faculty in Top 50 departments in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively; for assistant professors, White males accounted for 49.5%, 53.6%, and 31.2% in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively; for associate professors, White males accounted for 68%, 60%, and 45.3% in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively; and for full professors White males accounted for 81.5%, 75.6%, and 61.8% in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively (p. 18).

Nelson and Brammer (2010) point out that in Fiscal Year 2007, URM professors accounted for 5.7%, 6.9%, and 12.9% in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively (p. 5). For Blacks, they accounted for 1.8%, 4.2%, and 7.9% of faculty in Top 100 economics, political science, and sociology departments, respectively; for Hispanics, 4%, 2.9%, and 5.2% in economics, political science, and sociology departments, respectively; for Native Americans, 0.1%, 0.2%, and 0.4% in economics, political science, and sociology departments, respectively; and for Asians, 13.6%, 5.6%, and 6.1% in economics, political science, and sociology, respectively (Nelson and Brammer, 2010: pp. 6, 12).

DiFuccia et al. (2007) note that: “At present, the number of women employed in academic sociology positions does not indicate that the discipline has been fully integrated. Women are not equally represented at all academic ranks. In fact, it’s quite the opposite” (pp. 5-6) The authors add that within the discipline, figures from the American Sociological Association show that women accounted for 37.8% of full, associate and assistant professors combined. When Instructors are included, women accounted for 38.3 percent. In 2000/2001, women accounted for an estimated 32% all tenured faculty and 53% of tenure-track faculty in sociology. “Despite the increased presence of women in the discipline, they have not yet attained equal representation with men at the level of associate or full professor” (pp. 5-6).

DiFuccia et al. (2007) present a table (Table 2) entitled “Distribution of female tenured and tenure-track faculty in the top 50 graduate programs in sociology (2007)” showing the rank number, University, total tenured faculty, total female tenured faculty, percent female, Tenure-track hires, female tenure-track hires, and percent female. Data are not available for 4 institutions: Princeton University, CUNY Graduate School University Center, the University of Massachusetts—Amherst, and Michigan State University. There are 964 total tenured faculty and females accounted for 307 (32%), and there are 293 tenure track hires, with females accounting for 165 (56%). A group of highly selective private and public universities dominate the list. I identified 23 out of the 46 institutions with total tenured faculty data with 20 or more faculty members. For those with 30 or more total tenured faculty, the University of Wisconsin—Madison, the top ranked institution, has 45, with only 10 (22%) females; University of California, Los Angeles ranked number 8, has 40, with 10 (25%) females; Penn State University ranked number 17, has 31, with 5 (16%) females; and the University of Texas, Austin, ranked number 14, has 30, with 8 (27%) females. I identified 7 out of the 46 institutions with double figure tenure track hires: 15, with 9 (60%) females at the University of Wisconsin—Madison; 14, with 7 (50%) females at Texas A&M University—College Station (ranked number 49); 14, with 5 (36%) females at the University of Notre Dame (ranked number 49); 12, with 6 (50%) females at the University of Texas, Austin; 10, with 5 (50%) females at the University of Pennsylvania (ranked number 11); 10, with 6 (60%) females at the University of California, Irvine (ranked number 27); and 10, with 4 (40%) females at Florida State University (ranked number 42) (pp. 9-10; also see pp. 11-12 for a similar list of liberal arts programs in sociology in the United States).

In this current study, according to **Table 1**, of the 80 contributors of full length articles to the *American Sociological Review* in 2010, males accounted for 51 (63.7%) and females accounted for 29 (36.3%). For comparative purposes, of the 222 different contributors of full-length articles to all four regular issues of the 2010 *American Economic Review*, women accounted for 28 (12.6%) (Kaba, 2013a: p. 54). For the *American Political Science Review*, of the 79 different contributors of full-length articles to all 4 regular issues in 2010, women accounted for 11 (13.9%) (Kaba, 2013b: p. 59).

4.2. Racial/Cultural Background of Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

According to **Table 2**, of the 80 contributors to the ASR in 2010, Whites accounted for 69 (86.3%); Eastern Asians accounted for 9 (11.3%); and 1 (1.3%) each is Black and Southern Asian. Combined, Asians accounted for 10 (12.5%) and minorities accounted for 11 (13.8%).

For males, Whites accounted for 44 (86.3% of all males, and 55% of total); 5 (9.8% of all males, and 6.3% of total) are Eastern Asian; and 1 (2% of all males, and 1.3% of total) each is Black and Southern Asian. For females, Whites accounted for 25 (86.3% of all females, and 31.3% of total); and 4 (13.8% of all females, and 5% of total) East Asians (**Table 2**).

For the AER, of the 222 different contributors of full-length articles to all 4 issues in 2010, Whites accounted for 199 (89.6%); 12 (5.4%) are Eastern Asian; 9 (4.1%) are Southern Asian; and 1 (0.45%) each is Southeastern Asian and Mestizo (Kaba, 2013a: p. 54). For the APSR, of the 79 contributors of full-length articles in 2010, Whites accounted for 74 (93.7%); 2 (2.5%) each are Eastern Asian and Black and 1 (1.3%) Mestizo (Kaba, 2013b: p. 59).

4.3. Job Titles/Positions of Contributors to the *American Economic Review*, 2010

Table 3 shows that Full Professors accounted for 27 (33.8%) of all 80 contributors to the ASR in 2010; Assistant Professors accounted for 23 (28.8%); Associate Professor accounted for 15 (18.6%); Graduate Students accounted for 6 (7.5%); Lecturers accounted for 5 (6.3%); Researchers/Post Docs. accounted for 3 (3.75%); and 1 (1.3%) is an Instructor.

For males, Full Professors accounted for 23 (45.1% of all males, and 28.8% of total); 13 (25.5% of all males, and 25.5% of total) are Assistant Professors; 9 (17.6% of all males, and 11.3% of total) are Associate Professors; 3 (5.9% of all males, and 3.8% of total) are Lecturers; 2 (3.9% of all males, and 2.5% of total) are Graduate Students; and 1 (2% of all males, and 1.3% of total) is a Researcher/Post Doc. For females, 10 (34.5% of all females, and 12.5% of total) are Assistant Professors; 6 (20.7% of all females, and 7.5% of total) are Associate Professors; 4 (13.8% of all females, and 5% of total) each are Full Professors and Graduate Students; 2 (6.9% of all females, and 2.5% of total) each are Lecturers and Researchers/Post Docs.; and 1 (3.5% of all females, and 1.25% of total) is an Instructor (**Table 3**).

For the AER, of the 224 job titles or positions held by 222 different contributors, Full Professors accounted for 118 (52.7%); 38 (17%) Associate Professors; 30 (13.4%) Assistant Professors; 29 (13%) Researchers/Post Docs.; 2 (0.9%) each were Lecturers and Readers; and 1 (0.45%) each was a CEO, Creative Editor, Graduate Student, Manager, and Vice President (Kaba, 2013a: p. 54). For the APSR, of the 79 different contributors of full-length articles in 2010, Full Professors accounted for 27 (34.2%); 25 (31.6%) Assistant Professors; 23 (29.1%) Associate Professors; 2 (2.5%) Graduate Students; and 1 (1.3%) each for Researcher/Post Doc. and Tutor (Kaba, 2013b: p. 60).

4.4. Institution and Department of Employment of Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

Both the department and the institution in which it is located are usually the focus in studies ranking departments either in sociology, its two closest sister disciplines of economics and political science, or other fields in and outside of the social sciences. However, as we shall learn later, a university might not be ranked in the Top 30 among institutions in the country or the world, but its sociology department could be ranked in the Top 10 or Top 25 among sociology departments in the country or in the world. On the other hand, a university might be ranked in the Top 5 or Top 10 in the country or the world but its sociology department might not be in the Top 5

or Top 10. This is because those doing the rankings tend to focus on any set of variables or criteria, which might lead to an institution being ranked high or low. Furthermore, there are certain universities such as Harvard University, Yale University or Princeton University that tend to have any of their departments ranked very high by many different ranking studies or entities. Among United States colleges and universities, in the three social science disciplines of sociology, economics and political science, there are a set of institutions that have their departments ranked on top almost all of the time regardless of the variables examined or criteria of the study. These institutions are also among those that award the most number of doctorates in the social sciences. Among the criteria or variables examined in these ranking studies are prestige or reputation, number of scholarly articles published, especially in “top journals”, number of citations of the scholars in a department, size of faculty, number of graduate students and number of doctorates awarded annually, number of new doctorate recipients immediately employed at top ranked universities or colleges, and endowment of an institution (Amir and Knauff, 2008; Nelson and Brammer, 2010; Burris, 2004; DiFuccia et al., 2007; “Economics: Ranked in 2009”⁷; Eliason, 2008: pp. 51-52; Hinshaw and Siegfried, 1995; Kaba, 2009, 2012; Keith and Babchuk, 1998; Marwell, 2012; Paxton and Bollen, 2003; Oprisko, 2012; “Sociology: Ranked in 2009”⁸; “Table 4. Top 20 doctorate-granting Institutions,” 2012⁹; “Top 100 QS World University Rankings for Sociology 2011,” 2011¹⁰; Weakliem et al., 2012).

Pertaining to the prestige or reputation of departments, including the colleges and universities in which they are located, Burris (2004) points out that a large amount of scholarly research has illustrated that the prestige of an academic department is very important for the career chances of scholars in academia. Employers in colleges and universities consider the prestige of the department where potential applicants earned their doctoral degrees as the most important factor for employment. In many different academic disciplines, research has shown that there is a high correlation between the prestige of where an applicant earned her or his doctoral degree and the department where he or she is employed. This is especially the case for their first job (p. 239). According to Eliason (2008), a scholar’s ability to publish scholarly articles or books on a consistent bases improves their prestige, and is also a major factor that tends to determine where their “...employment will be within the prestige hierarchy of the discipline... Departments are also ranked according to the number of articles and books their faculty produce... A greater number of publications leads to greater scholarly prestige” (pp. 51-52).

Burris (2004) presents a table (Table 1) entitled: “Prestige Rankings of Sociology Departments, 1925-1993” covering 7 different years (1925, 1934, 1957, 1964, 1969, 1981, and 1993) ranking only the top 8 sociology departments (Top 6 departments for 1925, and Top 5 departments for 1934, and the rest are Top 8 departments). The Top 6 in 1925 are the University of Chicago, Columbia University, the University of Wisconsin, Madison, the University of Minnesota, the University of Michigan, and Harvard University. The Top 5 rated alphabetically in 1934 were Columbia University, the University of Chicago, the University of Minnesota, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and the University of Wisconsin, Madison. The Top 8 in 1957 are: Harvard University, Columbia University, the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, Cornell University, the University of California, Berkeley, the University of Minnesota, and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. The Top 8 in 1964 are the University of California, Berkeley, Harvard University, Columbia University, the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Cornell University, and Princeton University. The Top 8 in 1969 were the University of California, Berkeley, Harvard University, the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, Columbia University, the University of Wisconsin, Madison, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and the University of California, Los Angeles. The Top 8 in 1981 are: the University of Chicago, the University of Wisconsin, Madison, the University of Michigan, the University of California, Berkeley, Harvard University, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Columbia University, and Stanford University. Finally, the Top 8 in 1993 are: the University of Chicago, the University of Wisconsin, Madison, the University of California, Berkeley, the University of Michigan, the University of California, Los Angeles, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Harvard University, and Stanford University (p. 241).

⁷“Economics: Ranked in 2009,” 2012. *US News and World Report*. Top Economics Schools. Retrieved on December 28, 2012 from: <http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-humanities-schools/economics-rankings>.

⁸“Sociology: Ranked in 2009,” 2012. *US News & World Report*. Retrieved on December 28, 2012 from: <http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-humanities-schools/sociology-rankings>.

⁹“TABLE 4. Top 20 doctorate-granting institutions ranked by number of doctorate recipients, by broad field of study: 2011,” 2012. Doctorate Recipients from US Universities: 2011. Retrieved on December 15, 2012 from: http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/sed/2011/data_table.cfm.

¹⁰“Top 100 QS World University Rankings for Sociology 2011,” 2011, September 6. *The Guardian* (UK). Retrieved on January February 1, 2013 from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/higher-education-network/2011/sep/06/top-100-world-university-rankings-sociology-2011>.

Table 4. Institution of employment of contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010 (all six issues). N = 79 positions at 49 Institutions. No data available for 1 female contributor.

Institution	% of			% of				
	Male	%	Total	Female	%	Total	Total	%
University of California-Los Angeles	4	7.8	5.1	1	3.57	1.27	5	6.33
Ohio State University	3	5.9	3.79	1	3.57	1.27	4	5.1
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	4	7.8	5.1	0	0	0	4	5.1
University of Wisconsin-Madison	2	3.92	2.53	2	7.14	2.53	4	5.1
Princeton University	2	3.92	2.53	1	3.57	1.27	3	3.79
University of California-Irvine	2	3.92	2.53	1	3.57	1.27	3	3.79
University of Massachusetts-Amherst	1	1.96	1.27	2	7.14	2.53	3	3.79
Columbia University	2	3.92	2.53	0	0	0	2	2.53
Emory University	2	3.92	2.53	0	0	0	2	2.53
Florida State University	2	3.92	2.53	0	0	0	2	2.53
Harvard University	2	3.92	2.53	0	0	0	2	2.53
Stanford University	2	3.92	2.53	0	0	0	2	2.53
SUNY, Albany	1	1.96	1.27	1	3.57	1.27	2	2.53
University of Chicago	0	0	0	2	7.14	2.53	2	2.53
University of Maryland-College Park	1	1.96	1.27	1	3.57	1.27	2	2.53
University of Oregon	2	3.92	2.53	0	0	0	2	2.53
University of Texas-Austin	2	3.92	2.53	0	0	0	2	2.53
University of Washington-Seattle	1	1.96	1.27	1	3.57	1.27	2	2.53
Ben-Gurion University	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
Boston University	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
Coe College	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
California State University-Sacramento	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
Cornell University	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
Duke University	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
Franklin College	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
Indiana University-Bloomington	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
Kansas State University	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
Northeastern University	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
North Central College	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
Northwestern University	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
SUNY, Buffalo	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
Tel Aviv University	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
Texas A & M University	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
Trinity College	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
United States Census Bureau	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
University of Arizona	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
University of Colorado-Boulder	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
University of Illinois	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
University of Iowa	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
University of Kansas	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
University of Minnesota-Minneapolis	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
University of Southern California	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
Upper Iowa University	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27

Continued

University of Pennsylvania	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
Washington State University-Pullman	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
Washington State University -Vancouver	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27
Yale University	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27
Total	51	99.9	64.69	28	99.96	35.53	79	100.2
No Data	0	0	0	1			1	

Source: Compiled and computed by author based on data provided by the *American Sociological Review*, 2010. Volume 75, Issues 1 to 6. <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/by/year/2010>; Articles also accessed on ProQuest Academic Search Engine. Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

According to Paxton and Bollen (2003), ratings by the National Research Council and the *US News and World Report* have become the standard used to determine the quality of academic departments in colleges and universities in the United States. The ratings of departments by these two entities exemplify the emergence of the stratification of departments and institutions within the higher education system of the United States. Individuals such as students and faculty, and departments benefit with high ratings. The prestige of the institution that awards a doctoral degree is connected to the first academic job of the graduate. Colleges and universities across the United States tend to distribute more of their resources such as salaries to prestigious departments. As a result, the departments with high ratings within institutions receive more funding, and the students and faculty in those departments benefit (pp. 71-72; also see pp. 73-74; Weskliem et al., 2012: pp. 310-320).

Marwell's (2012) study focuses on the following sociology departments at these 6 universities for the years 1957, 1964, 1980, and 1995: the University of California, Berkeley, Harvard University, Columbia University, the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, and the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and points out that apart from their dominance in higher education, they experienced changes in their prestige or reputational rankings from 1950 to 1980. The University of Wisconsin, Madison, increased in rankings substantially, while Harvard University and Columbia University experienced a visible decline, and the other three kept their ranking positions. The University of Wisconsin, Madison, increased in the rankings from #12 in 1957 to #6 in 1962, to #2 in 1980, and remained #1 or #2 in the past two decades. Harvard University and Columbia University were ranked #1 and #2, respectively in 1957. In 1995, however, Harvard University was ranked #7 and Columbia University was ranked #12 (p. 296). According to Keith and Babchuk (1998), scholars have spent substantial amount of time to examine the relationship between scholarship and prestige from a micro-level angle, focusing on individuals as the focus of their research. "Within this framework, research has established the association between departmental prestige and scholarly recognition... as well as the prestige of the students' doctoral programs on subsequent career patterns" (p. 1496; also see p. 1499).

Discussing the institutions that dominate the American Economic Association's annual meeting programs and the pages of the *American Economic Review*, Hinshaw and Siegfried (1995) point out that one can examine the trends in the clustering of the institutions that employ the scholars who are the most frequent participants in the AEA program in a number of ways. One such way is to focus attention on the ten most dominant institutions whose faculty made the most presentations during the AEA meetings from 1980 to 1989. The institutions include: University of California, Berkeley, University of Chicago, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, Stanford University, University of Wisconsin, Madison, and Yale University. The authors claim that, "These ten remained the same between the 1970s and 1980s" (p. 157). The research by Oprisko (2012) examined the dominance of the American Political Science discipline by many of these same institutions¹¹.

According to the *US News & World Report*, the Top 25 sociology departments in the United States in 2009 are: 1) University of California—Berkeley; 2) University of Wisconsin—Madison; 3) Princeton University, and the University of Michigan—Ann Arbor; 5) Harvard University, Stanford University, University of Chicago, and the University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill; 9) Northwestern University and University of California—Los Angeles; 11) Columbia University, Indiana University—Bloomington, and University of Pennsylvania; 14) Duke University, New York University, and the University of Texas—Austin; 17) Cornell University, Ohio State University, and the University of Washington; 20) Pennsylvania State University—University Park, Uni-

¹¹Oprisko, Robert (2012) December 3. "Superpowers: The American Academic Elite," Georgetown Public Policy Review. Retrieved on January 25, 2013 from: <http://gppreview.com/2012/12/03/superpowers-the-american-academic-elite/>.

versity of Arizona, University of Maryland—College Park, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities, and Yale University; and 25) Brown University¹². However, the Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) “Top 100 QS World University Rankings for sociology 2011” have 13 US institutions in the Top 25 and there are substantial differences in rank order: 1) Harvard University; 2) UC Berkeley; 3) University of Oxford; 4) University of Cambridge; 5) University of Chicago; 6) Stanford University; 7) UCLA; 8) Yale University; 9) Columbia; 10) London School of Economics and Political Science; 11) University of Toronto; 12) Princeton University; 13) Australian National University; 14) University of Michigan; 15) McGill University; 16) National University of Singapore and the University of British Columbia; 18) University of Wisconsin—Madison; 19) Massachusetts Institute of Technology; 20) The University of Melbourne; 21) The University of Manchester; 22) Peking University; 23) New York University; 24) Cornell University; and 25) The University of Sydney¹³.

The total endowment of an institution plays an important role in the prestige or reputation of an institution because these institutions can afford to recruit top faculty and invest in the most modern scientific instruments needed for teaching and research. This is the advantage that most of the universities listed above have over others. For example, as of 2007, the endowments of the following institutions with \$5 billion or more are as follow: Harvard University, \$34.634 billion; Yale University, \$22.53 billion; Stanford University, \$17.2 billion; Princeton University, 15.8 billion; University of Texas System, \$15.6 billion; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, \$9.9 billion; Columbia University, \$7.15 billion; University of Michigan, \$7.1 billion; University of Pennsylvania, \$6.64 billion; Texas A & M System, \$6.59 billion; Northwestern University, \$6.5 billion; University of California System, \$6.44 billion; University of Chicago, \$6.2 billion; University of Notre Dame, \$5.98 billion; Duke University, \$5.9 billion; Washington University in St. Louis, \$5.57 billion; Emory University, \$5.56 billion; and Cornell University, \$5.4 billion (Kaba, 2012: pp. 27-29).

4.5. Institution of Employment of Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

In this current study, **Table 4** shows that 79 of the 80 contributors to the *ASR* in 2010 have primary employment at 49 different academic institutions. There is no employment information available for 1 female contributor. Of the 79 contributors, 7 institutions employed 3 or more: 5 (6.33%) at the University of California-Los Angeles; 4 (5.1%) each at the Ohio State University, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. For males, of the 51 contributors, 3 institutions employed 3 or more: 4 (7.8% of all males and, and 5.1% of total) each at the University of California-Los Angeles, and the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill; 3 (5.9% of all males, and 3.79% of total) at the Ohio State University. For the 28 female contributors, 3 institutions employed 2 (7.14% of all females, and 2.53% of total) each: University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, and the University of Chicago (**Table 4**).

For the *AER*, the 222 different contributors to all 4 regular issues in 2010 held a total of 224 positions (two scholars in Europe held two positions each) at 121 institutions and organizations and the following 11 institutions have 4 or more: University of California-Berkeley, 10 (4.5% of 224 total); Harvard University, 9 (4%); University of Chicago, 7 (3.1%); Columbia University, Stanford University, Princeton University and Yale University, 6 (2.7%) each; Brown University, 5 (2.2%); and Indiana University, University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Pompeu Fabra, 4 (1.8%) each (Kaba, 2013a: pp. 55-58).

For the *APSR*, the following 17 institutions have 2 or more contributors: Yale University, 9 (11.3% of all 79), Harvard University and the University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign, 4 (5%) each; Florida State University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of California—San Diego, and the University of Chicago, 3 (3.8%) each; and Dartmouth College, Duke University, Northwestern University, Rice University, University of California-Merced, University of Oxford, University of Rochester, University of Wisconsin—Madison, University of Virginia, and Indiana University—Bloomington, 2 (2.5%) each (Kaba, 2013b: 61-63).

4.6. Department/Unit of Employment of Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

There are 79 contributors (51 males and 28 females) with positions in 18 departments/units. There are no available data for 1 female contributor. Of the 79 contributors 56 (70.9%) are in the Department of Sociology; 3

¹²Sociology: Ranked in 2009,” 2012. US News & World Report. Retrieved on December 28, 2012 from:

<http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-humanities-schools/sociology-rankings>.

¹³“Top 100 QS World University Rankings for Sociology 2011,” 2011, September 6.

(3.79%) each in Criminology & Criminal Justice and Management; and 2 (2.53%) each in Business School and Sociology and Anthropology. There are 13 other departments/units each with 1 contributor.

For males, 33 (64.7% of all males, and 41.77% of total) are in the Department of Sociology; 3 (5.9% of all males, and 3.79% of total) in Criminology & Criminal Justice; 2 (3.9% of all males, and 2.53% of total) in Management; and 1 (1.96% of all males, and 1.27% of total) each in 13 different departments/units. For females, 23 (82.1% of all females, and 29.1% of total) are in the Department of Sociology; and 1 (3.57% of all females, and 1.27% of total) each in Management, Business School, Sociology & Anthropology, Law, and Policy, Planning, & Development (**Table 5**).

For the *AER*, of the 222 contributors with 224 positions in 38 different departments/units, 161 (71.9%) are in a Department of Economics; 9 (4%) in Finance; 8 (3.6%) in Management; 7 (3.1%) in a School of Business; 3 (1.3%) in the Social Sciences; 2 (0.9%) each in the Centre de Recerca en Economia Internacional, Marketing, and School of Government; and 1 (0.45%) each in the remaining 30 departments/units (Kaba, 2013a: p. 59). For the *APSR*, 78 contributors hold 79 positions at 10 academic institutions and 1 contributor is a research at an organization called SMS Research & Marketing Services, Inc. Of the 79 positions, 64 (81%) are in Political Science/Government/Politics; 5 (6.3%) in Economics; 3 (3.8%) Public Policy; and 1 (1.3%) each in 7 different departments/units, etc. (Kaba, 2013b: p. 63).

4.7. US States and Regions/World Regions and Countries of Employment of Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

Geographically and racially/ethnically, the United States is a very large and diverse country, with many of its 50 states plus Washington DC bigger and more populous than dozens of countries across the planet. In fact, Kaba (2008b) points out that the United States is not only a country-continent, but also a country-planet, because it has almost every creature, including humans from all parts of the world, and also has every type of climate from any

Table 5. Department/Unit, etc. of Employment of Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010 (all six issues). (N = 79 Positions and 18 Departments, Faculties, Divisions, Schools, Units, Centers, etc.).

Department	% of			% of			Total	Total	%
	Male	%	Total	Female	%	Total			
Sociology	33	64.7	41.77	23	82.1	29.1	56	70.9	
Criminology & Criminal Justice	3	5.9	3.79	0	0	0	3	3.79	
Management	2	3.9	2.53	1	3.57	1.27	3	3.79	
Business School	1	1.96	1.27	1	3.57	1.27	2	2.53	
Sociology & Anthropology	1	1.96	1.27	1	3.57	1.27	2	2.53	
Biostatistics	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Center for Economic Studies	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Community Health Services	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Economics	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
History	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Law	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27	
Medicine	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Organizational Behavior	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Organization & Management	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Policy, Planning & Development	0	0	0	1	3.57	1.27	1	1.27	
Public & International Affairs	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
School of Government	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Sociology, Political Science & Public Affairs	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Total	51	100	64.6	28	100	35.5	79	100	
No Data	0			1			1		

Source: Compiled and computed by author based on data provided by the *American Sociological Review*, 2010. Volume 75, Issues 1 to 6. <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/by/year/2010>; Articles also accessed on ProQuest Academic Search Engine. Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

where in the world (p. 14). There is also competition among the states of the U.S. and its four regions (Northeast, Midwest, South and West) for talent, business, and economic development. The same holds true among the over 200 countries and territories in the world and the continents of our planet. The *American Sociological Review*, *American Economic Review*, and the *American Political Science Review* have become international journals and it is therefore important to know the geographic distribution of their contributors within the U.S. and among the countries and continents of the world (Burris, 2004: pp. 241-242; Kaba, 2012; Lyytinen, 2007; Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft, 2006).

In this study, there are 79 contributors (51 males and 28 females) with positions in 24 US states and Israel. There are no available data for 1 female contributor. Of the 79 contributors, 77 (97.32%) are in 24 states in the United States; 22 (27.84%) in 8 states in the Midwest; 20 (25.3%) each in 5 states in the Northeast and in 5 states in the West; and 15 (18.9%) in 6 states in the South. There are 2 (2.5%) contributors employed in Israel (1 male and 1 female).

For males, 50 (98.26% of all males, and 63.2% of total) were employed in the United States: 15 (29.4% of all males, and 18.9% of total) in 5 states in the West; 13 (25.46% of all males, and 16.4% of total) in 6 states in the South; 11 (21.6% of all males and 13.9% of total) each in 4 states in the Northeast; and in 8 states in the Midwest. For females, 27 (96.5% of all females, and 34.2% of total) are employed in the United States: 11 (39.3% of all females, and 13.9% of total) are employed in 6 states in the Midwest; 9 (32.2% of all females, and 11.4% of total) are employed in 5 states in the Northeast; 5 (17.8% of all females, and 6.3% of total) in 2 states in the West; and 2 (7.2% of all females, and 2.53% of total) in 2 states in the South (Table 6). For individual states/countries, 1 of them, California has double figure contributors (12 or 15.2% of total). Ten states have 3 or more contributors: 8 (10.1%) in Massachusetts; 6 (7.6%) in New York; 5 (6.3%) each in Illinois and North Carolina; 4 (5.1%) each in Ohio, Washington and Wisconsin; and 3 (3.8%) each in Iowa, New Jersey and Texas.

For males, 6 states have 3 or more contributors: 9 (17.6% of all males, and 11.4% of total) in California; 5 (9.8% of all males, and 6.3% of total) in Massachusetts; 4 (7.8% of all males, and 5.1% of total) in North Carolina; and 3 (5.9% of all males, and 3.8% of total) each in New York, Ohio and Texas. For females, 6 states have 2 or more contributors: 4 (14.3% of all females, and 5.1% of total) in Illinois; 3 (10.7% of all females, and 3.8% of total) each in California, Massachusetts and New York; and 2 (7.1% of all females, and 2.5% of total) in Iowa, Washington and Wisconsin. There is 1 (3.6% of all females, and 1.27% of total) each in 8 other states and in Israel (Table 6).

For the *AER*, of the 222 contributors with 224 positions, 148 (66%) are employed in the Americas, including 147 (65.63%) in Northern America: 141 (62.9%) in the United States and 6 (2.7%) in Canada. There is 1 (0.45%) position held in Argentina, South America. There are 70 contributors with 72 (32.1%) positions in Europe. There are 3 (1.35%) positions held in Asia (Taiwan, South Korea and Singapore) and 1 (0.45%) position held in Oceania (Australia). Of the 72 positions held in Europe, 27 (12%) each are held in 5 countries in Northern Europe and 5 countries in Western Europe; and 18 (7.98%) held in 3 countries in Southern Europe. In the United States, 62 (27.63%) positions are held in the Northeast; 33 (14.75%) in the West; 24 (10.73%) in the Midwest; and 22 (9.82%) in the South. The following states/countries have double figure positions: 28 (12.5% of 224 total) positions in California; 18 (8%) in the United Kingdom; 15 (6.7%) in Massachusetts; 12 (5.3%) each in New York and Spain; 11 (4.9%) each in Germany, Illinois and Pennsylvania (Kaba, 2013a: pp. 60-61).

For the *APSR*, all 79 different contributors held 80 positions (one contributor held a position each in the United States and the United Kingdom). Of the 80 positions, 76 (95.4%) are held in Northern America: 75 (94.15%) in the United States and 1 (1.25%) in Canada. There are 4 (5%) positions held in Northern Europe: 2 (2.5%) each in Sweden and the United Kingdom. Of the 75 positions held in the United States, 24 (30.15% of 80 total) are in the Northeast; 20 (25%) each are in the Midwest and South; and 11 (13.8%) are in the West. The following states have 3 positions or more: 10 (12.5% of 80 total) in Illinois; 9 (11.3%) in Connecticut; 7 (8.8%) each in California and Massachusetts; 5 (6.3%) each in Florida and New York; 4 (5%) each in Wisconsin and Virginia; and 3 (3.8%) each in Indiana, North Carolina and Texas (Kaba, 2013b: pp. 64-65).

4.8. Numbers and Types of Highest/Terminal Degrees Earned, Academic Major, Year Degrees Earned, Institutions of Earned Degrees, and US States and Regions, Countries/World Regions of Earned Degrees (Tables 7-11) of Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

Tables 7-11 examine the numbers and types of highest or terminal degrees earned, academic major, year de-

Table 6. US States and regions/countries and world regional/geographic distribution of employment positions of contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010 (all six issues). N = 79; 24 US states and 2 countries (United States and Israel). Data not available for 1 female contributor.

State/Country	% of			% of			Total	Total	%
	Male	%	Total	Female	%	Total			
United States (n = 24)	50	98.26	63.2	27	96.5	34.2	77	97.32	
Northeast (n = 5)	11	21.6	13.9	9	32.2	11.4	20	25.27	
Massachusetts	5	9.8	6.3	3	10.7	3.8	8	10.1	
New York	3	5.9	3.8	3	10.7	3.8	6	7.6	
New Jersey	2	3.9	2.5	1	3.6	1.27	3	3.8	
Connecticut	1	2	1.27	1	3.6	1.27	2	2.5	
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	1	3.6	1.27	1	1.27	
Midwest (n = 8)	11	21.8	13.9	11	39.3	13.9	22	27.84	
Illinois	1	2	1.27	4	14.3	5.1	5	6.3	
Ohio	3	5.9	3.8	1	3.6	1.27	4	5.1	
Wisconsin	2	3.9	2.5	2	7.1	2.5	4	5.1	
Iowa	1	2	1.27	2	7.1	2.5	3	3.8	
Indiana	1	2	1.27	1	3.6	1.27	2	2.5	
Kansas	1	2	1.27	1	3.6	1.27	2	2.5	
Minnesota	1	2	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Michigan	1	2	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
South (n = 6)	13	25.46	16.4	2	7.2	2.54	15	18.87	
North Carolina	4	7.8	5.1	1	3.6	1.27	5	6.3	
Texas	3	5.9	3.8	0	0	0	3	3.8	
Florida	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5	
Georgia	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5	
Maryland	1	2	1.27	1	3.6	1.27	2	2.5	
Washington DC	1	1.96	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
West (n = 5)	15	29.4	18.9	5	17.8	6.3	20	25.34	
California	9	17.6	11.4	3	10.7	3.8	12	15.2	
Washington	2	3.9	2.5	2	7.1	2.5	4	5.1	
Oregon	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5	
Arizona	1	2	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Colorado	1	2	1.27	0	0	0	1	1.27	
Western Asia (n = 1)									
Israel	1	2	1.27	1	3.6	1.3	2	2.5	
Total	51	100.3	64.4	28	100.1	35.4	79	99.85	
No Data	0			1			1		

Source: Compiled and computed by author based on data provided by the *American Sociological Review*, 2010. Volume 75, Issues 1 to 6. <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/by/year/2010>; Articles also accessed on ProQuest Academic Search Engine. Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table 7. Numbers and types of highest/terminal degrees earned by contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010 (all six issues). N = 80 degrees and four different types of degrees.

Degree	% of			% of			Total	Total	%
	Male	%	Total	Female	%	Total			
Ph.D.	48	94.1	60	25	86.2	31.3	73	91.3	
Sc.D.	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5	
M.A.	1	2	1.3	2	6.9	2.5	3	3.8	
B.A.	0	0	0	2	6.9	2.5	2	2.5	
Total	51	100	63.8	29	100	36.3	80	100	

Source: Compiled and computed by author based on data provided by the *American Sociological Review*, 2010. Volume 75, Issues 1 to 6. <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/by/year/2010>; Articles also accessed on ProQuest Academic Search Engine. Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table 8. Academic major/field of earned highest or terminal degrees of contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010 (all six issues). (N = 80 and 17 different academic fields).

Major/Field	% of			% of				
	Male	%	Total	Female	%	Total	Total	%
Sociology	37	72.6	46.3	23	79.3	28.8	60	75
Management	3	5.9	3.75	0	0	0	3	3.8
Political Science	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
Society, Human Development and Health	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
Business Administration	0	0	0	1	3.5	1.25	1	1.25
Economics	1	2	1.3	0	0	0	1	1.25
History	1	2	1.3	0	0	0	1	1.25
Labor Studies	0	0	0	1	3.5	1.25	1	1.25
Criminology & Criminal Justice	1	2	1.3	0	0	0	1	1.25
Organizational Behavior	1	2	1.3	0	0	0	1	1.25
Public Affairs & Urban Policy	1	2	1.3	0	0	0	1	1.25
Psychology	0	0	0	1	3.5	1.25	1	1.25
Psychology & Social Relations	0	0	0	1	3.5	1.25	1	1.25
Social Anthropology	1	2	1.3	0	0	0	1	1.25
Social Relations	0	0	0	1	3.5	1.25	1	1.25
Sociology & Demography	0	0	0	1	3.5	1.25	1	1.25
Statistics	1	2	1.3	0	0	0	1	1.25
Total	51	100	64.2	29	100	36.3	80	100

Source: Compiled and computed by author based on data provided by the *American Sociological Review*, 2010. Volume 75, Issues 1 to 6. <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/by/year/2010>; Articles also accessed on ProQuest Academic Search Engine. Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

degrees are earned, institutions of earned degrees, and US states and regions, countries and world regions of earned degrees of the contributors to the *American Sociological Review* in 2010.

Within the United States, there can be substantial differences in the performances on many important variables, such as educational attainment, household income, military service, sports, etc. among the individual 50 states and Washington, D.C., just as there are substantial differences in the performances for those same variables among the four regions of the United States (Midwest, Northeast, South, and West). It makes a difference that all of the 8 Ivy League institutions (Brown University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Princeton University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Yale University) in the United States are all geographically located in the Northeast. The same claim can also be made about the countries of the world, the continents of our planet and the regions within those continents. It is therefore always important to examine any important similarities and differences from these geographic perspectives. This is especially the case when one examines the characteristics of the contributors to these three social science journals. The academic degrees earned by scholars and the year when such degrees are earned by contributors to these top ranked journals have also been studied extensively (Amir and Knauff, 2008; Burris, 2004: pp. 241-242; Eliason, 2008: p. 52; Kaba, 2011a, 2012; Keith and Babchuk, 1998; Lyytinen, 2007; Marwell, 2012: pp. 306-308; Oprisko, 2012; Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft, 2006; Sun, 1975; Weakliem et al., 2012: pp.314-320).

Pertaining to the differences in regional performance within the United States, in sports, in a study entitled "African Americans in the National Basketball Association (NBA), 2005-2006: Demography and Earnings," Kaba (2011c) finds that in the 2005-2006 NBA season: "... of 375 players from all four official geographic regions in the league as of March 6, 2006, while institutions [high schools and colleges and universities] in the Northeast had 54 players (14.4%), the West had 73 players (19.5%), the Midwest had 91 players (24.3%), the South had 157 players (41.9%)" (p. 5). In academia, in a study entitled "Demographics and Publication Productivity of Ivy League Political Science Professors: Harvard, Princeton, University of Pennsylvania and Yale," Kaba (2011c) finds that as of October 2005: "Of the 198 professors for whom data for university of graduation were available, 102 (51.5%) are from institutions in the Northeast and 39 (20%) are from the West, with over 90% of them from the state of California alone (UC Berkeley with 20 or 10.1% of total; Stanford with 13 or 6.6%;

Table 9. Institution of graduation with highest or terminal degrees of contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010 (all six issues). N = 38 institutions and 80 degrees.

Institution	% of			% of				
	Male	%	Total	Female	%	Total	Total	%
University of Wisconsin-Madison	6	11.8	7.5	3	10.3	3.75	9	11.3
Harvard University	6	11.8	7.5	2	6.9	2.5	8	10
Indiana University	2	3.9	2.5	3	10.3	3.75	5	6.3
Princeton University	4	7.8	5	1	3.45	1.25	5	6.3
University of Arizona	1	1.96	1.25	3	10.3	3.75	4	5
University of California-Los Angeles	3	5.9	3.75	1	3.45	1.25	4	5
Columbia University	3	5.9	3.75	0	0	0	3	3.8
Ohio State University	3	5.9	3.75	0	0	0	3	3.8
Stanford University	2	3.9	2.5	1	3.45	1.25	3	3.8
New York University	1	1.96	1.25	1	3.45	1.25	2	2.5
Northwestern University	1	1.96	1.25	1	3.45	1.25	2	2.5
SUNY, Albany	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
University of California-Berkeley	1	1.96	1.25	1	3.45	1.25	2	2.5
University of Chicago	1	1.96	1.25	1	3.45	1.25	2	2.5
University of Pennsylvania	1	1.96	1.25	1	3.45	1.25	2	2.5
University of Texas-Austin	1	1.96	1.25	1	3.45	1.25	2	2.5
Bocconi University	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
Carnegie-Mellon	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
Case Western Reserve University	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
Duke University	0	0	0	1	3.45	1.25	1	1.25
Florida State University	0	0	0	1	3.45	1.25	1	1.25
Michigan State University	0	0	0	1	3.45	1.25	1	1.25
North Carolina State University	0	0	0	1	3.45	1.25	1	1.25
SUNY, Stony Brook	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
Tel Aviv University	0	0	0	1	3.45	1.25	1	1.25
Texas A & M University	0	0	0	1	3.45	1.25	1	1.25
University of California-Irvine	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
University of California-Santa Barbara	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
University of Colorado-Boulder	0	0	0	1	3.45	1.25	1	1.25
University of Kansas	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
University of Minnesota-Minneapolis	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	0	0	0	1	3.45	1.25	1	1.25
University of Zurich	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
University of Washington-Seattle	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
Washington State University-Pullman	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
Yale University	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
Yonsei University	0	0	0	1	3.45	1.25	1	1.25
Total	51	100	63.8	29	99.9	36.3	80	100

Source: Compiled and computed by author based on data provided by the *American Sociological Review*, 2010. Volume 75, Issues 1 to 6. <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/by/year/2010>; Articles also accessed on ProQuest Academic Search Engine. Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

and Caltech with 3% or 1.5%). Europe is the only continent apart from North America, whose universities sent graduates to teach at these four institutions, 18 (9.1%), with the majority of them from the United Kingdom

Table 10. US States and regions/countries and world regions where earned highest or terminal degree institutions are located of contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010 (all six issues). N = 80; 19 US states and 5 countries, including the United States.

State/Country/Region	% of			% of				
	Male	%	Total	Female	%	Total	Total	%
United States	49	96.2	61.25	27	93.2	33.75	76	95.1
Northeast (n = 5)	20	39.2	25	5	17.4	6.25	25	31.3
Massachusetts	6	11.8	7.5	2	6.9	2.5	8	10
New York	7	13.7	8.75	1	3.5	1.25	8	10
New Jersey	4	7.8	5	1	3.5	1.25	5	6.25
Pennsylvania	2	3.9	2.5	1	3.5	1.25	3	3.75
Connecticut	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
Midwest (n = 7)	17	33.4	21.25	9	31	11.25	26	32.6
Wisconsin	6	11.8	7.5	3	10.3	3.75	9	11.3
Indiana	2	3.9	2.5	3	10.3	3.75	5	6.25
Illinois	2	3.9	2.5	2	6.9	2.5	4	5
Ohio	4	7.8	5	0	0	0	4	5
Michigan	1	2	1.25	1	3.5	1.25	2	2.5
Kansas	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
Minnesota	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
South (n = 3)	1	2	1.25	6	20.7	7.5	7	8.75
North Carolina	0	0	0	3	10.3	3.75	3	3.75
Texas	1	2	1.25	2	6.9	2.5	3	3.75
Florida	0	0	0	1	3.5	1.25	1	1.25
West (n = 4)	11	21.6	13.75	7	24.1	8.75	18	22.6
California	8	15.7	10	3	10.3	3.75	11	13.8
Arizona	1	2	1.25	3	10.3	3.75	4	5
Washington	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
Colorado	0	0	0	1	3.5	1.25	1	1.25
Europe (n = 2)	2	4	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
Southern Europe (n = 1)								
Italy	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
Western Europe (n = 1)								
Switzerland	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
Asia	0	0	0	2	7	2.5	2	2.5
Eastern Asia (n = 1)								
South Korea	0	0	0	1	3.5	1.25	1	1.25
Western Asia (n = 1)								
Israel	0	0	0	1	3.5	1.25	1	1.25
Total	51	100.2	63.75	29	100	36.25	80	100

Source: Compiled and computed by author based on data provided by the *American Sociological Review*, 2010. Volume 75, Issues 1 to 6. <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/by/year/2010>; Articles also accessed on ProQuest Academic Search Engine. Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

(Oxford University has 7% or 3.5% of total). These three regions comprised 80.1% of the 198 professors.”¹⁴

Prestige and reputation have been cited as the primary factors contributing to why a selected group of universities or institutions dominate the job market in terms of sending their graduates to teach at the top ranked departments in sociology, economics and political science. For example, according to Weskliem et al. (2012):

¹⁴Kaba, Amadu Jacky (2011c) June 29. “Demographics and Publication Productivity of Ivy League Political Science Professors: Harvard, Princeton, University of Pennsylvania and Yale,” *Holler Africa Magazine*. Retrieved on February 3, 2013 from: <http://www.hollerafrica.com/showArticle.php?catId=5&artId=484>.

Table 11. Year of highest or terminal degree attainment by contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010 (all five issues). (N = 80 degrees and 34 different years (ranging from 1968-2012).

Year	% of			% of			Total	%
	Male	%	Total	Female	%	Total		
1968	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
1970	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
1973	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
1975	1	1.96	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
1976	0	0	0	1	3.45	1.25	1	1.25
1978	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
1979	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
1981	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
1984	0	0	0	1	3.45	1.25	1	1.25
1985	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
1986	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
1988	1	2	1.25	1	3.45	1.25	2	2.5
1989	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
1991	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
1992	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
1994	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
1995	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
1996	1	2	1.25	0	0	0	1	1.25
1997	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
1998	1	2	1.25	1	3.45	1.25	2	2.5
1999	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
2000	2	3.9	2.5	1	3.45	1.25	3	3.75
2001	2	3.9	2.5	2	6.9	2.5	4	5
2002	2	3.9	2.5	3	10.3	3.75	5	6.25
2003	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
2004	2	3.9	2.5	3	10.3	3.75	5	6.25
2005	2	3.9	2.5	4	13.8	5	6	7.5
2006	3	5.9	3.75	1	3.45	1.25	4	5
2007	2	3.9	2.5	1	3.45	1.25	3	3.75
2008	0	0	0	2	6.9	2.5	2	2.5
2009	2	3.9	2.5	0	0	0	2	2.5
2010	4	7.8	5	2	6.9	2.5	6	7.5
2011	0	0	0	2	6.9	2.5	2	2.5
2012	3	5.9	3.75	4	13.8	5	7	8.75
Total	51	100	63.8	29	100	36.3	80	100

Source: Compiled and computed by author based on data provided by the *American Sociological Review*, 2010. Volume 75, Issues 1 to 6. <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/by/year/2010>; Articles also accessed on ProQuest Academic Search Engine. Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

“Departmental prestige plays a central role in the matching of individuals, resources, and rewards in the academic profession.... offering a job to a candidate can be regarded as an expression of esteem for the department of origin, and accepting a job is an expression of esteem for the department that offers the job. Top departments will rarely offer jobs to graduates of lower ranked departments. Lower ranking departments may attempt to hire from the top departments, but they will sometimes be unsuccessful and have to settle for graduates of lower-ranked departments. A number of studies in different fields have found that hiring patterns show a clear hierarchy, and that the resulting rankings of departments are highly correlated with reputational ratings

from surveys...” (pp. 310, 314).

The institution where an academic department is located plays a very important role in determining the prestige of such department. Keith and Babchuk (1998) discussed the issue of very productive academic departments that are still not recognized as prestigious because they are located within institutions that are “... not singled out as a purveyor of knowledge.... This perspective suggests that university eminence itself is a significant variable bearing on assigning prestige to a department irrespective of how productive a department may be in any given time period “ (p. 1499). According to Paxton and Bollen (2003):

“... departmental-achievements perspective would argue that departmental accomplishments, such as publications or citations, should influence perceived quality... departments that are located in universities with more resources, such as those in private or Ivy League universities, may have higher ratings through a university-resource effect. As a case in point, ...the success of Harvard...: ‘It has one of the best libraries in the world, an endowment measuring in the billions, celebrated professional schools, and supports a wide range of excellent programs.’ Other university-wide factors that increase resources (such as income from athletic programs) could also increase perceived quality through the university-resource mechanism” (pp. 73-74).

Weskliem et al. (2012) present a table (Table 1) entitled “Top 25 sociology departments by various measures of prestige, 2007” and the table has three rows: 1) Number of Placements; 2) Second-order Placements; and 3) Origin of Faculty. The departments at the institutions already mentioned above for sociology, economics and political science are the same that dominate this list (p. 318; also see p.320 for similar listings entitled “Table 2 Leading departments by second-order placements: 1965, 1983, and 2007”).

4.9. Numbers and Types of Highest/Terminal Degrees Earned by Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

In this current study, according to Table 7, of the 80 contributors (51 males and 29 females), 73 (91.3%) have a Ph.D.; 3 (3.8%) have an M.A.; and 2 (2.5%) each have a B.A. and Sc.D. For males, 48 (94.1% of all males, and 60% of total) have a Ph.D.; 2 (3.9% of all males, and 2.5% of total) have a Doctor of Science (Sc.D.); and 1 (2% of all males, and 1.3% of total) has an M.A. For females, 25 (86.2% of all females, and 31.3% of total) have a Ph.D.; and 2 (6.9% of all females, and 2.5% of total) each have a B.A. and an M.A. (Table 7).

For the *AER*, there are 13 different degree types and 219 contributors earned a total of 225 highest or terminal degrees. Data are not available for 2 males. Four males and 1 female have 2 degrees each. Of the 225 total degrees, 206 (91.6%) are Ph.D.s; 3 (1.3%) each are D.Phil. and B.A.; 2 (0.9%) each are B.S., D.E.S., and Dr. rer. Pol.; and the remaining are 7 different degrees, including an M.A. and JD (Kaba, 2013a: p. 62). For the *APSR*, all 79 contributors earned 5 different types of highest or terminal degrees, with each earning a degree. Of the 79 degrees, 74 (93.7%) are Ph.D.s.; 2 (2.5%) are M.A.s; and 1 (1.3%) each is a B.A., D.Phil., and M.P.I.A (Kaba, 2013b: p. 67).

4.10. Academic Major/Field of Earned Highest or Terminal Degrees of Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

According to Table 8, the 80 contributors (51 males and 29 females) earned 80 highest or terminal degrees in 17 different majors or academic fields. Of the 80 degrees, 60 (75%) were in Sociology; 3 (3.8%) in Management; 2 (2.5%) each in Political Science and Society, Human Development and Health; and 13 other contributors earned degrees in 13 different majors. For males, 37 (72.6% of all males, and 46.3% of total) contributors earned a degree each in Sociology; 3 (5.9% of all males, and 3.75% of total) 3 in Management; 2 (3.9% of all males, and 2.5% of total) each in Political Science and Society, Human Development and Health; and 7 other major got 1 degree each. For females, 23 (79.3% of all females, and 28.8% of total) contributors earned a degree in Sociology; and 1 degree each in 6 other majors (Table 8).

For the *AER*, 219 contributors earned 224 degrees in 17 different majors/fields. Data are not available for 3 males. Four males and 1 female earned 2 degrees each. Of the 224 degrees, 197 (88%) are earned in Economics; 5 (2.2%) in Math; 3 (1.3%) in Finance; 2 (0.9%) each in Biology, Computer Science, Law, Political Science, and Social Sciences; and 1 (0.45%) each in 9 other majors (Kaba, 2013a: p. 62). For the *APSR*, all 79 contributors earned their 79 degrees (1 each) in just 3 majors: 70 (88.6%) in Political Science/Government; 8 (10.1%) in Economics; and 1 (1.3%) in Math (Kaba, 2013b: p. 67).

4.11. Institution of Graduation with Highest or Terminal Degrees of Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

Table 9 shows that the 80 contributors earned their 80 highest or terminal degrees from 38 different colleges and universities: 9 (11.3%) from the University of Wisconsin, Madison; 8 (10%) from Harvard University; 5 (6.3%) each from Indiana University and Princeton University; 4 (5%) each from the University of Arizona and the University of California, Los Angeles; 3 (3.8%) each from Columbia University, Ohio State University and Stanford University; 2 (2.5%) each from 7 different institutions; and 1 (1.25%) each from 22 different institutions.

For males, 6 (11.8% of all males, and 7.5% of total) degrees each are earned from the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and Harvard University; 4 (7.8% of all males, and 5% of total) from Princeton University; 3 (5.9% of all males and 3.75% of total) from the Ohio State University, Stanford University and the University of California, Los Angeles; 2 (3.9% of all males, and 2.5% of total) each from Indiana University, Stanford University and State University of New York, Albany; and 20 degrees from 20 different institutions. For females, 3 (10.3% of all females, and 3.75% of total) degrees each are earned from Indiana University, the University of Arizona, and the University of Wisconsin, Madison; 2 (6.9% of all females, and 2.5% of total) degrees from Harvard University; and 1 (3.45% of all females, and 1.25% of total) degree each from 18 different institutions (**Table 9**).

For the 4 regular issues of the *AER*, 86 institutions conferred 224 highest or terminal degrees to 219 contributors and the following 14 institutions conferred 4 or more degrees: 21 (9.4%) each by Harvard University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology; 9 (4%) each by Stanford University and the University of Chicago; 8 (3.6%) each by Princeton University, the University of California-Berkeley, and the University of California, Los Angeles; 7 (3.1%) each by the University of Bonn and Yale University; 6 (2.7%) each by Carnegie Mellon University and London School of Economics and Political Science; and 4 (1.8%) each by California Institute of Technology, the University of Oxford, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison (Kaba, 2013a: pp. 63-65). For the *APSR*, of the 79 degrees (34 different types) earned by each of the 79 contributors, 10 institutions conferred 3 degrees or more: 9 (11.4%) by Harvard University; 7 (8.9%) each by the University of Chicago and the University of Rochester; 5 (6.3%) by the University of California-Berkeley; 4 (5.1%) by Duke University; 3 (3.8%) each by Columbia University, Indiana University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Ohio State University, and the University of Pittsburgh (Kaba, 2013b: pp. 68-69).

4.12. US States and Regions/Countries and World Regions Where Earned Highest or Terminal Degree Institutions Are Located of Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

Table 10 shows that the 80 contributors earned their 80 highest or terminal degrees in 19 states and 5 countries, including the United States. Of the 80 degrees, 76 (95.1%) were earned in the United States: 26 (32.6%) in the Midwest; 25 (31.3%) in the Northeast; 18 (22.6%) in the West; and 7 (8.75%) in the South. There are 2 (2.5%) degrees each earned in Asia (Israel and South Korea) and Europe (Italy and Switzerland).

For males, 49 (96.2% of all US males, and 61.25% of total) degrees are earned in the United States: 20 (39.2% of all males, and 25% of total) in 5 states in the Northeast; 17 (33.4% of all males, and 21.25% of total) degrees in 7 states in the Midwest; 11 (21.6% of all males, and 13.75% of total) degrees in 3 states in the West; and 1 (2% of all males, and 1.25% of total) degrees in 1 state in the South. For females, 27 (93.2% of all females, and 33.75% of total) degrees are earned in the United States: 9 (31% of all females, and 11.25% of total) in 4 states in the Midwest; 7 (24.1% of all females, and 8.75% of total) degrees in 3 states in the West; 6 (20.7% of all females, and 7.5% of total) degrees in 3 states the South; and 5 (17.4% of all females, and 6.25% of total) in 4 states in the Northeast (**Table 10**).

For individual states, California conferred 11 (13.8% of total) degrees; 9 (11.3%) in Wisconsin; 8 (10%) each in Massachusetts and New York; 5 (6.25%) each in Indiana and New Jersey; 4 (5%) each in Arizona, Illinois and Ohio; 3 (3.75%) each in North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Texas; 2 (2.5%) each in Michigan and Washington; and 1 (1.25%) each in 5 other states and 4 other countries.

For males, 8 (15.7% of all males, and 10% of total) degrees were earned in California; 7 (13.7% of all males, and 8.75% of total) were earned in New York; 6 (11.8% of all males, and 7.5% of total) degrees each were earned in Massachusetts and Wisconsin; 4 (7.8% of all males, and 5% of total) degrees each were earned in New Jersey and Ohio; 2 (3.9% of all males, and 2.5% of total) degrees each were earned in Illinois, Indiana, Penn-

sylvania and Washington; and 1 (2% of all males, and 1.25% of total) in 7 other states and 2 countries (Italy and Switzerland). For females, 3 (10.3% of all females, and 3.75% of total) degrees each were earned in Arizona, California, Indiana, North Carolina, and Wisconsin; 2 (6.9% of all females, and 2.5% of total) degrees each in Illinois, Massachusetts, and Texas; and 1 (3.5% of all females, and 1.25% of total) degree each in 6 other states and 2 countries (South Korea and Israel) (**Table 10**).

For the *AER*, of the 224 degrees earned by 219 contributors, 162 (72.35%) are in the Americas: 158 (70.6% of total) in the United States, and 4 (1.8%) in Canada. These scholars earned their degrees in 15 countries including the United States and 25 states in the United States. Of the 158 degrees earned in the United States, 80 (35.75% of 224 total) are in 6 states in the Northeast; 39 (17.4%) in 5 states in the West; 25 (11.1%) in 7 states in the Midwest; and 14 (6.3%) in 7 states in the South. Of the 62 (27.7% of total) degrees earned in Europe, 27 (12.08% of 224 total) are earned in 6 countries in Western Europe; 23 (10.2%) are earned in 4 countries in Northern Europe; and 12 (5.4%) are earned in 3 countries in Southern Europe. The following US states and countries conferred double figure highest or terminal degrees: Massachusetts, 45 (20.1% of 224 total); California, 33 (14.7%); United Kingdom, 18 (8%); Illinois and Pennsylvania, 11 (4.9%) each; and 10 (4.5%) in Germany (**Kaba, 2013a: pp. 66-67**).

For the *APSR*, 79 contributors earned 1 degree each. Of the 79 degrees, 73 (92.6%) are earned in 18 states in the United States and 6 (7.6%) degrees earned in 4 countries in Europe; 4 (5% of 79 total) in Northern Europe, 2 (2.5%) each in Sweden and the United Kingdom and 2 (2.5%) in Western Europe, 1 (1.3%) each in Austria and Germany. Of the 73 degrees earned in the United States, 32 (40.5% of 79) are in 5 states in the Northeast; 18 (22.8%) in 4 states in the Midwest; 13 (16.5%) in 3 states in the West; and 10 (12.8%) in 6 states in the South. The following 4 states awarded degrees in double figures: 14 (17.7% of 79) in New York; 12 (15.2%) in Massachusetts; and 11 (13.9%) each in California and Illinois (**Kaba, 2013b: pp. 69-70**).

4.13. Year of Highest or Terminal Degree Attainment (1968-2012) by Contributors to the *American Sociological Review*, 2010

All 80 contributors earned all 80 of their highest or terminal degrees in 34 different years ranging from 1968 to 2012: 7 (8.75% of total) degrees earned in 2012; 6 (7.5%) degrees each earned in 2005 and 2010; 5 (6.25%) degrees each earned in 2002 and 2004; 4 (5%) degrees each earned in 2001 and 2006; 3 (3.75%) degrees each earned in 2000 and 2007; 2 (2.5%) degrees each earned in 12 different years; and 1 (1.25%) degree each earned in 13 different years.

For males, 4 (7.8% of all males, and 5% of total) degrees were earned in 2010; 3 (5.9% of all males, and 3.75% of total) degrees each earned in 2006 and 2012; 2 (3.9% of all males, and 2.5% of total) earned in 14 different years; and 1 (1.96% of all male degrees, and 1.25% of total) degree each earned in 13 different years. For females, 4 (13.8% of all females, and 5% of total) degrees each were earned in 2005 and 2012; 3 (10.3% of all females, and 3.75% of total) degrees each earned in 2002 and 2004; 2 (2.96% of all females, and 2.5% of total) degrees each earned in 2001, 2008, 2010, and 2011; and 1 (3.45% of all females, and 1.25% of total) degree each earned in 1976, 1984, 1988, 1998, 2000, 2006, and 2007 (**Table 11**).

For the *AER*, the 224 highest or terminal degrees earned by 219 contributors of full length articles to the four regular issues in 2010 did so from 1963 to 2010. At least 10 degrees are earned in these years: 18 (8% of 224 total) in 2000; 16 (7.1%) in 2001; 14 (6.3%) each in 1995 and 2005; and 10 (4.5%) each in 1992 and 2007 (**Kaba, 2013a: p. 68**). For the *APSR*, the 79 highest and terminal degrees are earned from 1968 to 2011. The following years have 3 or more degrees earned: 7 (8.7% of total) in 2002; 6 (7.6%) each in 1995, 2007, and 2008; 4 (5.1%) each in 1997, 1999, 2000, and 2009; and 3 (3.8%) each in 1998, 2002, 2003, and 2004 (**Kaba, 2013b: p. 71**).

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The statistics presented in the tables of this study tell a variety of interesting stories. For example, the data show that while the *American Sociological Review* has more diversity than the *American Economic Review* and the *American Political Science Review*, it appears to be less international. This means that while significant proportions of scholars from various cultural or racial groups tend to publish in the *ASR* compared to the *AER* and *APSR*, those scholars tend to be based mostly in North America, especially the United States. **Lyttinen et al. (2007)** and **Rosenstreich and Wooliscroft (2006)** have examined this fact of top ranked North American scho-

larly journals publishing articles by scholars based in North America.

Another interesting finding that comes out of the data of this study is the competitiveness of the University of Wisconsin—Madison. This is especially in the disciplines of sociology and economics, where it is very visible, but it still came up among employers of contributors to the *APSR* in 2010. What makes Wisconsin unique is that the institution as a whole is not ranked in the Top 38 (ranked 39th) in the 2009 *US News & World Report* College Rankings, and it is also not ranked in the Top 60 (ranked number 61) in the 2009 *Times Higher Education* QS Top 200 Universities in the World. It also had an endowment of \$1,645,250,000 in 2007 (ranked number 44 in the United States) (Kaba, 2012: p. 28; also see Paxton and Bollen, 2003: pp. 73-74). Yet as the works by DiFuccia et al. (2007: pp. 9-10), Marwell (2012), Nelson and Brammer (2010, Tables 5-15) and Weakliem et al. (2012: pp. 318-320) have shown, the University of Wisconsin, Madison, is a very academically competitive institution.

Let us now turn our attention to attempt to understand why compared to the *AER* and *APSR*, substantially more women tend to publish in the *ASR*, especially in 2010. It is a fact that in all three disciplines and others in and out of the social sciences, there are still very serious gender and racial/cultural inequalities (Nelson and Brammer, 2010; DiFuccia et al., 2007: pp. 13-16; Evans, 2007; Jacobs, 2007; Ginther and Khan, 2004; Harley, 2008; Hesli and Lee, 2011; Kaba, 2013c; Margolis and Romero, 1998; Moss-Racusin, 2012; Rosenfeld et al., 1997; “Table 27. Median Age of Doctorate Recipients,” 2012¹⁵).

A number of factors could be contributing to this important phenomenon and some scholars have examined it considerably (DiFuccia, et al., 2007: pp. 8-12; Jacobs, 2007; Rosenfeld et al., 1997). Diversity through the intersection of gender, race, class and nationality/U.S. resident status or nativity could be an important factor. As the data in this study show, compared to decades ago, more doctorate degrees are awarded to women and minorities in sociology than in economics and political science, which creates a steady and progressing pipeline into the profession, where eventually they would have a critical mass that will help them hold positions of power within the discipline, including becoming editors and associate editors, and reviewers for *ASR* and other top journals in the field. Race contributes because Black women account for a very high majority of doctorates (at least 60% on average in different disciplines) awarded to Blacks (Kaba, 2013c).

According to DiFuccia et al. (2007): “Sociologists have been particularly sensitive to diversity and inequality within the academy, and especially so with regards to women and sociology...” (p. 4). Writing about the contributors to the *ASR* that have been cited 100 times or more and 500 times or more, Jacobs (2007) attempts to present a historical account through the gradual progress that women and minorities, especially Blacks and Asians, have made in the discipline and publishing articles in that journal. According to Jacobs (2007), women and minorities have increased their numbers substantially in the discipline of sociology, and that he expects them to continue to contribute more articles to the *ASR* in the future, which will result in more citations of their research. On a longer list of 379 articles in the *ASR* with 100 or more citations, women and minorities are more represented. In the 1940s and 1950s, women co-authored a handful of articles in the *ASR*, including husband and wife teams that have been cited 100 times or more. One such example of a husband and wife team is Otis D. Duncan and Beverly Duncan, who published articles in the *ASR* in 1953 and 1955.

Sociologist Mirra Komarovsky published a handful of articles in the *ASR* that have not yet been cited 100 times or more. Sociologist Zena Smith Blau published an article in the *ASR* in 1961 as a single author, and that article made the list of high-impact articles (cited 100 times or more). Three other women published articles in the *ASR* in the 1960s that made the high-impact list. They are Diana Crane (an article each in 1965 and 1969), Harriett Zuckerman (an article in 1967), and Rosabeth Moss Kanter (an article in 1968). Sociologist Edna Bonacich published three articles in the *ASR* in the 1970s (1972, 1973, and 1976) that made the high-impact list. In 1978, two female sociologists, Janet Lever and Margaret M. Marini, also published single-authored articles in the *ASR* that made the high-impact list. Also in 1978, four women were lead authors in articles published in the *ASR*: Karen Cook, Donna Eder, Sandra Scarr, and Lynn Smith-Lovin. Jacobs notes that, “This trend reflects the growth in the representation of women in academic sociology during this period” (pp. 124-127).

Turning to the progress that minorities have made in the discipline and in publishing articles in the *ASR*, including high-impact articles, Jacobs (2007) points out that their scholarship goes back to the late Black American scholar, W. E. B. DuBois, but that their research was very seldom published in the *ASR*. However, the 1990 ASA Presidential Address by the Black American scholar William Julius Wilson, which was published in the

¹⁵“Table 27. Median Age of Doctorate Recipients, by Broad Field of Study, Sex, Citizenship, and Race/Ethnicity: 2011,” 2012. 2012. Doctorate Recipients from US Universities: 2011. Retrieved on December 15, 2012 from: http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/sed/2011/data_table.cfm.

ASR in 1991 is a high-impact article, cited more than 200 times. An article published in 1993 by the Black American sociologist Lawrence Bobo at Harvard University and sociologist James Kluegel has also been cited over 100 times. Jacobs concludes by pointing out that: “Research by Asians and Asian-Americans begins to appear on the list of highly-cited articles by the late 1980s, as represented by such scholars as Nan Lin, Victor Nee, Ross Matsueda, and Lawrence Wu” (pp. 124-127). Also, sociologist William Julius Wilson, who teaches at Harvard University, who has published full-length articles in the *ASR* as noted above is one of only 24 University Professors at Harvard University as of February 2015¹⁶, the highest level one can reach in academia anywhere in the world.

Pertaining to the progress of women in the membership and leadership of the American Sociological Association, DiFuccia et al. (2007) point out that their proportions have increased from 12.2% in 1906, to 24.6% in 1970, to 32.6% in 1982, to 49.11% by 2007; and by 2007, males accounted for 47.51% and those with unidentified gender accounting for 3.37% (p. 5). Focusing on student membership in the ASA, DiFuccia et al. (2007) point out that in 2003, female student members of the ASA showed relatively high representations in section memberships in traditionally male fields or areas. For example, they accounted for 52.2% in political sociology, 50.7% in science, knowledge, and technology, 50.6% in labor and labor movements, 55.6% in methodology, 71.5% in medical sociology, 43.1% in political economy of world system, and 56.9% in collective behavior and social movements. The only two traditional male areas where they are underrepresented are mathematical sociology, (19.2%), and theory (37.3%). “Other research has found that gender differences in sociologists’ specified areas of concentration exist...” (p. 17). Rosenfeld et al. (1997) point out that in 1905 ASA membership was 115, and that figure increased to 13,200 in 1996. The authors continue by noting that women have increased their leadership roles in the organization. For example, “... there were a few women officers, Council members, and committee members before the 1970...women are now *overrepresented* in ASA governance relative to their share of membership” (pp. 746-747). Women accounted for 53% of officers and elected committee members, in 1990-1991; and 50% of appointed committees. The authors note that women have generally had higher representations in elected office. Women accounted for all nominated officers in 1994 and 1996 (pp. 746-747).

Rosenfeld et al. (1997) add that among the factors responsible for this progress of women in the ASA are: 1) The US Women’s Movement and Gender Attitudes; 2) efforts by the organization established in 1971 called Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS); and 3) Organizational Change and Elite Dilution with the ASA (pp. 748-750).

While lack of internationalization noted above could be a liability to the *ASR* and the ASA, domestically it contributes to more females becoming prominent in the discipline. This is because males account for a very large proportion of international students earning doctorates in the United States. For example, in 2011, of the 1,124 doctorates awarded in economics/econometrics in the United States, Temporary Visa Holders accounted for 624 (55.5%). In 2011, of the 686 doctorates awarded in political science and government in the United States, Temporary Visa Holders accounted for 150 (21.9%). In 2011, of the 656 doctorates awarded in sociology in the United States, Temporary Visa Holders accounted for 113 (17.2%)¹⁷.

This study begins by providing explanations of the importance of publishing articles in scholarly journals. The benefits to publishing such articles or studies in academic journals include earning a tenured or tenure track position at a college or university, and also the opportunity to win research grants and hold leadership positions in one’s discipline and in society. This is especially the case in sociology and two of its closer sister disciplines, economics and political science. The study presents data illustrating that while the *ASR*, *AER* and *APSR* and the organizations that established them continue to experience serious gender and racial inequalities in representation, the *ASR* and *ASA* have more gender and racial representations than the other two. Five theoretical perspectives (human capital theory; social capital theory, cultural capital theory, reproduction theory and identity theory) are utilized to explain both gender and racial inequalities in academia, including in sociology, economics, and political science.

Among the many findings in the data compiled and computed above are that the *ASR* tends to publish articles of scholars based in North America. Scholars in a selected group of private and public institutions in the United States tend to have more influence over the *ASR* and *ASA*. Just over 7 out of every 10 contributors of full-length articles to the *ASR* in 2010 are directly employed in a Department of Sociology. The most common degree

¹⁶“Harvard University Professorships,” 2015. Retrieved on February 13, 2015 from: <http://www.harvard.edu/university-professorships>.

¹⁷“Table 22. Doctorate Recipients, by Citizenship, Race/Ethnicity, and Subfield of Study: 2011,” 2012. Doctorate Recipients from US Universities: 2011. Retrieved on December 15, 2012 from: http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/sed/2011/data_table.cfm.

earned by contributors to the ASR is the Ph.D., with over 9 out of every 10 of them having at least one. At least 3 out of every 4 contributors earned a degree in sociology. The Northeast and the Midwest conferred almost two-thirds of the total 80 degrees earned by the 79 contributors, and the South awarded only 7 (8.7%) of all degrees. All 80 degrees are earned from 1968-2012, with the highest number of degrees (7) awarded in 2012.

References

- Agarwala, R., & Teitelbaum, E. (2010). Trends in Funding for Dissertation Field Research: Why Do Political Science and Sociology Students in So Few Awards. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 43, 283-293.
- Allen, M. P. (2003). The "Core Influence" of Journals in Sociology Revisited. *Footnotes*, 31. <http://www.asanet.org/footnotes/dec03/fn11.html>
- Amir, R., & Knauff, M. (2008). Ranking Economics Departments Worldwide on the Basis of PhD Placement. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90, 185-190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/rest.90.1.185>
- Baldi, S. (1998). Normative Versus Social Constructivist Processes in the Allocation of Citations: A Network-Analytic Model. *American Sociological Review*, 63, 829-846. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2657504>
- Ballantine, J. H., & Hammack, F. M. (2012). *The Sociology of Education: A Systematic Analysis* (7th ed.). New York: Pearson.
- Bertrand, M. (2010). New Perspectives on Gender. In O. Ashenfelter, & D. Card (Eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics Volume 4B* (pp. 1545-1592). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Bott, D. M., & Hargens, L. L. (1991). Are Sociologists' Publications Uncited? Citation Rates of Journal Articles, Chapters, and Books. *The American Sociologist*, 22, 147-158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02691874>
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Masculine Domination*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Burchard, E. G., Borrell, L. N., Choudhry, S., Naqvi, M., Tsai, H.-J., Rodriguez-Santana, J. R., Chapela, R., Rogers, S. D., Mei, R., Rodriguez-Cintron, W., Arena, J. F., Kittles, R., Perez-Stable, E., Ziv, E., & Risch, N. (2005). Latino Populations: A Unique Opportunity for the Study of Race, Genetics, and Social Environment in Epidemiological Research. *American Journal of Public Health*, 95, 2161-2168. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2005.068668>
- Burris, V. (2004). The Academic Caste System: Prestige Hierarchies in PhD Exchange Networks. *American Sociological Review*, 69, 239-264. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/000312240406900205>
- Butler, D. M., Butler, R. J., & Rich, J. T. (2008). The Equalizing Effect of the Internet on Access to Research Expertise in Political Science and Economics. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 41, 579-584. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1049096508080785>
- Cheng, S.-W. (2006). Cultural Goods Creation, Cultural Capital Formation, Provision of Cultural Services and Cultural Atmosphere Accumulation. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 30, 263-286.
- DiFuccia, M., Pelton, J., & Sica, A. (2007). If and When Sociology Becomes a Female Preserve. *The American Sociologist*, 38, 3-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12108-007-9001-2>
- Dillabough, J.-A. (2003). Gender, Education, and Society: The Limits and Possibilities of Feminist Reproduction Theory. *Sociology of Education*, 76, 376-379. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1519874>
- Eliason, S. L. (2008). The Publish or Perish Imperative: Some Polemical Observations on the Sociological Research Enterprise. *Sociological Viewpoints*, 24, 51-60.
- Evans, S. Y. (2007). Women of Color in American Higher Education. *Thought & Action*, 23, 131-138.
- Feagin, J. R., & Sikes, M. P. (1994). *Living with Racism: The Black Middle-Class Experience*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Gans, H. J. (2012). "Whitening" and the Changing American Racial Hierarchy. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 9, 267-279. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X12000288>
- Ginther, D. K., & Kahn, S. (2004). Women in Economics: Moving Up or Falling Off the Academic Career Ladder? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 18, 193-214. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/0895330042162386>
- Glazer, N. (2001). American Diversity and the 2000 Census. *Public Interest*, 144, 3-18.
- Goltz, S. (2005). Women's Appeals for Equity at American Universities. *Human Relations*, 58, 763-797. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726705057173>
- Hargens, L. L. (1991). Impressions and Misimpressions about Sociology Journals. *Contemporary Sociology*, 20, 343-349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2073657>
- Harley, D. A. (2008). Maids of the Academy: African American Women Faculty at Predominantly White Institutions. *Journal of African American Studies*, 12, 19-36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12111-007-9030-5>
- Hesli, V. L., & Lee, J. M. (2011). Faculty Research Productivity: Why Do Some of Our Colleagues Publish More than Oth-

- ers? *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44, 393-408. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1049096511000242>
- Hesli, V., Lee, J. M., & Mitchell, S. M. (2012). Predicting Rank Attainment in Political Science: What Else Besides Publications Affects Promotion? *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 45, 475-492. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1049096512000364>
- Hilmer, C., & Hilmer, M. (2007). Women Helping Women, Men Helping Women? Same-Gender Mentoring, Initial Job Placements, and Early Career Publishing Success for Economics PhDs. *American Economic Review*, 97, 422-426. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/aer.97.2.422>
- Hilmer, C., & Hilmer, M. (2010). Are There Gender Differences in the Job Mobility Patterns of Academic Economists? *American Economic Review*, 100, 353-357. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.2.353>
- Hinshaw, C. E., & Siegfried, J. J. (1995). Who Gets on the AEA Program? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9, 153-163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jep.9.1.153>
- Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. (1995). A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58, 255-269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2787127>
- Huang, K.-P., Chou, C. J., & Sun, C. F. (2009). The Effect of Social Capital on Human Capital: A Resource Acquisition Perspectives. *International Journal of Innovation*, 2, 6-12.
- Jacobs, J. A. (2005). ASR's Greatest Hits. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 1-3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/000312240507000101>
- Jacobs, J. A. (2007). Further Reflections on ASR's Greatest Hits. *The American Sociologist*, 38, 99-131. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12108-007-9003-0>
- Jacobs, J. A. (2011). Journal Rankings in Sociology: Using the H Index with Google Scholar. *PSC Working Paper Series*, Population Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania, PSC 11-05. http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=psc_working_papers
- Kaba, A. J. (2008a). Religion, Immigration and Assimilation: The Hispanic/Latino Population in the United States and the North African/Muslim Population in Europe. *Asian Journal of Latin American Studies*, 21, 69-102.
- Kaba, A. J. (2008b). Barack Obama's Dual Triple Heritage. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 2, 12-21.
- Kaba, A. J. (2009). Demographics and Profile: The Most Cited Black Scholars in the Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 3, 153-207.
- Kaba, A. J. (2010). Inheritance, Race and the Four Major Factors for the Unity between African Americans and European Americans: Land/Territory, Blood/Genes, Religion and Language. *African Renaissance*, 7, 93-106.
- Kaba, A. J. (2011a). African Americans in the National Basketball Association (NBA), 2005-2006: Demography and Earnings. *International Journal of Social and Management Sciences*, 4, 1-25.
- Kaba, A. J. (2011b). The Family and Political Unity between Blacks and Jews in the United States. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1, 167-177.
- Kaba, A. J. (2011c). Demographics and Publication Productivity of Ivy League Political Science Professors: Harvard, Princeton, University of Pennsylvania and Yale. *Holler Africa Magazine*. <http://www.hollerafrica.com/showArticle.php?catId=5&artId=484>
- Kaba, A. J. (2012). Analyzing the Anglo-American Hegemony in the Times Higher Education Rankings. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 20, 1-53.
- Kaba, A. J. (2013a). *Profile of Contributors to the American Economic Review, 2010: Human Capital Theory, Gender and Race*. Irvine, CA: Scientific Research Publishing, Inc.
- Kaba, A. J. (2013b). Profile of Contributors to the American Political Science Review, 2010. *Journal of Politics and Law*, 6, 54-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v6n2p54>
- Kaba, A. J. (2013c). Black Americans, Science and Engineering Degree, and Gender. *Sociology Mind*, 3, 67-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/sm.2013.31012>
- Katsurada, E., & Sugihara, Y. (2002). Gender-Role Identity, Attitudes toward Marriage, and Gender-Segregated School Backgrounds. *Sex Roles*, 47, 249-258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1021334710431>
- Keith, B., & Babchuk, N. (1998). The Quest for International Recognition: A Longitudinal Analysis of Scholarly Productivity and Academic Prestige among Sociology Departments. *Social Forces*, 76, 1495-1533. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/sf/76.4.1495>
- Kingston, P. W. (2001). The Unfulfilled Promise of Cultural Capital Theory: A Magazine of Theory and Practice. *Sociology of Education, Extra Issue*, 88-99.
- Kraaykamp, G., & van Eijck, K. (2010). The Intergenerational Reproduction of Cultural Capital: A Threefold Perspective. *Social Forces*, 89, 209-231. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/sof.2010.0087>
- Leahey, E., Crockett, J. L., & Hunter, L. A. (2008). Gendered Academic Careers: Specializing for Success? *Social Forces*, 86, 1273-1309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/sof.0.0018>

- Lester, J. (2008). Performing Gender in the Workplace: Gender Socialization, Power, and Identity among Women Faculty Members. *Community College Review*, 35, 277-305. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0091552108314756>
- Lyytinen, K., Baskerville, R., Livari, J., & Te'eni, D. (2007). Why the Old World Cannot Publish? Overcoming Challenges in Publishing High-Impact IS Research. *European Journal of International Systems*, 16, 317-326. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000695>
- Margolis, E., & Romero, M. (1998). "The Department Is Very Male, Very White, Very Old, and Very Conservative": The Functioning of the Hidden Curriculum in Graduate Sociology Departments. *Harvard Education Review*, 68, 1-32.
- Martin, N. D. (2009). Social Capital, Academic Achievement, and Postgraduation Plans at an Elite, Private University. *Sociological Perspectives*, 52, 185-210.
- Marwell, G. (2012). Department Demography and Reputational Success: The Fall and Rise of Top Sociology Departments 1950-1980. *The American Sociologist*, 43, 294-309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12108-012-9162-5>
- Morning, A. (2000). Who Is Multiracial? Definitions and Decisions. *Sociological Imagination*, 37, 209-229.
- Morning, A. (2005). Multiracial Classification on the United States Census: Myth, Reality, and Future Impact. *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales*, 21, 111-134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/remi.2495>
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science Faculty's Subtle Gender Biases Favor Male Students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109, 16474-16479. <http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2012/09/14/1211286109.full.pdf+html>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211286109>
- Nelson, D., & Brammer, C. N. (2010). A National Analysis of Minorities in Science and Engineering Faculties at Research Universities. 2nd Edition. http://faculty-staff.ou.edu/N/Donna.J.Nelson-1/diversity/Faculty_Tables_FY07/07Report.pdf
- Oprisko, R. (2012). Superpowers: The American Academic Elite. *Georgetown Public Policy Review*. <http://gppreview.com/2012/12/03/superpowers-the-american-academic-elite/>
- Oromaner, M. (1977). The Diffusion of Core Publications in American Sociology. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 28, 34-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.4630280106>
- Oromaner, M. (1986). The Diffusion of Core Publications in American Sociology: A Replication. *International Journal of Information Management*, 6, 29-35. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0268-4012\(86\)90044-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0268-4012(86)90044-7)
- Paxton, P., & Bollen, K. A. (2003). Perceived Quality and Methodology in Graduate Department Ratings: Sociology, Political Science, and Economics. *Sociology of Education*, 76, 71-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3090262>
- Price, G. N. (2009). The Problem of the 21st Century: Economics Faculty and the Color Line. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38, 331-343. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2008.10.007>
- Rosenfeld, R. A., Cunningham, D., & Schmidt, K. (1997). American Sociological Association Elections, 1975 to 1996: Exploring Explanations for "Feminization". *American Sociological Review*, 62, 746-759. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2657358>
- Rosenstreich, D., & Wooliscroft, B. (2006). How International are the Top Academic Journals? The Case of Marketing. *European Business Review*, 18, 422-436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09555340610711067>
- Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity. 28 August 1995, United States Federal Register, Executive Office of the President of the United States, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg_race-ethnicity
- Stephan, P. (2012). Perverse Incentives. *Nature*, 484, 29-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/484029a>
- Stets, J. E., & Carter, M. J. (2011). The Moral Self: Applying Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 74, 192-215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0190272511407621>
- Sun, E. (1975). Doctoral Origins of Contributors to the American Economic Review, 1960-72. *Journal of Economic Education*, 7, 50-55.
- Teeman, T. (2013). A Final Plot Twist. *New York Times*, 1-15.
- Troyer, L. (2005). Advances in Identity Theory and Research. *Contemporary Sociology*, 34, 155-156. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/009430610503400227>
- Weakliem, D. L., Gauchat, G., & Wright, B. R. E. (2012). Sociological Stratification: Change and Continuity in the Distribution of Departmental Prestige, 1965-2007. *The American Sociologist*, 43, 310-327. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12108-011-9133-2>
- Yamamoto, Y., & Brinton, M. C. (2010). Cultural Capital in East Asian Educational Systems: The Case of Japan: A Magazine of Theory and Practice. *Sociology of Education*, 83, 67-83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0038040709356567>
- Yancey, G. (2003). *Who Is White: Latinos, Asians, and the New Black/Nonblack Divide*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Appendices

Appendix A

Regional Breakdown of the United States (N = 51)

Northeast (n = 9)

Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont.

Midwest (n = 12)

Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

South (n = 17)

Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia.

West (n = 13)

Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

Source: "Summary Social, Economic, and Housing Characteristics: 2000 Census of Population and Housing," (2003, June). Selected Appendixes: 2000. PHC-2-A. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.

Appendix B

Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings Nations, Territories and Entities plus Taiwan (N = 238).

Africa (n = 57)

Eastern Africa (n = 19)

Burundi, Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Reunion, Rwanda, Seychelles, Somalia, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mayotte.

Middle Africa (n = 9)

Angola, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Republic of Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon and Sao Tome & Principe.

Northern Africa (n = 7)

Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia and Western Sahara.

Southern Africa (n = 5)

Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa and Swaziland.

Western Africa (n = 17)

Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo and Saint Helena.

Americas N = 53

Latin America and the Caribbean (n = 48)

Caribbean (n = 26)

Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Haiti, Jamaica, Martinique, Montserrat, Netherlands Antilles, Puerto Rico, Saint-Barthélemy, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Martin (French part), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos Islands, United States Virgin Islands.

Central America (n = 8)

Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama.

South America (n = 14)

Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), French Guiana, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

Northern America (n = 5)

Bermuda, Canada, Greenland, Saint Pierre and Miquelon, United States of America.

Asia (N = 51)

Central Asia (n = 5)

Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan.

Eastern Asia (n = 8) China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China, Macao Special Administrative Region of China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, Mongolia, Republic of Korea, Taiwan* (As noted in the methodology, I added Taiwan to Eastern Asia).

Southern Asia (n = 9)

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka.

South-Eastern Asia (n = 11)

Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Viet Nam.

Western Asia (n = 18)

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Cyprus, Georgia, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Occupied Palestinian Territory (Gaza and the West Bank), Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Europe (N = 52)

Eastern Europe (n = 10)

Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Ukraine.

Northern Europe (n = 17)

Åland Islands, Channel Islands, Denmark, Estonia, Faeroe Islands, Finland, Guernsey, Iceland, Ireland, Isle of Man, Jersey, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Southern Europe (n = 16)

Albania, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Gibraltar, Greece, Holy See, Italy, Malta, Montenegro, Portugal, San Marino, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

Western Europe (n = 9)

Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Switzerland.

Oceania (N = 25)

Australia and New Zealand (n = 3)

Australia, New Zealand, Norfolk Island.

Melanesia (n = 5)

Fiji, New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu.

Micronesia (n = 7)

Guam, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau.

Polynesia (10)

American Samoa, Cook Islands, French Polynesia, Niue, Pitcairn, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, Wallis and Futuna Islands.

Source: "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings" Retrieved on November 15, 2009 from:

<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm>.