
Authorship and Affiliation in *Armed Forces & Society*: Volumes 1-25

MORTEN G. ENDER

Morris Janowitz established the journal *Armed Forces & Society* (*AF&S*) in 1974 and served as its editor through 1983.¹ It began and continues to serve as the official publication of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society (IUS), and it finished 25 volumes of continuous publication in 1999. The original mission of the journal was to be a major publication outlet for scholars interested in military subjects, and, like the IUS, established in the early 1960s by Morris Janowitz, it was expected to be interdisciplinary and international. According to Janowitz in the Statement of Policy of the inaugural issue, the journal had two major goals:

The sponsors of this journal, the Executive Council of the Inter-University Seminar, believe that there is need for a scholarly medium which focuses on (a) an interdisciplinary and (b) international approach to the topics of armed forces and society, war, revolution, arms control, and peacekeeping. The journal will seek to reflect the emerging focus on military institutions as objects of research and in their relations with other sociopolitical phenomena.²

With the exception of Zoll's³ study of region of authors and article topics in a ten-year publication period of *AF&S*, there has been no

MORTEN G. ENDER is an associate professor of sociology in the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership, United States Military Academy. He completed his associate undergraduate degree in sociology from Sonoma State University and earned his M.A. and Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Maryland. He is currently editing a book on child and adolescent socialization in organization families. *Address correspondence to:* Morten G. Ender, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership, ATTN: MADN-BS&L, United States Military Academy, West Point, NY 10996-1784. E-mail: morten-ender@usma.edu

ARMED FORCES & SOCIETY, Vol. 27, No. 4, Summer 2001, pp. 623-638.

systematic analysis of the journal and its contents. The purpose of this article is to examine its first 25 volumes of published works (N=669).⁴

In general, previous research on authorship and affiliation have focused on specific topics: (1) the configuration of authors with a focus on single versus multiple authorship;⁵ (2) the author-article ratio; (3) the sex of the authors and their order by sex;⁶ and (4) locating the authors in a geographic region by their institutional affiliation.⁷ This study complements previous research in new ways because of its specific interest in sociological aspects of the military: (1) recording the type of institutional affiliation of the first author and (2) identifying the academic discipline of the authors. What follows is a brief description of the various areas considered, frequency distributions of the primary variables under analysis, and the major literature on each specific in the area.

Method

The present study focuses on the first 25 volumes of articles (N=669) authored by 894 scholars and selected by six different editors⁸ while *AF&S* worked with four different publishers—Sage, University of North Carolina Press, Seven Locks Press, and the current publisher, Transaction Publications. The database does not include published articles such as policy papers; symposium papers; book reviews, review essays; commentaries; rejoinders; and archives.⁹

A Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows data file has been established with the following variables: (1) editor; (2) full citation; (3) number of authors; (4) sex of the authors; (5) sex distribution of collaborating authors; (6) institutional affiliation of the first author; (7) state and country affiliation of the first author's institution; (8) institutional type; and (9) academic discipline of the authors. Variables 1-3 required no special considerations. Sex (variable 4-5) was determined by name recognition. Androgynous and non-Western names are identified as such. In most cases, sex could be determined through published biographical information. Institutional affiliation and state and country of affiliation in some cases were located via the Internet. State and country categories were coded according to the geographical location of the institutional affiliations. Academic discipline of the author, if available, usually appears as a footnote to the article's title or proceeds the first endnote.

Previous scientific metric studies of social science journals relied on random samples¹⁰ or focused on time periods.¹¹ This one contributes to the literature by focusing, in depth, on an entire journal, and provides a

database for historical, longitudinal, and comparative analysis. The primary analytic method is quantitative, although some archival document analysis is used.

Author Analysis

Multiple authorship has become the norm rather than the exception in scholarly publications.¹² Explanations for the trend include advances in the sophistication of research questions, the need for career enhancement, and increased specialization. *AF&S* follows this trend to a moderate extent.

The data in Table 1 show the number of collaborators on articles published in *AF&S* from 1974-1999, volumes 1-25. About one quarter of the articles are multiauthored with the majority of these (17.6%; $n=118$) dual-authored. For comparison, slightly over half of sociology articles in the top three sociology journals, *American Sociological Review (ASR)*, *American Journal of Sociology (AJS)*, and *Social Forces (SF)* between 1984-1994, were multiauthored.¹³

Author-Article Ratio

The author-article ratio is the mean number of authors per article per volume. No published data are available for academic journals during the exact 25-year period of *AF&S*. However, during the first 25 years of the *Journal of Peace Research* (1964-1989), the author-article ratio was 1.24.¹⁴ Other scholarly journals have reported author article-ratios for shorter time periods: *ASR*, *AJS*, *SF*, and *Social Science Quarterly* (1984-1994) = 1.7;¹⁵ *Health Education* = 1.7 and *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport* = 2.4 (both for 1986-1990);¹⁶ *Death Studies* (1977-1990) = 1.65;¹⁷ *School Psychology Review* (1982-1992) = 1.8, and *The New England Journal of Medicine* (1982-1992) = 2.7.¹⁸

For *AF&S*, the mean score for each volume is the author-article ratio for the volume. The distribution in Table 2 provides the volume number, number of articles and authors per volume, and the author-article ratio for the first 25 volumes of articles published in *AF&S*.

As Table 1 shows, an article published in *AF&S* is most likely to be single rather than co-authored—a ratio slightly higher than that for the *Journal of Peace Research* for approximately the same period.¹⁹ However, the author-article ratio for *AF&S* has increased from the first five volumes (1.28) to the last five (1.45). The last two volumes (24 and 25) have especially featured collaborative publication (1.52 and 1.78 respectfully).

Table 1**Number of Collaborators per Article in
Armed Forces & Society, Volumes 1-25**

Number of Collaborators	n	%
Single-Authored	507	75.8
Dual-Authored	118	17.6
Triple-Authored	29	4.3
4 Authors	13	1.9
6 Authors	2	.3
Total	669	100

Sex and Authorship

Historically, as women became more involved in sociological education and research, so too has the increase of studies on their contribution to academic publications. In fact, the authorship and publication literature shows that no other area has received greater attention than the sex of the author, especially in sociology.²⁰ The increased diversity of sociology is reflected both in a rise of representation of women sociologists—from 14 percent in 1960 to 30 percent in 1985—and an increase in the percentage receiving doctoral degrees in sociology—from 42.6 percent in 1980 to 51.6 percent in 1985.²¹

While a growing trend in women's contributions to sociological journals has been identified, struggles and obstacles remain in their competition with their male counterparts, both in productivity and recognition from the elite journals. Factors impeding women's publishing success include the facts that women sociologists in general tend to be: (1) affiliated more with college positions than university ones;²² (2) excluded from full collegial relationship for collaborative research;²³ (3) focused on qualitative and sex and gender-specific studies, which usually receive a lower priority from elite journals than does quantitative research;²⁴ and (4) less experienced in the field, with fewer editorial connections.²⁵ Are similar factors at work among women studying the military?

Military institutions are dominated by a masculine culture. Thus, we might expect the diversity of sociology, and scholarship in general, to

Table 2

Number of Articles, Number of Authors, and the Author-Article Ratio in *Armed Forces & Society*, Volumes 1-25

Volume	Number of Articles	Number of Authors	Author-Article Ratio
1	25	28	1.12
2	30	37	1.23
3	30	42	1.40
4	32	46	1.44
5	26	32	1.23
6	30	44	1.47
7	27	37	1.37
8	26	34	1.31
9	26	31	1.19
10	28	39	1.39
11	28	37	1.32
12	28	34	1.21
13	24	30	1.25
14	24	29	1.21
15	26	33	1.27
16	26	33	1.27
17	27	35	1.30
18	26	40	1.54
19	26	36	1.38
20	28	34	1.21
21	28	36	1.29
22	26	36	1.38
23	23	31	1.35
24	23	35	1.52
25	26	45	1.73
Total	669	894	$\bar{x} = 1.34$

impede research on and about the military. We should ask the question: Has the growth of women sociologists' and other academic disciplines' presence and involvement coincided with their contributions to publication on military-related topics?

In scholarship, when women publish they are more apt to be co-authors.²⁶ In sociology, about 29 percent of journal articles by individual women are solo authored but solo authorship is less common in the top tier sociology journals (e.g., *ASR* and *AJS*), with a slight increase in specialty or regional journals.²⁷ For example, 38 percent of articles in *Death Studies* are single-authored by women.²⁸ However, supporting the above, women appear more as co-authors than solo authors in the top international relations (IR) journals between 1995-1997.²⁹

In an analysis of 17 IR journals, female authors are responsible for 12 percent of the articles overall and from five percent in *Foreign Affairs* to 27 percent in *International Organization*. In reflecting on what she called the “gender gap in peace research,” Boulding observed a lesser one, dating back to WWII, compared to the other social sciences.³⁰ Yet, Gleditsch was dismayed that in the first 25 years (1964-1989) of the *Journal of Peace Research*, women comprised a mere eight percent of the authorship.³¹ Comparing women’s scholarship in *JPR* and *AF&S* from a Marxist-Feminist perspective, Yerkes found that institutional and international affiliation and sex to impinge negatively on female authorship and that women’s scholarship in both journals, like science in general, remains fairly “ghettoized.”³²

The data analysis includes the sex of authors (N=668) published in *AF&S* in volumes 1-25. Overall, single male authored articles dominated (66.2%; n=442) followed by multi-male authored (16.3%; n=109), and solo female authored (9.6%; n=64). Overall, women participated in the authorship of 17.5 percent (n=117) of all articles during this period. Mixed-sex authored articles comprise seven percent (n=47) and, finally, multi-female articles comprise less than one percent (n=6) of articles in *AF&S*.

A sex gap in authorship exists in *Armed Forces & Society*.³³ Men were more likely to publish, alone or collaboratively. The gap mirrored IR journals at 12 percent and exceeded the *Journal of Peace Research* by about four percent. However, unlike their female colleagues publishing in mainstream sociology journals, *AF&S*-published women are slightly more pioneering. They are more likely to publish solo than with other men and much more than with other women. This finding is especially interesting given the focus of the journal—military issues.

The trend of sex configuration of authorship across the 25-volume history of the journal is fairly consistent. *AF&S* is a specialty journal and the number of women publishing is fairly low overall. Further, there is no outstanding trend worth noting across the 25-volume publication period with the exception of a slow decline of solo-male authors and a movement toward convergence of the five different author configuration types beginning in the late 1990s.

Author Affiliation

Social networks exist among sociologists and their publication records. Willis and McNamee studied social networks between editors

and published article authors of the four leading sociology journals (*ASR*, *AJS*, *SF*, and *Social Problems*),³⁴ and found editorial evaluation to show *particularism* overall. In other words, editors did have a subjective process of manuscript evaluation and acceptance that statistically showed a preference for institutional affiliations of the submitting author. However, in the latter years of the four journals, there was a move toward a more *universalistic* evaluation—stricter adherence to the norms of science that include a blind review and acceptance of publication based on the quality of the manuscript.

The primary social indicators for particularism are geographic proximity between editors and publishers and institutional network ties. The literature on affiliation has been fairly consistent on this theme. An institutional network in the earlier years of all four leading sociology journals has dissipated somewhat in more recent years.³⁵ But others have noted geographic biases in specialty journals.³⁶

The IUS is a relatively small, highly specialized, and international network of scholars. Indeed, in the inaugural issue of *Armed Forces & Society*, Janowitz evidenced a clear commitment to the world community.³⁷

Given the nature of organizations at their inception (e.g., oriented toward commitment, initial planning, and small size), we might expect particularism with a trend toward universalism. The research literature supports the existence of particularism and scholarly networks in the earlier years of journals. To explore the degree of interorganizational connection in *Armed Forces & Society*, the country, state, type of institution, and institutional affiliation of the first authors were compared with the institutions of the editors, with the expectation that the data would show if a history of the editors' institutional affiliation influenced publication. The findings can then be compared to previous studies.

Table 3 shows the distribution of the country affiliation of the first authors of articles published in *AF&S*. The U.S. first authors comprise slightly over three-quarters of the articles. Twenty-nine countries are represented; English speaking countries are dominant, and authors from Germany and France are among the top six countries. A larger number of other non-European countries are represented.

Overall, the results are in line with those found in the *Journal of Peace Research*. Gleditsch noted that two-thirds to three-quarters of the authors in the *JPR* were from North America and Scandinavian countries (Norway is the home of the *JPR*).³⁸ One-fifth of the authors were from Western Europe and one-tenth from the rest of the world.

Table 3

**Country Affiliation of First Author of Articles
in *Armed Forces & Society*, Volumes 1-25**

Country	n	%
USA	528	79.2
Israel	22	3.3
England	21	3.1
Canada	18	2.7
Germany	14	2.1
France	13	1.9
Australia	7	1.0
Netherlands	6	.9
Belgium	4	.6
Italy	4	.6
Nigeria	4	.6
Sweden	3	.4
Switzerland	3	.4
India	2	.3
Scotland	2	.3
Singapore	2	.3
Yugoslavia	2	.3
Sole Country Affiliation	12	1.8
Total	667*	100.0**

*Two countries of first authors not identifiable.

**Total may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

The data in Table 4 show the distribution of first authors by state (and the District of Columbia) affiliation (states represented by five or less are not listed). Of the 528 U.S.-affiliated first authors, 508 qualifying states and DC were identified, representing forty-three states and DC. California and New York are the top article-producing states, followed by the District of Columbia. California is the only state with more than 10 percent representation (12.4%; n=64).

Illinois served as the longest home for *AF&S* and its editor, from 1974-1983, followed by Maryland (1983-1988 and 1993-1995), New York (1988-1992), Texas (1995-1998) and most recently, California (1998). While California is currently the home of *AF&S*, it is geographically distant from all the previous editorships. New York, Illinois, Maryland, and Texas are among the top author-affiliated states and homes of the journal at different points in time, but the proportions of published articles are less than 10 percent for these states. While some degree of geographic networking exists for *AF&S*, taken in toto, the distribution of authors across countries and the U.S., coupled with its relatively short

Table 4

**U.S. State (or District of Columbia)
Affiliation (Six or More Representations) of First Author of
Articles in *Armed Forces & Society*, Volumes 1-25**

State (or DC) Affiliation of First Author	n
California	64
New York	48
District of Columbia (DC)	46
Virginia	36
Illinois	35
Maryland	35
Pennsylvania	30
Texas	28
Ohio	22
Colorado	17
Massachusetts	16
North Carolina	14
Michigan	13
Alabama	10
Florida	9
Connecticut	8
New Jersey	7
South Carolina	7
Kansas	6
Oregon	6
Wisconsin	6

editorship (generally three years), suggests only a minimal incidence of particularism.

The data in Table 5 show the kinds of institutional affiliations of the first authors in *AF&S*. Over half of the first authors are affiliated with public (n= 251; 37.5%) or private U.S. universities (n=125; 18.7%). Next, authors from U.S. government agencies (n=120; 17.9%) and foreign universities (n=102; 15.2%) are represented. Finally, authors affiliated with for-profit, nonprofit, unknown, and other types of organizations make up the remaining *AF&S* authors. The diversity of these organizations is impressive and relatively peerless. Specifically, a representation from both nonprofit and for-profit, and especially defense-related organizations, from around the world is most notable for an academic journal based in the United States.

The specific name of the institution was also studied. Table 6 shows the ranking of the specific top institutional affiliations of first authors in *AF&S* for articles with ten or more affiliations (n=93) as well as those

Table 5

**Organization Type of First Author of Articles in
Armed Forces & Society, Volumes 1-25**

Organization	n	%
Public University – U.S.	251	37.5
Private University – U.S.	125	18.7
Government Organization – U.S.	120	17.9
Foreign University	102	15.2
Government Organization – Foreign	25	3.7
For-Profit Organization – U.S. and Foreign	23	3.4
Unknown	14	2.1
Nonprofit Organization – U.S.	5	.7
Other	4	.6
Total	669	100.0*

*Total may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

reported nine or less times (n=570). The University of Maryland (n=21), the United States Military Academy (n=17), the University of Chicago (n=17), and the Naval Postgraduate School (n=15) are the top four institutions. Sixteen institutions can claim six or more articles in the 25-year history of the journal, and it is interesting to note that the University of Maryland, whose 21 first authors give it top ranking, accounts for a mere 3.1 percent of the total affiliations.

The reader should be alert to the special circumstances of community professional ties in specialty journals. First, a number of the authors publishing in *AF&S* include graduate students with academic and applied positions at other institutions or agencies specializing in military topics. Both groups subscribe to and have relied upon the *IUS* and *AF&S* for research purposes. Thus, the social distance between specialty affiliation and affiliation of first author is reduced somewhat by the historical interorganizational connections. Second, and as a matter of survival, specialty journals, like regional and state association journals, tend to have smaller scholar submission pools than the larger sociological journals, and, consequently, may have a lower manuscript rejection rate compared to the commanding sociology journals. To insure quantity and quality of submission, editors of *AF&S* rely on more interpersonal strategies to solicit more of them.

The community nature of the *IUS* and the official journal, *AF&S*, suggests that particularism rather than universalism would be the norm in obtaining and publishing submissions, but the data minimally support that norm. The unique character of a specialty journal such as *AF&S*, and

Table 6

**Institutional Affiliations of First Author of
Articles in *Armed Forces & Society*,
Volumes 1-25**

Institution	n
University of Maryland	21
United States Military Academy	17
University of Chicago	17
Naval Postgraduate School	15
Army Research Institute	13
Texas A&M University	10
9 or less first author affiliations	570
Total	663

Note: Six first authors had no identifiable institutional affiliation.

the location of particular social science research activities, such as the armed forces, have been qualitatively sustained without an overreliance on the particularistic approach. Journal character might be compromised somewhat if the journal were to move to a strict universalistic approach to publication. What works for the top selective, national, and more general journals may not work for the specialty area journals. Indeed, *AF&S* will probably serve itself best through a balanced, action-oriented model that seeks and maintains the objectivity of the universalistic approach while taking advantage of its cultural universal theme—armed forces—and optimizing some characteristics of the particularistic method to sustain an intellectual and contributory niche.

Academic Discipline

In addition to an international focus, Janowitz called for an interdisciplinary journal.³⁹ Table 7 shows the academic discipline of the first authors of articles published in *AF&S*. Authors identifying themselves as political scientists or political economists and sociologists or social scientists account for almost one-half of the first authors (29.7% and 18.4% respectively). The next largest group is, unfortunately, the “Unknowns” (12%) who did not elect to publish biographical information about their discipline. Finally, the remaining academic disciplines, including the “Other” category, account for 40 percent of the first authors, which includes, among others, mathematicians, journalists, and librarians. These results are not atypical. Gleditsch reports similar

Table 7

**Academic Discipline of First Author of
Articles in *Armed Forces & Society*, Volumes 1-25**

Academic Discipline	n	%
Political Scientist/Political Economist	199	29.7
Sociologist/Social Scientist	123	18.4
Unknown	80	12.0
Historian	62	9.3
International Studies/Relations or African/European/Asian Studies	43	6.4
Psychologist/Psychiatrist/Organizational Psychologist	32	4.8
Economist	24	3.6
Defense/Strategic/War Studies	20	3.0
National Security Affairs	10	1.5
All Others	76	11.5
Total	669	100.0%*

* Total may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

results for the first 25 years of *JPR*—sociologists and political scientists dominate, but a range of other disciplines are represented.⁴⁰

Conclusion

The purpose of this article is to yield univariate and bivariate results from an analysis of (primarily) authorship and institution affiliation of the official journal of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society—*Armed Forces & Society* (669 articles in the first 25 volumes). A larger project involves the establishment of a long-term database comparing *AF&S* to the *Journal of Peace Research*.⁴¹

Based on the overall analysis, *AF&S* is more or less similar to other academic journals. While a gap between male and female authors persists and multiple authorship is low, both show some movement in recent years—more women, an increase in co-authorship and solo women authors. International contributions are high relative to other journals, but there is often a call for greater international representation.⁴² Given the nature and increase in regional conflicts, an international journal is perhaps more appropriate today than when Janowitz and others first envisioned the journal. Similarly, the multination military coalitions supporting peace-keeping and other types of missions promote a more interdisciplinary research approach. Finally, multiple authorship will probably become the norm rather than the exception in *AF&S* because this is the direction of scholarship in general. One feature of multiple authorship is the increased

specialization of researchers that results in highly rigorous analyses.

AF&S has all but achieved Morris Janowitz's stipulated goals and vision for the journal. First, the journal has an international focus and following.⁴³ Second, based on academic discipline, the journal is highly interdisciplinary.

AF&S is the major outlet for scholars interested in historical and contemporary military subjects. The present study replicates and expands on previous studies of authorship in the social and behavioral sciences with a focus on a specialty journal of the highest intellectual caliber. It represents the tradition of intellectual self-monitoring and the maintenance of longitudinal and comparative understanding of authorship and publication. Finally, the study aspires to contribute to the discourse on the sociology of knowledge by providing a case study of the sociodemographic characteristics of the people studying the most significant issues of our day—war, peace, military institutions, and international and domestic conflict.

Notes

AUTHOR'S NOTE: I am greatly appreciative for the insights and assistance of Jim Burk, Mark Eitelberg, David Segal, Jay Stanley, and Claude Welch on earlier versions of this manuscript. Amy Yerkes provided valuable research assistance in the early stages of the project. This research is supported in part by a United States Military Academy faculty research grant through the Army Research Institute (#MIPR9EUSM99024). The views presented here are my own and do not purport to reflect the position of the United States Military Academy, Army Research Institute, the Department of the Army, or the Department of Defense. Portions of this paper were presented at the 1999 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A., 6-10 August, and the 1999 International Biennial Meeting of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A., 20-22 October.

1. See James Burk, "Introduction: A Pragmatic Sociology," in *Morris Janowitz, On Social Organization and Social Control*, ed. James Burk (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 1-58.
2. See Morris Janowitz, "Armed Forces & Society: An Interdisciplinary Journal." *Armed Forces & Society* 1, 1 (1974), 3-4.
3. See Ralf Zoll, "The Journal 'Armed Forces & Society': Contributions and Contributors." Paper presented at Biennial Meetings of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society, Baltimore, Maryland, 20-22 October 1989.
4. This article is part of a larger research project establishing a scientometric database of articles published in both *Armed Forces & Society* (1974-1999) and the *Journal of Peace Research (JPR)* between 1971-1999. *The Journal of Peace Research* is fairly similar to *Armed Forces & Society*: (1) The *JPR* has published for over 30 years; (2) it was established by a sociologist, Johan Galtung; (3) it is multidisciplinary, with a focus

- on the causes of violence, methods of conflict resolution, and ways of sustaining peace; (4) articles develop policy recommendations from their findings; (5) it is both international in institutional affiliation of authors and readership; and (6) it is backed by a specific institution, the International Peace Research Institute (PRIO), Oslo, Norway.
5. See Morten G. Ender and Shihlung Huang, "Revisiting Regional Traditions: An Emerging Sociology of the Great Plains," *The American Sociologist* 29, 4 (Winter 1999): 37-54; James W. Endersby, "Collaboration Research in the Social Sciences: Multiple Authorship and Publication Credit," *Social Science Quarterly* 77, 2 (1996): 375-392; Margot Holaday and Tracey E. Yost, "Psychology of the Scientist: LXVIII. Trends in Multiple Authorship," *Psychological Reports* 74 (1994): 299-303; John Hudson, "Trends in Multi-Authored Papers in Economics," *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 10, 3 (1996): 153-158; Kim A. McDonald, "Too Many Co-Authors?," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 41, 33, (28 April 1995): A35-A36; J. C. Smart and A. E. Bayer, "Author Collaboration and Impact: A Note on Citation Rates of Single Versus Multiple Authored Articles," *Scientometrics* 10 (1986): 297-305; and P. Vinkler, "Research Contribution, Authorship, and Team Cooperativeness," *Scientometrics* 26, 1 (1993): 213-230.
 6. Nils Petter Gleditsch, "Focus On: *Journal of Peace Research*." *Journal of Peace Research* 26, 1 (1989): 1-5; Linda Grant and Kathryn B. Ward, "Gender and Publishing in Sociology," *Gender and Society* 5, 2 (1991): 207-223; Linda Grant, Kathryn B. Ward, and X. L. Rong, "Is There an Association Between Gender and Methods in Sociological Research," *American Sociological Review* 52 (1987): 852-862; S. McNamee, C. Willis, and A. Rotcheford, "Gender Difference in Pattern of Publication in Leading Sociology Journals, 1960-1985," *The American Sociologist* 21, 2 (1990): 99-115; Kathryn B. Ward and Linda Grant, "The Feminist Critique and a Decade of Published Research in Sociology Journals." *The Sociological Quarterly* 26 (1985): 139-157; and Amy C. Yerkes, *An Assessment of Authorship and Publication Patterns by Gender in The Armed Forces & Society Journal and The Journal of Peace Research, 1974-1999*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota, 1999.
 7. Darrell Crase, "Authorship Analysis of *Death Studies*, Volumes 1-14," *Death Studies* 16 (1992): 199-209; Glen Dunlap, Shelley Clarke, and Lilliane Reyes, "An Analysis of Trends in *JABA* Authorship," *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis* 31 (1998): 497-500; Ender and Huang, "Revisiting Regional Traditions," 37-54; Gleditsch, "Focus On." 1-5; Mostafa Mehdizadeh, "An Analysis of Authors and Institutions Contributing to *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 1981-1993," *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 52, 4 (1993): 459-466.
 8. Morris Janowitz (1974-1983, volumes #1-9); David R. Segal (1983-1988, volumes #10-14); Claude Welch (1988-1992, volumes #15-18); Jay Stanley (1993-1995, volumes #19-21); James Burk (1995-1998, volumes #22-24); and Mark Eitelberg (1998-2001, volumes #25-27).
 9. The journal has featured symposiums, special features, and special issues. The articles published in these editions are included in the present analysis but are given no special attention.
 10. See McNamee et al., "Gender Difference," 99-115.

11. Crase, "Authorship Analysis," 199-209; Grant and Ward, "Gender and Publishing," 207-223; Mehdizadeh, "An Analysis of Authors," 459-466; Zoll, *The Journal*, 1-9.
12. See Endersby, "Collaboration Research," 375-392; Holaday and Yost, "Psychology of the Scientist," 299-303; John Hudson, "Trends in Multi-Authored Papers in Economics," *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 10, 3 (1996): 153-158; McDonald, "Too Many Co-Authors?" A35-A36; Smart and Bayer, "Author Collaboration and Impact," 297-305; and Vinkler, "Research Contribution," 213-230.
13. Endersby, "Collaboration Research," 379.
14. Gleditsch, "Focus On," 3.
15. See Endersby, "Collaboration Research," 375-392.
16. See Darrell Crase and Frank D. Rosato, "Single Versus Multiple Authorship in Professional Journals," *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance* 63, 7 (1992): 28-31.
17. Crase, "Authorship Analysis," 203.
18. A reference to another publication in Holaday and Yost, "Psychology of the Scientist," 299.
19. Gleditsch, "Focus On," 3.
20. See Grant et al., "Is There an Association," 852-862.
21. McNamee et al., "Gender Difference," 99.
22. See Bettina Huber, *Guidelines for Incorporating Women Faculty into Department of Sociology during the Eighties*. (Washington, DC: American Sociological Association, 1984), and Michael Welch and Stephen Lewis, "A Mid-Decade Assessment of Sex Biases in Placement of Sociology Ph.D.'s: Evidence for Contextual Variation," *The American Sociologist* 15 (1980): 120-127.
23. See Barbara Reskin, "Sex Differentiation and Social Organization of Science," in *Sociology of Science*, ed. Jerry Gaston (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1978).
24. See Grant et al., "Is There an Association?" 852-862; L. Schiebinger, "The History and Philosophy of Women in Science," *Journal of Women in Culture in Society* 12 (1987): 305-332; and Kathryn B. Ward and Linda Grant, "The Feminist Critique and a Decade of Published Research in Sociology Journals," *The Sociological Quarterly* 26 (1985): 139-157.
25. McNamee et al., "Gender Difference," 99.
26. Grant and Ward, "Gender and Publishing," 212-213.
27. Grant and Ward, "Gender and Publishing," 213.
28. Crase, "Authorship Analysis," 203.
29. See Carola Weil, "Publish or Perish? The Status of Women in International Relations Journals," *WIIS Words: A Newsletter for Women in International Security* 6, 4 (1997): 1-2.

30. Elise M. Boulding, "Focus On: The Gender Gap," *Journal of Peace Research*, 21, 1 (1984), 1-3.
31. Gleditsch, "Focus On," 4.
32. See Amy C. Yerkes, "An Assessment."
33. It is worth noting that a slightly greater proportion of articles are represented by female authors (17.5%) compared to the approximate number of women of the total active U.S. armed forces in 1999 (14%).
34. See Cecil L. Willis and Stephen J. McNamee, "Social Networks of Science and Patterns of Publication in Leading Sociology Journals, 1960-1985," *Knowledge* 11, 4 (1990): 363-381.
35. Willis and McNamee, "Social Networks," 370-371.
36. Crase, "Authorship Analysis," 205-206; Ender and Huang, "Revisiting Regional Traditions," 45
37. Janowitz, "Armed Forces and Society," 3.
38. Gleditsch, "Focus On," 1.
39. Janowitz, "Armed Forces and Society," 3.
40. Gleditsch, "Focus On," 3.
41. An addendum to this project could include a comparative analysis of the other journals such as *International Journal of World Peace*, *Military Psychology*, and the *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*.
42. See Zoll, "The Journal," 1.
43. According to the current publisher, Transaction Publications, *AF&S* has subscribers from many countries around the world.