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RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS: AN EVALUATION

PREFACE

In the world of academe, he or she “got an NEH” is shorthand indicating that a colleague has received an NEH Fellowship. For academics and independent scholars in the liberal arts community, the NEH Fellowships Program has prestigious meaning. It gives scholars the means to pursue creative research and provides a legitimizing basis to communicate their ideas and work product.

Scholarship is at the heart of NEH. As a public agency, we conduct open competitions based on review by the scholars’ peers—competitions that result in awards for the very highest quality projects, no matter how senior or junior the scholars, and no matter what state or region or institution they hail from. Because of the intense competition and the honor of the endorsement from peers, NEH Fellowships are among the most coveted of scholarly honors.

Several times each year the rules that govern NEH competitions undergo review to ensure that all applications receive equalitarian consideration. However, until now the Fellowships Program has never been formally evaluated. Over a yearlong period the staff of the Division of Research Programs, therefore, conceived and conducted an intense review of the program. For the first time in its forty-five-plus years, we systematically sought answers to such broad questions as: Who applies? How do they use their fellowships? What are the results? What does a fellowship mean to a recipient?

Gaining answers to these questions allowed the staff also to consider important issues that relate to the value of the program: Are NEH Fellows productive? What is the impact of their work? Is the program effectively advancing scholarship in the humanities?

The results of this inquiry show that NEH Fellowships enormously impact individual lives and careers and encourage talented scholars throughout the humanities to produce high quality work. The quantitative and qualitative evidence effectively reinforce what scholars have repeatedly told us: NEH Fellowships provide essential support that enables American scholars to advance humanistic knowledge, enrich the cultural record, contribute to educational programs, and inform the general public.

Jim Leach
Chairman
RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS: 
AN EVALUATION OF 2002–2004 AWARDS

SUMMARY

The Endowment’s enabling legislation establishes support of humanities scholarship as one of the agency’s fundamental purposes. Over the past forty-six years, the principal way by which NEH has encouraged scholarship has been through its Fellowships Program. By providing a stipend and a significant amount of time away from teaching, the Fellowships Program enables scholars to conduct advanced research in the humanities and publish their findings in articles and books.

The Fellowships Program is among the agency’s largest and best-known programs, attracting well over twelve hundred applicants each year. It is also among the agency’s most productive programs. Over the course of its lifetime, the program has led to the publication of nearly seven thousand books, many of which have received prestigious awards and prizes. NEH staff regularly tracks publications resulting from its Fellowships awards, but few systematic efforts have been made to study the extent to which the program has been meeting its objectives. This study was undertaken as a first step toward better understanding the program’s impact and outcomes.

The evaluation examined all fellowship awards made between 2002 and 2004 and relied on several sets of data. Using NEH records and the database resources of the Library of Congress, the evaluation determined the number of fellows who successfully published books and how long it took from when they received their fellowships. The evaluation also examined publication prizes, book review data, and publishers. In addition, the evaluation undertook a survey of recent fellowship winners, including an examination of a comparison group of applicants who competed for, but did not receive, a fellowship. The results comprise the most comprehensive evaluation to date of the Endowment’s largest single grant program.
SUMMARY FINDINGS

The evaluation yielded the following significant findings:

• About 70 percent of NEH Fellows complete their projects (i.e., publish a book) within seven to nine years of their awards.

• On average, NEH Fellows produced their books four and one-half years after the completion of their awards, approximately nine months sooner than those who did not receive NEH support.

• NEH-supported fellowships are widely distributed among junior and senior scholars, and across geographic regions and types of institutional affiliations.

• The NEH Fellowships Program is an important funder of independent humanities scholars in the U.S.

• The work of NEH Fellows is widely recognized for its scholarly excellence—sixty-seven different institutions having awarded eighty-four publication prizes to the 2002–2004 fellows.

• 98 percent of those completing the survey considered their fellowships to be “extremely significant” for the development of their projects.

• 96 percent of fellows responding to the survey have published a book, article, or essay.

• Over 90 percent of those completing the survey considered their fellowships to have had an impact on their careers.

• 77 percent of survey respondents indicated that their NEH-supported research had a direct and positive impact on their teaching.

• NEH-supported books received, on average, three to four reviews within the first three years after publication—suggesting that NEH-supported books are read and have scholarly (as well as broader) impact.

These findings strongly suggest that NEH’s Fellowships Program has been succeeding in its efforts to promote humanities scholarship. They also testify to the central place of NEH’s Fellowships Program in the intellectual life of the nation.
INTRODUCTION

When the National Endowment for the Humanities was established in 1966, it represented a grassroots and bipartisan effort to provide those engaged in the study of the humanities—those in disciplines such as history, literature, philosophy, languages, and classics—an opportunity to achieve at the same high level as those working in the sciences. In his inaugural report to Congress, the first NEH chairman remarked that “fellowships in the sciences have played a major role in the development of the nation's pool of qualitatively superb scientists; similar efforts in the humanities will produce similar results.” Advancing knowledge and understanding have ever since been an important part of NEH’s mission.

One of the primary methods for achieving these goals has been through fellowships: awards to individual scholars for periods of six to twelve months to write books and thereby create a tangible, lasting record of the very best in humanities research. NEH Fellowships make available the most important scholarly commodity: time. Humanities scholars need time to read; time to conduct archival research; time to think; and time to write. In almost every case, NEH Fellowships provide scholars with time to produce books—the “gold standard” in the communication and evaluation of humanities ideas. Their books spell out ideas that promote discussion within the disciplines, create public awareness, nurture scholarly careers, and prepare the next generation for the challenges of the future.

This report represents the Endowment’s most systematic attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the Fellowships Program, a program that is widely known among independent scholars, college teachers, and university faculty members.

Since 1980, the NEH Fellowships Program has received almost fifty thousand requests for funding and made over 6,500 awards, covering every field in the humanities and leading to the publication of thousands of scholarly books. While impressive, these numbers do not necessarily mean that the program is meeting its core objectives. It was the purpose of this study to examine whether the program is meeting its objectives and to understand more fully what the scholarly community and the American public have gained from NEH's Fellowships Program. More precisely, the study assessed the extent to which the Fellowships Program facilitates basic research and original scholarship in the humanities by analyzing program outcomes—particularly books—as a result or “payoff” of providing scholars with a concentrated period of time for research and writing.

To this end, the evaluation project examined the work of 520 award recipients (the “study group”) from fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004. From the same years, we also examined 180 nonwinners (the “comparison group”) who submitted highly competitive applications but just missed being funded. The aim is twofold: First, to establish the extent to which fellows use their awards to publish books and how long it takes before their books appear in print; second, to determine whether and how fellowship-supported books enter into discussions among scholars, readers, and the public at large.

We made use of several different sources of data:

• The online catalog of the Library of Congress, to determine the number of published books (including single-author works, edited collections, translations, and other research tools). The Library’s catalog is widely considered to be authoritative and, therefore, would include any published book relevant to our evaluation. A list of books
published by 2002–2004 NEH Fellowships awardees and a list of publishers appear in Appendices A and B, respectively.

• Lists of prizes and awards from online sources and compiled through correspondence with fellows in the study group. Sponsors of publication prizes are noteworthy for their diversity and include professional and academic organizations, public philanthropic organizations, local and national newspapers and magazines, and public interest groups. A list of publication prizes won by 2002–2004 NEH Fellowship awardees appears in Appendix C.

• The Book Review Index Plus (BRIP) database available through the Library of Congress to determine the extent to which NEH-supported books were reviewed or noted in scholarly and popular publications. BRIP is a comprehensive online guide to book reviews that includes more than five million review citations for books, periodicals, books on tape, and electronic media representing a wide range of popular, academic, and professional interests. A full list of publications reviewing NEH-supported books appears in Appendix D.

• A wide-ranging survey of the 520 fellowship awardees for the fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004, which constituted the study group. We received 320 completed surveys, for a response rate of 62 percent. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to the 320 respondents for the extended comments that they included with their surveys. NEH staff can speculate on what it means to receive an award, but there is no source better to articulate the importance of the Endowment’s work than its recipients.

The NEH Fellowships Program strives to conduct fair and open competitions that reward scholars at any stage of their careers, in diverse geographic locations, and with a wide range of affiliations. These guiding objectives are central to honoring the trust between the Endowment and the American public, which expects wise and fair expenditure of funds based on support of the best ideas. We believe that the evidence we have gathered confirms that the NEH Fellowships Program is accomplishing its important and unique mission to facilitate “basic research and original scholarship in the humanities.”

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In a time when the publishing industry is undergoing major changes as a result of digital technologies, most NEH Fellowships applicants still aim to write books. While NEH-supported books now appear in both traditional and electronic formats, the genre (regardless of the format) continues to be the measure of scholarly significance and the manner by which new ideas in the humanities are communicated. In what follows, we draw upon the survey results and other data sources to discuss, among other key issues: important characteristics of the NEH applicant pool, publishing success rates of NEH scholars, various measures of scholarly excellence, impact, and reach, and the benefits of NEH Fellowships for the awardees, including the impact on their careers and their teaching.

Characteristics of the Applicant Pool and Award Winners

NEH awards fellowships based on merit and the advice it receives from outside, independent evaluators. The diversity of NEH’s award winners—in terms of academic rank, geographical location, and institutional affiliation—is remarkable.
Applicant Rank. Applicants are classified as either junior scholars or senior scholars. Junior applicants are those who completed their final degrees within seven years of the submission deadline; senior scholars are those who received their final degrees more than seven years ago. Providing funding opportunities to both junior and senior scholars has been a goal of the Endowment since the beginning of the Fellowships Program.

From its earliest fellowships competitions to the present, NEH’s applicant pool has varied little, with approximately 60 percent of applicants being senior scholars and 40 percent junior scholars. In the three years considered in this study, the entire application pool of 3,641 applicants included 59 percent senior scholars and 41 percent junior scholars. What has varied over the years are the proportions of awards going to junior and senior scholars. The Endowment has never imposed a target for any category of scholars. Instead, it has relied on its peer review process to identify the best applications. In some years, senior scholars fare better; in other years, junior scholars fare better. In the years under evaluation, 347 of the 520 fellows (67 percent) were senior scholars, and 173 of the 520 fellows (33 percent) were junior scholars.

Geographic Distribution. The Endowment has always taken its status as a national funding agency seriously. While the Endowment imposes no regional targets for awards in any of its programs, it strives to make all regions of the country aware of its programs, including Fellowships. For the years under review, the Endowment funded fellowship applicants from each region at approximately the same rates as they applied. While applicants from New England and the Middle Atlantic states apply in slightly higher numbers, they by no means dominate the competition, as the following chart indicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>ALL NEH APPLICANTS</th>
<th>NEH FELLOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW ENGLAND</td>
<td>490 (13%)</td>
<td>92 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE ATLANTIC</td>
<td>892 (24%)</td>
<td>143 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDWEST</td>
<td>777 (21%)</td>
<td>109 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>475 (13%)</td>
<td>67 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>643 (17%)</td>
<td>72 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAINS, MOUNTAINS &amp; SOUTHWEST</td>
<td>296 (8%)</td>
<td>28 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER*</td>
<td>108 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,681</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes U.S. territories and U.S. citizens living abroad
In 2002–2004, the Fellowships Program received applications from all fifty states and made awards to applicants living in forty-four of these. On average, NEH funds reached scholars in thirty-nine states each year. It should be noted that states that did not receive awards submitted, on average, fewer than four applications per competition, and that in the same time period these states received multiple awards through the Endowment’s other grant programs.

**Institutional Affiliation.** Over the last two decades, there have been significant shifts within U.S. academe. With more PhDs awarded than there are new positions available for them, qualified teachers and scholars have become more widely distributed throughout institutions of higher education. Scholars teaching at major research institutions, however, continue to have resources not always available to scholars working at smaller universities, four-year colleges, two-year colleges, and to those who remain unaffiliated. The applicant pool for NEH Fellowships reflects this diversity. During the years under evaluation, 48 percent of all applicants indicated affiliations with major research institutions, 39 percent were affiliated with nonresearch institutions, and 13 percent were unaffiliated independent scholars.

As with scholarly rank and geographical distribution, NEH does not target specific institutions or institution types for its awards. Panelists are asked to evaluate each application on its own merits, regardless of an applicant’s institutional affiliation. Of the 520 awards made in 2002, 2003, and 2004, 57 percent went to faculty members at research institutions; 36 percent went to faculty members at nonresearch institutions; and 7 percent went to independent scholars.

**Support for Independent Scholars**

The rubric “independent scholar” includes a wide range of individuals: some are eager for academic appointments but do not yet have them; others are employed in positions outside of the academy; still others have chosen to remain without affiliation. During the three years under review, NEH awarded fellowships to 37 independent scholars. The significance of this finding should not be overlooked. NEH Fellowships are not for faculty members alone but for any qualified individual who wishes to undertake serious research in the humanities.

The importance of NEH to independent scholars can be seen in some of the survey responses. Steven Holmes, for example, commented, “For independent scholars, NEH is one of the few sources of support for continued research in the humanities, thus contributing greatly to intellectual work that is often more explorative and free-ranging than that which takes place in the academy.” Andrea Weiss, who was an independent scholar when she received her NEH Fellowship, recounts that the fellowship made her “research more careful and more thorough than it would have been; . . . I was afforded the time to develop my skills as an author; I think my writing style and nonfiction storytelling abilities advanced significantly because of that extra time, leading to more positive reviews and recognition. . . . I was an independent scholar when I received the fellowship, so I had no financial support and the fellowship was a true lifeline enabling me to finish my project.” After the completion of her FY 2003 fellowship, the City University of New York hired Weiss, awarding her tenure after only three years. Her book, *In the Shadow of the Magic Mountain: The Erika and Klaus Mann Story* (University of Chicago Press), was published in 2008.

Daniel Sharfstein received his NEH Fellowship in 2004 when he was an independent scholar. He is now a tenured professor at Vanderbilt University Law School, and his survey
comments suggest that without an NEH Fellowship not just a book but an entire scholarly career might have been lost: “I was awarded an NEH Fellowship at a crucial moment in my life. I had graduated from law school in 2000 and spent a few years clerking in the federal courts and practicing public-interest law. I was in the process of interviewing with Boston law firms with the idea that I would embark on a career as a trial lawyer. And then I saw NEH’s call for proposals in early 2003. In college and law school, I had done some research into nineteenth- and early twentieth-century court cases in which judges and juries had to determine whether people were white or black. The picture that these cases revealed of small Southern communities during slavery and segregation was unlike anything I had learned in history books—to my mind, the cases called into question some of our most deep-seated assumptions about race in the United States. I dreamed of writing a book about these cases, but I had to work to support myself… When I applied as an independent scholar, I thought of it as one last chance to realize my dream. If it did not work out, then I would move on with my life in legal practice. I will never forget the day the notification from NEH arrived in the mail, just as I will never forget what the fellowship enabled me to do. I spent the year immersed in research, figuring out how to write a book and what its focus would be. At the same time, even though I was an independent scholar, the fellowship opened up an entire world to me, a community of historians and legal scholars who embraced my work and gave me invaluable feedback during the years I spent researching and writing it. The fellowship led to additional funding opportunities, an academic position at Vanderbilt, and, ultimately, The Invisible Line. The world has one less lawyer, but the NEH Fellowship has given me a book, a community, and a career. And judging from the responses I have received from readers as well as descendants of the families in the book, my NEH Fellowship has had an impact on many other people’s lives, too. I will always be grateful for this life-changing opportunity, and I hope that the agency continues to play its essential role in nurturing the ideas and historical imagination of the United States.” Sharfstein published The Invisible Line: Three American Families and the Secret Journey from Black to White with Penguin in 2011.

Publications

Of the 520 fellows in the the study group, 357 (or 69 percent) published books between the end of their fellowship and June 30, 2011 (the closing date of this study). By contrast, those individuals who prepared applications that were highly competitive but not funded were significantly less successful. Of the 180 applicants in the comparison group, only 72 (42 percent) were able to publish books. At the most basic level, then, the value of a fellowship is clear. Scholars who receive NEH funding published books at a rate 25 to 30 percent higher than their unfunded counterparts, suggesting at least two conclusions. First, it confirms that the most valuable commodity for a scholar is time. Individuals who have been freed from the duties of teaching and administration are more likely to be productive scholars. Professor Sandra Petrulionis of the Department of English at Pennsylvania State University–Altoona noted in her survey response that research leading to book publication “takes an extraordinary amount of time.
These projects and this kind of writing cannot truly be done well during a regular semester or summer break. They require intensive thought and concentration, which NEH Fellowships provide.”

Second, the statistics refute the notion—sometimes voiced by those unfamiliar with the nature of humanities research—that humanities scholars do not need fellowships. In fact, there is a clear need. Without funding, many scholars would not be able to accomplish the work expected of them by their institutions, nor would they be able to keep their scholarly skills honed or to continue to develop intellectually. As universities and colleges curtail their own funding, NEH Fellowships provide a publishing “lifeline” for many, a fact borne out by the survey comments. For example, Professor John Cort in the Department of Religion at Denison University, Granville, Ohio, wrote, “Without the year of uninterrupted writing allowed by the NEH Fellowship, a year freed from the heavy teaching responsibilities of a small liberal arts college, I would not have been able to finish the book.” Likewise, Professor Claudia Jensen, a part-time faculty member in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Washington, noted, “I would not have been able to write this book without the support of NEH. So, calling the impact of the NEH Fellowship ‘extremely important’ is actually something of an understatement.” Jensen published *Musical Cultures in Seventeenth-Century Russia* with Indiana University Press in 2009.

While it is important that NEH Fellows are succeeding in publishing their work, it is equally noteworthy where they are publishing. In a time when the number of “vanity presses” and presses that do not utilize peer review is increasing, the list of publishers of NEH-supported books (Appendix B) indicates that the majority of NEH books are published by university presses, trade presses, or independent presses, all of which use peer review in the evaluation of manuscripts. The top ten publishers of NEH-supported books account for almost half of the total. These ten presses—Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, University of Chicago Press, Cornell University Press, University of California Press, Harvard University Press, Ashgate Press, Routledge Press, University of Pennsylvania Press, and Stanford University Press—are widely considered to be among the most prestigious and competitive presses in the humanities. They employ rigorous peer review of manuscripts, and sophisticated marketing departments, and strive to make their products widely available. Such a publishing record testifies to the scholarly significance of NEH-funded research and its successful dissemination.

Some projects will take more than nine years to bear fruit, and the statistics show that about 30 percent of fellows in the study group have not yet published books. The reasons are varied. The Endowment funds individual projects at any stage of development. Some fellows are ready to begin writing when their fellowship periods begin; others, however, spend their awards on the arduous but necessary task of sifting through archival materials. Larry Stempel, for example, recently published his magnum opus *Showtime: A History of the Broadway Musical Theater* (W. W. Norton, 2011). His NEH Fellowship, funded in 1984, supported the initial research trips to archives and libraries around the country, and this research eventually made his book possible.

Few books will be twenty-seven years in the making like Stempel’s. Yet NEH-funded fellows find that their awards allow them to achieve greater intellectual depth as a result of their fellowship. Ninety-eight percent of survey respondents indicate that the work accomplished with NEH support allowed them to write higher quality books. “Without the NEH Fellowship,” noted Professor Julie Winch of the University of Massachusetts, Boston,
“I would not have been able to mine all the sources I eventually did.” Professor Jan Shetler of Goshen College in Indiana had an even more dramatic tale: “Since my research is in . . . Tanzania, I could not have completed this project without an extensive fieldwork time there. It would have been impossible without funding.” An NEH Fellowship, by design, enables a scholar to delve deeper, range more widely, and create more lasting scholarship.

Some fellows did not publish because they received funding for projects with goals other than books. For example, Thomas Field, a linguist at the University of Maryland-Baltimore County, received a fellowship to produce an electronic corpus of the medieval Gascon language, a Romance language dialect once spoken in southern France and parts of Spain. While no book was proposed by Field, the open access database he compiled will be of great use to other linguists who will as a result of it publish books.

While our first conclusion—that fellows published more than nonfellows—is perhaps not surprising, a closer examination of the publication numbers holds some noteworthy results. The conventional wisdom among peer reviewers is that senior scholars publish more easily and more often than junior scholars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total in Group</th>
<th>Total # of Books Published</th>
<th># of Junior Scholars</th>
<th>Junior Scholars who published</th>
<th># of Senior Scholars</th>
<th>Senior Scholars who published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEH Fellows</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>357 (69%)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>120 (69%)</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>237 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEH Unsuccessful Applicants</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>76 (42%)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24 (34%)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>52 (47%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet the evaluation revealed that junior scholars who received fellowships published more than their senior counterparts. Sixty-nine percent of junior scholars published books, while 63 percent of senior scholars published books. What this suggests is that junior scholars, who are frequently attempting to gain tenure, are quite motivated to complete their projects.

Sixty-nine percent of award winners published books, but when broken down by institutional affiliation, it is clear that some groups are at an advantage. Scholars with affiliations at large research institutions typically have access to impressive research libraries and additional research support, and, therefore, it is not surprising that 75 percent of award winners at research institutions were able to publish. Faculty members at nonresearch institutions—which include a wide variety of small universities, liberal arts colleges, and two-year colleges—published in numbers just below the average, 62 percent. The unaffiliated independent scholars who published did so at an even lower rate of 51 percent. These numbers suggest that infrastructure and access to resources does matter. Larger institutions typically have more research money available for their faculty members. But money is only part of the picture: Research institutions are more likely to allow faculty members to teach in their specialized areas of research and are more likely to have research assistants for their use.

However that may be, the “big picture” for all groups who received a fellowship is bright in terms of productivity. While 74 percent of survey respondents indicate that they completed a single-authored book (a number consistent with our independently derived figure from the Library of Congress catalog), 308 of the 320 respondents, or 96 percent, reported publishing as
a result of their fellowships (either a single-authored book, a peer-reviewed article, a chapter in a book, an edited volume, or some combination of these). Of the eleven respondents who did not publish, nine indicated that they presented public lectures and/or conference papers on their fellowship work, while only two reported no public results to date whatsoever (and, it should be noted, both of these fellows mentioned that they had just completed their book manuscripts).

**Time from Award to Publication**

It is fair for American taxpayers to ask how long one should have to wait before an “investment” in a scholar yields a return. Since a fellowship can cover any stage in the research process, from exploring archives to drafting and revising, the timeline for completion can vary significantly. A fellow funded at the writing stage is more likely to complete the project quickly than a fellow who is only just beginning research. Nonetheless, based on available book publication data, we can determine the average lag between awards and results. NEH Fellows who published a book at the time the evaluation was completed did so, on average, 4.4 years after receiving their awards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Years for Junior Scholars</th>
<th>Average Years for Senior Scholars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEH Fellows</td>
<td>4.4 years</td>
<td>4.4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEH Unsuccessful Applicants</td>
<td>4.5 years</td>
<td>5.1 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Endowment’s main goal was the quick production of books, then the Fellowships Program would fund only projects that are already at the writing stage. However, NEH’s mission emphasizes funding the best scholarship, and that often means supporting applicants who will engage in arduous archival research or other long-term research efforts involving oral histories or data gathering. Professor Joseph McCartin at Georgetown University, for example, indicates that his fellowship allowed him “to deepen my research considerably, to add a whole new dimension through oral histories, and to broaden the context within which I was situating my work. It was hugely significant and resulted in much better and more significant research products.” McCartin’s *Collision Course: Ronald Reagan, the Air Traffic Controllers, and the Strike that Changed America* (Oxford University Press) appeared in 2011. Likewise, Farzaneh Milani at the University of Virginia suggests that delays are inherent in fellowships awarded to conduct archival research. With her fellowship, Professor Milani was able to conduct research that expanded “the themes proposed and, as a consequence, [I] needed more time to complete my project.” Milani’s book—*Words Not Swords: Iranian Women Writers and the Freedom of Movement* (Syracuse University Press, 2011)—was published after nine years of work by its author. A fellowship awarded to Sarah McNamer in the English Department at Georgetown University allowed the author to “undertake new research I had not anticipated, and essentially to rewrite the first half of my book. My book is much the stronger…but it took several years longer than anticipated to complete.”
McNamer published *Affective Meditation and the Invention of Medieval Compassion* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

The survey also makes clear how heavy teaching loads can affect productivity—and that an NEH Fellowship can help address this issue. The challenge identified by Chairman Barnaby Keeney in 1967 is echoed in 2011 by Professor Leslie A. Adelson at Cornell University, who received an NEH Fellowship and has been active in the Modern Language Association: “Many individual scholars capable of developing important new ideas have no other means of support because their home institutions are either too poor or understaffed to provide it. Teaching loads and service loads for many scholars in the humanities are so high that little or no time remains to pursue sustained research during a normal semester. The financial support and leave time enabled by NEH support are absolutely necessary for many individual scholars to pursue and complete high-quality research of significance to the humanities.” Professor Adelson published her book, *The Turkish Turn in Contemporary German Literature*, on the effects of Turkish migration to Germany, in 2005, with Palgrave Macmillan.

**Additional Benefits of Fellowships for Fellows**

It is significant that 99 percent of survey respondents stated that they were able to provide a more thorough treatment of their subject because of their awards. And 98 percent responded that their NEH awards allowed them to achieve a higher quality final product. This is reinforced by answers suggesting that more than 70 percent of respondents were able to use their awards to examine archival materials.

What the survey also makes clear is that fellowships frequently pay off in unanticipated ways. They improve, for example, the chances of serendipitous discovery in the course of research. Julie Winch at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, recounted how during one research trip she located “a cache of material that no scholar had ever seen before. A box (rather a large box) of letters emerged from the crawl-space of an old home belonging to the family I was researching. The letters—now suitably conserved and catalogued—have become part of the collection of the Missouri Historical Society. . . . Without this support it is virtually impossible for scholars at all but the wealthiest schools to get the time to do this kind of work. Squeezing writing—and especially research trips—into a week here or there just doesn’t yield the same kinds of results.” Winch’s NEH-supported research resulted in *The Clamorgans: One Family’s History of Race in America* (Hill and Wang, 2011). Likewise, Robert Rupert of the Philosophy Department at the University of Colorado, Boulder, recounted in his survey that his “book-project has led to ongoing debates with leaders in my field, . . . helping everyone involved to get a clearer picture of what’s at stake in debates about the nature of human cognition and mind, to locate the genuine points of disagreement, and to give everyone involved a better idea which avenues of future research are promising.” Professor Rupert received his award as a junior scholar working at Texas Tech University. His book, *Cognitive Systems and the Extended Mind*, was published by Oxford University Press in 2009.

**Impact in the Scholarly Community**

No matter how well written or researched, a book that goes unread is worth little more than the paper on which it is printed. So, while books are the immediate outcome of NEH Fellowships, the extent to which the books engage and stimulate new ideas among readers determines an important impact of the Fellowships Program. Book reviews provide a useful indication of the interest that NEH-supported books generate. NEH-supported
Books clearly gain ready recognition by scholarly and popular reviewers. On average, books published with 2002–2004 fellowships have so far been reviewed three to four times each. (This statistic remained relatively consistent across both the study group of NEH Fellows and the comparison group.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEH Fellows</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>879 (87%)</td>
<td>120 (12%)</td>
<td>13 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEH Unsuccessful Applicants</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>181 (90%)</td>
<td>20 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Books attract reviews, among other reasons, if they are topical and relevant to the readers of a particular journal or periodical. The majority of reviews of NEH-supported books are to be found in scholarly journals. Eighty-seven percent of reviews of NEH-supported books appear in these discipline-based journals. Disciplinary journals foster the kind of discussions and debates that are central to communicating and testing ideas in the humanities. For example, John Cort's *Framing the Jina: Narratives of Icons and Idols in Jain History* (Oxford University Press, 2010) received two reviews in 2011 in the two most prominent journals in the author's field. The reviewer in the *Journal of South Asian Studies* concluded: “While this book allows readers to gain entry into Jain narratives and ritual practices, this is not a book solely about Jainism. In every chapter, Cort provides relevant comparative material from other religious traditions, including Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam. By doing so, Cort dismantles any monolithic understanding of icons and iconoclasm and forces us to consider the various interpretive frames that are employed in these narratives. In short, this book is essential for scholars who are interested in image worship and the ways in which religious communities defend or reject such practices.” In September 2011, a reviewer in the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* offered this assessment: “Seeking the widest possible aperture of understanding, Cort locates the Jina image in multiple interpretive frames: archaeology, history, art history, text, ethnography, comparative religion, and more. The result is a pioneering study of great interest on both methodological and substantive grounds.” These reviews corroborate what many survey respondents noted: Their fellowships afforded them the time to both broaden and deepen their analyses.

Next to reviews, a useful way to discover the extent to which NEH-supported books shape scholarly discussions is to examine publication prizes. Scholarly organizations award publication prizes to recognize the best work done in their respective
fields. Books published in 2010 and beyond are just now becoming eligible for such awards. But as of September 2011, the 2002–2004 NEH Fellows had received eighty-six prizes, each awarded by a separate adjudicating committee. The American Philological Association, for example, awarded its 2008 Charles Goodwin Award to NEH Fellow David Konstan. The award recognizes the best book in any field of classical studies for the previous three years. Konstan published *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature* (University of Toronto Press, 2007) with the support of a fellowship in 2004. The American Historical Association awarded six of its coveted book prizes to NEH Fellows included in the study group. AHA acknowledged excellence in French history (Rachel Fuchs and Martha Hanna), Italian history (Thomas Kuehn), African studies (Pier Larson), ancient history (Anthony Barbieri-Low), and East Asian studies (Susan Mann). In addition to receiving the AHA’s 2008 James Breasted Prize for best book in ancient history, Barbieri-Low’s *Artisans in Early Imperial China* (University of Washington Press, 2007) also received the Association of Asian Studies’s award for the best book on China, and the College Art Association’s 2009 Charles Rufus Morey Book Award for the best work in the history of art. The list of awards is long, and it stands as compelling evidence that the scholarly community finds NEH-supported work valuable. A list of prizes won by the 2002–2004 fellows appears in Appendix C.

There are other ways in which the products of NEH Fellowships influence scholarly discussions. The list of books funded through the NEH Fellowships Program includes several editions and translations. NEH awards have supported scholars such as Professor William Baker of the University of Northern Illinois, who used his fellowship to prepare the final of four volumes of *The Letters of Wilkie Collins* (Pickering and Chatto, 2005). Laura Leibman of Reed College in Portland, Oregon, prepared an edition of Experience Mayhew’s *Indian Converts* (University of Massachusetts Press, 2008). Douglas Brookes, an independent scholar in Oakland, California, translated and edited the memoirs of three women who lived concurrently at the Ottoman court during the nineteenth century (University of Texas Press, 2008). Wilson Kimmach of the University of Bridgeport in Connecticut prepared an edition of American preacher Jonathan Edwards’s *Sermons and Discourses, 1743–1758* (Yale University Press, 2006). Professor Deborah Logan of Western Kentucky University used her fellowship to prepare *The Collected Letters of Harriet Martineau* (Pickering and Chatto, 2007). These editions and translations, and others like them, lay the groundwork for the next generation of scholars and students by providing access to materials that would otherwise be unavailable or inaccessible to those who do not command the necessary languages.

**Impact Among More General Audiences and the Public**

A significant number of NEH-supported books reach beyond the scholarly community, energizing discussions among the broader reading public. For example, about 12 percent of reviews of NEH-supported books appear in publications that reach a large, general readership. General readers encounter the ideas of NEH Fellows through reviews of NEH-supported books in the *New York Times* (circulation of approximately 900,000 daily readers), the *New Republic* (approximately 53,000 readers), the *Weekly Standard* (approximately 103,000 readers), the *Times Literary Supplement* (approximately 110,000 readers), *Time* (approximately 3.9 million readers), *Newsweek* (approximately 1.5 million readers), the *London Review of Books* (approximately 49,000 readers), *Fortune* (approximately 845,000 readers), the *New Yorker* (just over 1.1 million readers), and the *Economist* (just under 1.6 million readers). Michael Honey at the University of Washington, Tacoma, received an NEH Fellowship in 2003 to complete *Going Down Jericho Road: The Memphis Strike, Martin Luther*
King’s Last Campaign (W. W. Norton, 2007). His book garnered reviews in the popular press as well as in scholarly publications. In the Nation (circulation of approximately 160,000) for example, reviewer Scott Saul praised Honey for revealing “an epic struggle, with a cast of characters and a gripping plot that put it on the level of a biblical spectacular…. Going Down Jericho Road takes the long view of the Memphis campaign…but the book is lovingly and scrupulously detailed, evoking the high drama that ensued after ‘the lowly’ demanded respect. In the process, it is also suggests indelibly how the movement made King, and how King made the movement” (the Nation, May 19, 2008, 36–41). Such recognition did not come at the cost of scholarly rigor. Reviews in scholarly journals have praised Honey’s book for providing a major reinterpretation of the history of civil rights. A review in the Journal of Southern History (circulation of approximately 3,500) by eminent American historian Dennis Dickerson, James M. Lawson Jr. Professor of History at Vanderbilt University, notes that the “strength of Honey’s moving narrative lies in his deep probes into the personalities and principles of the strike’s major and minor participants.” This depth, Dickerson concludes, allows Honey to argue convincingly that the strike “marked a major shift in the civil rights struggle” (November 2010, 1069–1072). The New York Times praised Daniel Sharfstein’s Invisible Line: Three American Families and the Secret Journey from Black to White as “an astonishingly detailed rendering of the variety and complexity of racial experience in an evolving national culture moving from slavery to segregation to civil rights” (February 21, 2011). The Economist lauded Ian Morris’s Why the West Rules—For Now: The Patterns of History and What They Reveal about the Future (Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 2010) for its “clarity and vigor…. This is an important book—one that challenges, stimulates, and entertains. Anyone who does not believe there are lessons to be learned from history should start here.” The catalog of such general-interest reviews in mass publications goes on and on.

NEH continues to fund biographies, which often have “crossover” appeal to nonacademic audiences. Between 2002 and 2004, NEH supported Catherine Clinton’s Harriet Tubman: The Road to Freedom (Little, Brown, 2004); Julia Markus’s J. Anthony Froude: The Last Undiscovered Great Victorian (Scribner, 2005); Keith Newlin’s Hamlin Garland: A Life (University of Nebraska Press, 2008); Duane Roller’s Cleopatra: A Biography (Oxford University Press, 2010); Melvin Urofsky’s Louis D. Brandeis: A Life (Pantheon, 2009); and Roman Koropeckyj’s Adam Michiewicz: The Life of a Romantic (Cornell University Press, 2008). Biographies make history come alive in a way that narrative and analytical histories sometimes cannot. Clinton’s work on the leader of the Underground Railroad was acknowledged by both the Christian Science Monitor and the Chicago
Tribune as the best nonfiction book of 2004. Urofsky’s work on Justice Brandeis was judged the book of the year by the Economist and the Jewish Book Council. Biographies have proven to be one of the best ways for NEH scholars to reach a wider reading audience.

Over the last decade, the NEH Fellowships Program has strengthened its commitment to encouraging writing that is widely accessible to both scholarly and general readers. Beginning in 2008, application guidelines for NEH Fellowships have listed “clarity of expression” among the rating criteria, requiring that NEH-supported work be written in language understandable by any educated reader. This decision formalized an already existing emphasis on the general reader that can be seen even in the books published with support from 2002–2004 NEH Fellowships.

Trade publishers, which typically aim at the general reader, frequently publish NEH books. The list of books resulting from NEH Fellowships awarded between 2002 and 2004 includes many trade publishers: Pantheon; Modern Library; Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux; Rowman and Littlefield; Longman; W. W. Norton; Hackett; Viking; Random House; Hill and Wang; Scribner; and Penguin. A complete list of the publishers who published the books so far written with 2002–2004 Fellowships appears in Appendix B.

Impact of Fellowships on Careers

If one measure of success is making a difference in the lives of awardees, then the NEH Fellowships Program has succeeded beyond what the founders of the program may have imagined. A typical junior scholar must publish a book or monograph to receive academic tenure and secure a permanent place in the academe. One hundred and twenty of the 357 books published by fellows in the study group came from junior scholars, suggesting that NEH Fellowships have played a major role in fostering the career advancement of the next generation of humanities scholars. The survey makes clear that fellowships have tangible impacts on the careers of award winners: 92 percent of survey respondents credit their fellowships with advancing their careers; 73 percent established new collaborative relationships with colleagues as a result of their awards; 61 percent used the work completed during the fellowships to develop a new intellectual approach or interest; and most impressively, 98 percent of respondents indicated that their awards had an impact on their careers. For example, American historian Marsha Weisiger commented that “none of the awards or accolades I’ve received, the new respect I’ve gained from my peers, nor the endowed chair I won at the University of Oregon, would have been possible without this vital support. I will always be in debt to NEH! It changed my life.” Weisiger received a fellowship in 2004 as a junior scholar at New Mexico State University in Las Cruces. Her book—*Dreaming of Sheep in Navajo Country* (University of Washington Press, 2009)—received reviews in *Agricultural History*, *Western Historical Quarterly*, *American Indian Quarterly*, *Pacific Historical Review*, *American Historical Review*, *Journal of American History*, and *American Scientist*. Likewise, art historian Anna Arnar at the University of Minnesota, Moorhead, commented, “Regarding my book, I ended up with the highest end product possible: quality publisher, beautiful illustrations and design; last but not least: the depth and breadth of my research and writing were vastly improved. To
complete the project still took me a few more years but the NEH year made my book a more ambitious and far-reaching work. . . . I am also especially grateful to NEH as I am employed by a state-funded institution that does not have a lot of money to support research. I simply cannot imagine how I could have written the same book without NEH.” Arnar published *The Book as Instrument: Stéphane Mallarmé, the Artist’s Book, and the Transformation of Print Culture* (University of Chicago Press, 2011), which received the Robert Motherwell Book Award by the Dedalus Foundation in New York.

The survey responses also suggest that national awards change the ways that fellows think about themselves as scholars. The NEH imprimatur provides validation for many scholars. Professor Thomas Augst of the Department of English at New York University notes, “NEH offers a warrant of the importance of humanistic scholarship to the United States’ stewardship of new and existing knowledge in the 21st century. There are other grant-making agencies, but none that carry NEH’s meaning, the symbolic message that the humanistic scholarship matters to our civic enterprise. I have won other fellowships in my career, but THIS fellowship changed how I thought about the nature and purpose of my work.” Augst’s sentiments are echoed by independent scholar Steven Holmes: “As an independent scholar, my NEH Fellowship has helped my career immeasurably by substituting for a formal academic affiliation as a sort of certification of my legitimacy as a scholar, thus contributing to my recognition and acceptance in scholarly and professional circles, publication opportunities, availability of freelance work, and so on.”

NEH Fellowships provide a boost for recipients’ careers as scholars in another way: The work accomplished while holding a fellowship may have payoffs long after the immediate outcome is achieved. For example, Marta Hanson, Johns Hopkins University, applied to complete research in Taiwanese archives. As a result of her fellowship, she published *Speaking of Epidemics in Chinese Medicine: Disease and the Geographic Imagination in Late Imperial China* (Routledge, 2011). She reports, however, “I did so much research during my NEH Fellowship, I am still publishing from the material I gathered that year at Princeton and in Taiwan. In fact, my second book on hand mnemonics and Chinese arts of memory, which I am now writing at the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in Berlin, is the result of a new discovery of sources I uncovered during that year.” Hanson articulates what many other fellowship winners have found: namely, that NEH Fellowships have an intellectual afterlife that shapes scholarship long after their initial projects are completed.

Finally, the flexibility and portability of NEH Fellowships have proven to be especially valuable in the career of the modern-day scholar. Today’s scholar may be a parent with young children or with other family commitments, or the partner of someone who also holds a full-time job. NEH Fellowships have been especially successful in meeting such complex needs and family situations. As Marsha Weisiger at the University of Oregon notes, “One of the major benefits of the fellowship was that, unlike many fellowships from private institutions, it did not require residency at some far-away institution . . . Residential fellowships are particularly hard on female scholars, two-career families, and parents, as they often require scholars to live apart from their families for the fellowship year (with the added costs of maintaining two households and commuting to see family) or to uproot the entire family for a year. These are based on an old economic model of a male scholar with a homemaker-wife. [NEH Fellowships] are nearly unique in that they have no such requirement.” This sentiment was echoed by others, including Greta Austin at the University of Puget Sound: “NEH grants are indispensable for women and academics with families. Most other humanities grants (and there are very few) require you to move to another place. I am a woman who has two small
children and a partner who works full-time (also as a professor), and it is nearly impossible for us to apply for these sabbaticals. The NEH allowed me to do my research without having to dislocate my whole family.” NEH Fellowships are designed to be flexible, to accommodate the increasingly complex lives of the scholars who want to apply. It is gratifying that fellows find NEH awards appropriate for their individual circumstances.

**Impact of Fellowships on Classroom Teaching**

When the Endowment received authorization from Congress in 1966, the link between a scholar’s teaching and research was largely taken for granted. Teaching, it was thought, revealed areas for new research and enabled scholars to explore their scholarly interests with advanced students, while research, in turn, informed and improved teaching. In the 1980s and 1990s, however, increased emphasis on specialization led many in the humanities to lament what often appeared as a disconnection between esoteric research projects and teaching in colleges and universities.

NEH’s strategy to encourage, identify, and support research that is both significant and broadly accessible has helped create stronger bonds between research and teaching. Indeed, the survey suggests that fellows frequently measure the success of their awards by what they are able to accomplish in the classroom. During the period under review, 93 percent of NEH awards went to scholars teaching in colleges and universities. Of those who responded to the survey, 77 percent indicated that the research conducted with their fellowships led them either to create new courses or significantly improve their existing courses.

For example, Professor Christine Poggi in the Department of Art History at the University of Pennsylvania noted that her fellowship “has had a positive effect on my teaching as well, allowing me to revise my graduate seminar in this field, and to develop related material in several undergraduate courses.” Professor Clare Crowston, a historian of France at the University of Illinois, is particularly articulate on the connection between research and teaching: “Not only does NEH allow scholars to pursue new and innovative ideas in their research, but these ideas are directly passed on to graduate and undergraduate students in the courses we teach. Future citizens and leaders of the country need to receive a post-secondary education that challenges and opens their minds and connects them to the latest ideas on culture, society, history, etc., in this country and all over the world.”

Although the study did not attempt to document how many students in classrooms across the country are assigned books written by NEH Fellows, the Internet provides some information about this on an incidental basis. For example, Frederick Buell’s 2002 fellowship resulted in *From Apocalypse to Way of Life: Environmental Crisis in the American Century* (New York: Routledge, 2003). His book appears on many online undergraduate course syllabi in English, history, and sociology at institutions such as Vanderbilt University, University of Vermont, Northeastern University, University of Virginia, University of Florida, and University of Maryland. Likewise, Anne Kinney’s 2004 NEH Fellowship resulted in *Chinese Views of Childhood* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2005), which has appeared on course reading lists at institutions including Indiana University, Case Western Reserve University, University of California–San Diego, Princeton University, Louisiana State University, and University of Wisconsin. These examples suggest that the work produced by NEH Fellows reaches not only their own students but students across the country.
CONCLUSIONS

The core objective of NEH’s Fellowships Program may be stated as follows: To support individuals pursuing advanced research that is of value to humanities scholars, general audiences, or both. It is to encourage and support scholarship in the humanities that advances human knowledge. This evaluation of the program reveals how successful the program has been in meeting its objectives. More particularly, the evaluation yielded the following salient findings:

• Approximately 70 percent of NEH Fellows complete their projects (i.e., publish a book) within seven to nine years of their awards. Awardees produced 357 books within, on average, four and a half years of their fellowships. Ninety-six percent of fellows responding to the survey have published a book, article, or essay, or a combination of the three.

• The intellectual content of the books produced is superior to what it would have been without support. Fellowships ensure that topics are covered more comprehensively and more imaginatively than would otherwise be the case, and that the results of research are more effectively communicated to the broadest possible audience.

• Compared with nonfellows, a significantly higher percentage of fellows produced books, and they did so faster. On average, it took NEH Fellows approximately nine months less to produce books than those who did not receive NEH support.

• NEH-supported books stir intellectual debates and conversations among scholars as well as more general audiences. This can be seen in the fact that NEH-supported books received, on average, three to four reviews within the first three years after publication from leading scholarly journals as well as from more popular magazines with circulations exceeding one million readers.

• NEH-supported books are widely acclaimed: Sixty-seven different institutions or organizations awarded eighty-four publication prizes to the 2002–2004 fellows.

• NEH-supported fellowships are broadly distributed: among junior and senior scholars, across geographic regions, and to applicants with varied institutional affiliations.

• NEH Fellowships balance a mix of projects at both the research and writing stages. While those at the writing stage might seem to be “a sure bet” for completion, those at the research stage often represent potential for the greatest advances in knowledge.

• The NEH Fellowships Program is a major funder of independent humanities scholars with no academic affiliation as well as scholars employed by nonresearch institutions.

• The NEH imprimatur or “brand” matters. Fellows report overwhelmingly that their NEH awards directly resulted in new jobs, new collaborations among scholars, new opportunities with presses, and—perhaps most importantly—leveraged money from their institutions and other funding organizations to support their research. Ninety-eight percent of those completing the survey considered their fellowships...
to be “extremely significant” for the development of their projects. Over 90 percent of those completing the survey considered their fellowships to have had an impact on their careers.

• 77 percent of survey respondents indicated that their NEH-supported research had a direct impact on their teaching. NEH Fellowships improve teaching in American colleges and universities by deepening the knowledge of educators and supporting research that makes its way into widely taught books.

In sum, the results of this evaluation indicate that NEH Fellowships have succeeded in supporting humanities scholarship in the United States—contributing to the advancement of research and scholarship as well as public understanding of the humanities. Perhaps most importantly, the evaluation’s findings suggest that the awards made in fellowships are taxpayer money well spent and ultimately a sound investment in the future of humanities scholarship.
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APPENDIX A — BOOKS PUBLISHED BY STUDY GROUP


Amberg, Rob. The New Road: I-26 and the Footprints of Progress in Appalachia. Chicago: Center for American Places at Columbia College (distributed through University of Georgia Press), 2009. (FB3785402)


De Armas, Frederick. Quixotic Frescoes: Cervantes and Italian Renaissance Art. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006. (FA3765003)


Eamon, William. The Professor of Secrets: Mystery, Medicine, and Alchemy in Renaissance Italy. Washington DC: National Geographic, 2010. (FA3694602)


Hanson, Marta. Speaking of Epidemics in Chinese Medicine: Disease and the Geographic Imagination in Late Imperial China. Abingdon: Routledge, 2011. (FA3721402)


Marvin, Roberta. Verdi the Student, Verdi the Teacher. Parma: Istituto Nazionale de Studi Verdiiani, 2010. (FA5019604)


McDonald, Russ. Shakespeare’s Late Style. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. (FA5062204)


Wu, Yi-Li. Reproducing Women: Medicine, Metaphor, and Childbirth in Late Imperial China. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010. (FB3793702)


APPENDIX B — PUBLISHERS OF BOOKS BY STUDY GROUP (BY NUMBER OF BOOKS PUBLISHED)

40 - Oxford University Press (New York, NY)
32 - Cambridge University Press (New York, NY)
18 - University of Chicago Press (Chicago, IL)
15 - Cornell University Press (Ithaca, NY)
14 - University of California Press (Berkeley, CA)
12 - Harvard University Press (Cambridge, MA)
10 - Ashgate Press (Burlington, VT)
10 - Routledge (New York, NY)
9 - University of Pennsylvania Press (Philadelphia, PA)
9 - Stanford University Press (Stanford, CA)
8 - Johns Hopkins University Press (Baltimore, MD)
8 - Pennsylvania State University Press (University Park, PA)
7 - Duke University Press (Durham, NC)
6 - Palgrave Macmillan (New York, NY)
6 - Yale University Press (New Haven, CT)
5 - Princeton University Press (Princeton, NJ)
4 - Columbia University Press (New York, NY)
4 - Indiana University Press (Bloomington, IN)
4 - Rutgers University Press (New Brunswick, NJ)
4 - University of Hawaii Press (Honolulu, HI)
4 - University of North Carolina Press (Chapel Hill, NC)
3 - Blackwell (Malden, MA)
3 - Penguin (New York, NY)
3 - University of New Mexico Press (Albuquerque, NM)
3 - University of Texas Press (Austin, TX)
3 - University of Toronto Press (Toronto, Canada)
3 - University of Virginia Press (Charlottesville, VA)
3 - University of Washington Press (Seattle, WA)
2 - Brill (Boston, MA)
2 - Brill (Leiden, Netherlands)
2 - Dumbarton Oaks Research Library (Washington, DC)
2 - Hill and Wang (New York, NY)
2 - MIT Press (Cambridge, MA)
2 - Ohio University Press (Athens, OH)
2 - Pickering & Chatto (London, UK)
2 - Preager (Westport, CT)
2 - Routledge (Abingdon, UK)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher/Museum</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - Rowman &amp; Littlefield</td>
<td>Lanham, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Scarecrow Press</td>
<td>Lanham, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - State University of New York Press</td>
<td>Albany, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - University of Illinois Press</td>
<td>Urbana, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - University of Massachusetts Press</td>
<td>Amherst, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - University of Michigan Press</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - University of Nebraska Press</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - University of Oklahoma Press</td>
<td>Norman, OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - University of Rochester Press</td>
<td>Rochester, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - University Press of New England</td>
<td>Hanover, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - W. W. Norton &amp; Co.</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Wiley-Blackwell</td>
<td>Hoboken, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Academie de France à Rome</td>
<td>Rome, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Albatros</td>
<td>Valencia, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Alfred A. Knopf</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - American Philosophical Society Press</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - American University in Cairo Press</td>
<td>Cairo, Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - A-R Editions</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Baylor University Press</td>
<td>Waco, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Beacon Press</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - BookBuilders</td>
<td>Ibadan, Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Brepols</td>
<td>Turnhout, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Cambridge Scholars Publishing</td>
<td>Newcastle, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Ediciones Era</td>
<td>Mexico City, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Fairleigh Dickinson University Press</td>
<td>Madison, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Farrar, Strauss and Giroux</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Free Press</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Hackett</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - HarperCollins</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Heinemann</td>
<td>Portsmouth, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Il mulino</td>
<td>Bologna, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Istituto Nazionale de Studi Verdiiani</td>
<td>Parma, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Lexington Books</td>
<td>Lanham, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Little, Brown</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Louisiana State University Press</td>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - M. E. Sharpe</td>
<td>Armonk, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Mage Publishers</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Markus Weiner Publishers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - McFarland Press</td>
<td>Jefferson, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Modern Library</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Museum of Modern Art Press</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - National Geographic</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - New York University Press</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Northwestern University Press</td>
<td>Evanston, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Ohio State University Press</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Olms-Weidmann</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Orbis Books</td>
<td>Maryknoll, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Pantheon Books</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Paris musée, Petit Palais</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Pearson Longman</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Prentice Hall</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Presses Universitaires Blaise Pascal</td>
<td>Clermont-Ferrand, France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 - Presses Universitaires du Septentrion (Villeneuve d’Ascq, France)
1 - Ruckers-Genootschap (Antwerp, Belgium)
1 - School for Advanced Research Press (Santa Fe, NM)
1 - Scribner (New York, NY)
1 - Seidosha (Tokyo, Japan)
1 - Shoemaker and Hoard (Emeryville, CA)
1 - Soka University Press (Tokyo)
1 - Southern Illinois University Press (Carbondale, IL)
1 - Springer (London, UK)
1 - Syracuse University Press (Syracuse, NY)
1 - Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico (Mexico City, Mexico)
1 - University of Georgia (Athens, GA)
1 - University of Kansas Press (Lawrence, KS)
1 - University of Minnesota Press (Minneapolis, MN)
1 - University of Pittsburgh Press (Pittsburgh, PA)
1 - University of Tokyo Press (Tokyo, Japan)
1 - University Press of America (Lanham, MD)
1 - Viking (New York, NY)
1 - Wesleyan University Press
1 - Winter (Heidelberg, Germany)
1 - Yeong & Yeong Books (St. Paul, MN)
## APPENDIX C — PUBLICATION PRIZES WON BY STUDY GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awarding Organization</th>
<th>Name of Award</th>
<th>Fellow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Studies Association</td>
<td>2010 Melville J. Herskovits Prize for best scholarly book on Africa</td>
<td>Adeline Masquelier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies</td>
<td>2006 W. Bruce Lincoln Prize</td>
<td>Douglas Northrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association for the History of Nursing</td>
<td>Theresa Christy Award for Exemplary Historical Writing</td>
<td>Julie Fairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages</td>
<td>2009 Best Book in Literary and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>Roman Koropeckyj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association</td>
<td>2007 J. Russell Major Prize for best book published in French history</td>
<td>Marsha Hanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association</td>
<td>2008 Helen and Howard Marraro Prize for best book published in Italian history</td>
<td>Thomas Kuehn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association</td>
<td>2008 James Henry Breasted Prize for best book in ancient history</td>
<td>Anthony Barbieri-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association</td>
<td>2008 John K. Fairbanks Prize for best book published in East Asian studies</td>
<td>Susan Mann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association</td>
<td>2009 J. Russell Major Prize for best work published in French history</td>
<td>Rachel Fuchs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association</td>
<td>2010 Wesley-Logan Book Prize for best book on African diaspora studies</td>
<td>Pier Larson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Association – Pacific Coast Division</td>
<td>Norris and Carol Hundley Award</td>
<td>Marsha Weisiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Review</td>
<td>2007 Higby Prize for best journal article</td>
<td>Sarah Stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Library Association</td>
<td>2004 Choice Outstanding Reference Source</td>
<td>S. Lillian Kremer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Library Association</td>
<td>2005 Choice Outstanding Academic Title</td>
<td>Lambert Zuidervaart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Library Association</td>
<td>2005 Choice Outstanding Academic Title</td>
<td>Elizabeth Klimasmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Library Association</td>
<td>2006 Choice Outstanding Academic Title</td>
<td>David De Grazia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Library Association</td>
<td>2009 Choice Outstanding Academic Title</td>
<td>Richard Koszarski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Award Description</td>
<td>Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Library Association</td>
<td>2009 Choice Outstanding Academic Title</td>
<td>Christopher Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Musicological Society</td>
<td>2006 Ruth A. Solie Award for best multi-authored volume</td>
<td>Marsha Feldman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Musicological Society</td>
<td>2010 Otto Kinkeldey Award for best book by a junior scholar</td>
<td>Charles Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Philological Association</td>
<td>2008 Charles Goodwin Award for Best Book in Past Three Years</td>
<td>David Konstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Philosophical Society</td>
<td>2008 Jacques Barzun Prize for best book in cultural studies</td>
<td>Thomas Burman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for Aesthetics</td>
<td>2006 John Fisher Memorial Book Prize</td>
<td>Barbara Montero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for Aesthetics</td>
<td>2007 Outstanding Book Prize</td>
<td>Rachel Zuckert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies Association</td>
<td>2006 John Hope Franklin Prize</td>
<td>Rebecca Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Historical Foundation</td>
<td>2009 Distinguished Writing Award</td>
<td>Beth Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies Association</td>
<td>Harry Benda Prize</td>
<td>Mark Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Asian Studies</td>
<td>2009 Joseph Levenson Prize</td>
<td>Anthony Barbieri-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Asian Studies</td>
<td>Joseph Levenson Prize</td>
<td>Susan Mann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Latin American Art</td>
<td>Arvey Award for best book on Latin American Art</td>
<td>Adriana Zavala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Latino and Latina Anthropologists</td>
<td>2008 Outstanding Book Prize</td>
<td>Stephen Lynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Queer Anthropology</td>
<td>2010 Ruth Benedict Prize for outstanding work in anthropology</td>
<td>Ellen Lewin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies</td>
<td>2009 Orbis Book Prize for Polish Studies</td>
<td>Roman Koropeczyj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies</td>
<td>2010 Book of Prize for best book in Literary and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>Claudia Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for the Study of Nationalism</td>
<td>2011 Joseph Rothchild Prize</td>
<td>Carter Findley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Women in Slavic Studies</td>
<td>Heldt Prize for outstanding book</td>
<td>Douglas Northrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Caribbean Historians</td>
<td>2006 Elsa Goveia Book Prize</td>
<td>Louis A. Perez, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Wisconsin Librarians</td>
<td>2005 Best Book of the Year</td>
<td>Harvey Kaye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Columbus Foundation</td>
<td>2010 American Book Award</td>
<td>Nancy Carnevale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Regional Library Association</td>
<td>2011 Southwest Book Award</td>
<td>Ellen McCracken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Society for Middle East Studies</td>
<td>2010 Award for Best Book</td>
<td>Janet Afary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Society for Continental Philosophy</td>
<td>2006 Symposium Book Award</td>
<td>Lambert Zuidervaart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Tribune</td>
<td>2004 Best Non Fiction Book</td>
<td>Catherine Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Science Monitor</td>
<td>2004 Best Non Fiction Book</td>
<td>Catherine Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Art Association</td>
<td>2009 Charles Rufus Morey Prize</td>
<td>Anthony Barbieri-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University School of Journalism and the Nicaran Foundation</td>
<td>2012 J. Anthony Book Prize for Outstanding Work of Nonfiction</td>
<td>Daniel Sharfstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on College Composition and Communication</td>
<td>2009 Outstanding Book Award</td>
<td>John Duffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Museum of Art</td>
<td>Vasari Award for best book</td>
<td>Adam Herring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedalus Foundation</td>
<td>2012 Robert Motherwell Book Award</td>
<td>Anna Arnar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Public Library</td>
<td>Caroline Bancroft Honor Book Award</td>
<td>Marsha Weisiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilder-Lehrman Center</td>
<td>2006 Frederick Douglass Prize</td>
<td>Rebecca Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Society of New Mexico</td>
<td>Gaspar Perez de Villagra Award</td>
<td>Marsha Weisiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Association for Asian Studies</td>
<td>2009 ICAS Book Prize</td>
<td>Anthony Barbieri-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Book Council</td>
<td>2007 Sami Rohr Prize for Jewish Literature</td>
<td>Sarah Stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Book Council</td>
<td>2009 Book of the Year</td>
<td>Melvin Urofsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Historical Association</td>
<td>2006 Kemper and Leila Williams Prize for best book</td>
<td>Rebecca Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Language Association</td>
<td>2010 Howard R. Marroro Prize for best book on Italian literature and culture</td>
<td>Christine Poggi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Award Description</td>
<td>Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana History Association</td>
<td>2008 Montana Book Award</td>
<td>Ursula Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Council for the Humanities</td>
<td>2009 Book Award</td>
<td>Michael Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Historical Association</td>
<td>Dixon Ryan Fox Award</td>
<td>Philip Otterness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Conference on British Studies</td>
<td>2009 John Ben Snow Book Prize</td>
<td>Jennifer Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Victorian Studies Association</td>
<td>2005 Donald Gray Prize for the best essay published in the field of Victorian studies</td>
<td>Catherine Robson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Academy of History</td>
<td>2011 Publication Award</td>
<td>Carter Findley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Historical Association</td>
<td>2008 Oklahoma Book Award</td>
<td>Ursula Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of American Historians</td>
<td>2008 Liberty Legacy Foundation Award</td>
<td>Michael Honey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of American Historians</td>
<td>2010 James A. Rawley Prize for best book on race relations</td>
<td>Julie Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>2011 Richard A. Lester Prize for outstanding book on Labor Relations or Labor Economics</td>
<td>Joseph McCartin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert F. Kennedy Foundation</td>
<td>2008 Robert F. Kennedy Book Award</td>
<td>Michael Honey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteenth Century Studies Conference</td>
<td>2009 Roland H. Bainton Book Prize</td>
<td>Jennifer Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for American Music</td>
<td>2006 Lowen Prize for best article in musicology</td>
<td>Nancy Rao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Christianity and Literature</td>
<td>2010 Book of the Year</td>
<td>Sarah McNamer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Cultural Anthropology</td>
<td>2006 Cultural Horizons Prize</td>
<td>Peter Redfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Military History</td>
<td>2007 Best Book Award: Biography</td>
<td>Martha Hanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for the Anthropology of North America</td>
<td>2007 Prize for Distinguished Achievement in the Critical Study of North America</td>
<td>Stephen Lynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Professional Journalists</td>
<td>2007 Special Book Award</td>
<td>Deborah Yaffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Historical Association</td>
<td>2007 Kim Hanger Prize for best article on Latin American Studies</td>
<td>Ida Altman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Award Description</td>
<td>Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Historical Association</td>
<td>2008 M. L. Mitchell Prize for best book on race relations</td>
<td>Michael Honey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Historical Association</td>
<td>2009 Charles E. Smith Prize for best book in European history</td>
<td>Rachel Fuchs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Historical Society</td>
<td>2011 Griswold Prize</td>
<td>Melvin Urofsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Economist</em></td>
<td>Book of the Year</td>
<td>Joseph Horowitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of English-Speaking Peoples</td>
<td>2010 Ambassador’s Book Award</td>
<td>Melvin Urofsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Association of Labor Educators</td>
<td>Book of the Year</td>
<td>Michael Honey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td>Kayden Award for best book written by a faculty member</td>
<td>Robert Rupert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Studies Association</td>
<td>2008 Award for best paper published in the <em>Journal of Urban Affairs</em></td>
<td>Elizabeth Strom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Association of Women Historians</td>
<td>2009 Frances Richardson Keller-Sierra Prize for best monograph in the field of history</td>
<td>Rachel Fuchs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Association of Women Historians</td>
<td>2011 Gita Chaudhuri Book Prize</td>
<td>Janet Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Historical Association</td>
<td>2007 Oscar O. Winther Award for best article</td>
<td>Marsha Weisiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Writers of American</td>
<td>2008 Spur Award for Best Non-Fiction Book</td>
<td>Ursula Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX D — PUBLICATIONS THAT REVIEWED BOOKS BY STUDY GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African American Review</th>
<th>China Quarterly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural History</td>
<td>China Review International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>Christianity and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Book Review</td>
<td>Chronicle of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly</td>
<td>Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Review</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Culture and Research Journal</td>
<td>Civil War Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Quarterly</td>
<td>Claremont Review of Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish History</td>
<td>Classical Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Human Biology</td>
<td>Classical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Philology</td>
<td>CLIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Sociology</td>
<td>Commonweal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Literary History</td>
<td>Comparatist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Literature</td>
<td>Comparative Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Music</td>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Music Teacher</td>
<td>Comparative Literature Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Quarterly</td>
<td>Comparative Studies in Society and History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Scientist</td>
<td>Contemporary Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Spectator</td>
<td>Contemporary Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Speech</td>
<td>Contemporary Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>Current Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Current Musicology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Philosophy</td>
<td>Dance Chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology &amp; Education</td>
<td>Dialogue: Canadian Philosophical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch Review</td>
<td>Discover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives of Pediatrics &amp; Adolescent Medicine</td>
<td>Early American Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Early Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artforum International</td>
<td>East Asian Science, Technology and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Ethnology</td>
<td>Ecologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantis</td>
<td>Economist (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustinian Studies</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Journal of Anthropology</td>
<td>Eighteenth-Century Fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible and Critical Theory</td>
<td>Eighteenth-Century Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Theology Bulletin</td>
<td>English Historical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>English Language Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Journal for the History of Science</td>
<td>English Studies in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Issues Book Review</td>
<td>Essays in Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Journal of Aesthetics</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business History Review</td>
<td>European History Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Lawyer</td>
<td>European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callaloo</td>
<td>Europe-Asia Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Bulletin of Medical History</td>
<td>Far Eastern Economic Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Journal of History</td>
<td>Federal Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Journal of Public Health</td>
<td>Feminist Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Literature</td>
<td>Film Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
<td>First Things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Historical Review</td>
<td>Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central European History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Daily Law Bulletin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fortune  
Free Inquiry  
French Forum  
French Politics, Culture and Society  
French Studies  
Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide  
Geographical  
Geographical Journal  
German Politics and Society  
German Quarterly  
German Studies Review  
Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies  
Hastings Center Report  
Hispanic American Historical Review  
Historian  
Historical Geography  
Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television  
History of Science  
History Today  
History: Review of New Books  
H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online  
Human Rights Quarterly  
Hume Studies  
Huntington Library Quarterly  
International Affairs  
International Bulletin of Missionary Research  
International History Review  
International Journal  
International Journal of African Historical Studies  
International Journal of Middle East Studies  
International Review of Social History  
Internet Bookwatch  
Isis  
Islam & Science  
Italian Culture  
Journal of African History  
Journal of American Culture  
Journal of American Ethnic History  
Journal of American History  
Journal of the American Medical Association  
Journal of American Studies  
Journal of Asian Studies  
Journal of British Studies  
Journal of Clinical Investigation  
Journal of Contemporary History  
Journal of Cultural Geography  
Journal of East Asian Studies  
Journal of Ecclesiastical History  
Journal of Economic History  
Journal of Economic Literature  
Journal of English and Germanic Philology  
Journal of Environmental Education  
Journal of European Studies  
Journal of Gender Studies  
Journal of Hellenic Studies  
Journal of Interdisciplinary History  
Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology  
Journal of Latin American Studies  
Journal of Legal Education  
Journal of Military History  
Journal of Middle East Women's Studies  
Journal of Modern History  
Journal of Modern Literature  
Journal of Musicological Research  
Journal of Popular Culture  
Journal of Religion  
Journal of Roman Studies  
Journal of Social History  
Journal of Southern History  
Journal of the American Musicological Society  
Journal of the American Oriental Society  
Journal of the American Planning Association  
Journal of the Early Book Society  
Journal of the Early Republic  
Journal of the History of Philosophy  
Journal of the History of Sexuality  
Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute  
Journal of the West  
Journal of Theological Studies  
Journal of Urban History  
Journal of Value Inquiry  
Journal of Women's History  
Journal of World History  
Judicature  
Keats-Shelley Journal  
Kirkus Reviews  
Kliatt  
Kritika  
Labor History  
Language  
Latin American Literary Review  
Latin American Research Review  
Law and History Review  
Law and Politics Book Review  
Law Library Journal  
Legacy: A Journal of American Women Writers  
Libraries and the Cultural Record  
Library Quarterly  
London Review of Books
Material Religion
Medical Anthropology Quarterly
Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England
Medieval Review
Medievalia Et Humanistica
Medium Aevum
Middle East Journal
Mind
Modern Age
Modern Drama
Modern Fiction Studies
Modern Language Notes
Modern Language Quarterly
Modern Language Review
Modern Philology
Modernism/Modernity
Mother Jones
Music & Letters
Music Educators Journal
Musical Times

NACLA Report on the Americas
National Review
Nature
Nature Medicine
Naval War College Review
New England Journal of Medicine
New England Quarterly
New Formations
New Scientist
New Statesman (1996)
New York Review of Books
New York Times
New York Times Book Review
Nineteenth-Century Contexts
Nineteenth-Century French Studies
Nineteenth-Century Music Review
Nineteenth-Century Prose
Notes
Notes and Queries
Notre Dame Philosophical Review
Novel
Nursing Administration Quarterly
NWSA Journal

Opera News
Oral History Review
Oregon Historical Quarterly
Owl of Minerva

Pacific Affairs
Pacific Historical Review
Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America
Philosophical Review
Philosophy
Philosophy East and West
Political Communication
Political Science Quarterly
Political Theory
Population and Development Review
Public Historian
Publishers Weekly
Quarterly Review of Biology

Raritan: A Quarterly Review
Reason
Renaissance Quarterly
Research in African Literatures
Review of English Studies
Review of Metaphysics
Reviews in American History
Rocky Mountain Review
Romantic Review
Russian Review

Sarmatian Review
Saturday Evening Post
Science News
SciTech Book News
Seventeenth-Century News
Sewanee Review
Shakespeare Quarterly
Shakespeare Studies
Shofar
Signs
Sixteenth Century Journal
Slavic and East European Journal
Slavic Review
Slavonic and East European Review
Social Anthropology
Social Forces Social Justice
Southeastern Geographer
Southern Cultures
Southern Humanities Review
Spectator
Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies
Studies in Romanticism
Studies in the Novel

Teaching Philosophy
Technology and Culture
The Nation
The New Republic
The New Yorker
Theatre History Studies
Theatre Journal
Theatre Survey
Theological Studies
Theology
Time Magazine
Times Higher Education Supplement
Times Literary Supplement
Trial
Tulsa Law Review
Twentieth Century Literature

University of Toronto Quarterly
USA Today

Victorian Studies
Virginia Quarterly Review

Walt Whitman Quarterly Review
Washington Post Book World
Washington State Bar News
Weekly Standard
Western Folklore
Western Historical Quarterly
William and Mary Quarterly
Women: A Cultural Review
Women’s History Review
Women’s Review of Books
Wordsworth Circle
World Affairs
World History Bulletin
World Literature Today

Yearbook of English Studies