Intercoder reliability was assessed for Krippendorff's α for each of the 29 theories at the explicit citation (1), reference (2), and implicit (indication of the theory) (3) levels. For each of the variables, α was determined with SPSS following Hayes and Krippendorff (2007). The mean of the α values for set 1 is M = .79, SD = .28, set 2 is M = .22,

SD = .29, and set 3 is M = .17, SD = .27. Because the α values for set 3 are low, we did not include them in the analysis; however, we combined sets 1 and 2 together because the presence of a theory in our sample was frequently low, and recalculated the α values. This resulted in M = .74 and SD = .31. Using a .75 cutoff for reliability, the following variables produced reliable coding: dependency theory, two-step flow, diffusion,

knowledge gap, spiral-of-silence, third person, social networks, channel effects, cultivation, agenda setting, and computer-mediated communication. A content analysis of qualitative literature is currently underway using a sample of the top 20 most frequently cited articles from three of the top mass communication journals in the critical and qualitative tradition: Media Culture & Society, Cultural Studies, and Critical Studies in Mass Communication. These journals are relatively new (the earliest beginning in 1980), so the sampling technique involved selecting the top 20 most

frequently cited articles, for a total of 60 articles. The coding scheme was developed by looking at several textbooks and syllabi for the most important theoretical traditions in the field (e.g., public sphere theory, hegemony, etc.) and then developing a list of seminal citations by both referring to textbooks and iteratively looking for the most frequent citations within the sample itself. A full table of the 200 articles and their frequencies of citation is available at wrneuman.com. The 200-article subsample is not used in the discussion and illustration of the Matthew Effect because as a slice of the very top of the citation concentration

curve, it contributes very little to our understanding of the character of the full distribution of citations.