

Political Science in the United States: Notes on the Discipline

Michael Brintnall, American Political Science Association
Tony Affigne, Providence College
Dianne Pinderhughes, University of Notre Dame

Prepared for the
IPSA Conference on International Political Science:
New Theoretical and Regional Perspectives¹

Concordia University
Montreal (Quebec), Canada
April 30 – May 2, 2008

¹ Prepared with the assistance of Michael Marriott, George Washington University and APSA

1. Background of US Political Science

Political science in the United States is extensively examined, and sensitively self aware. The literature examining the discipline and practice in the US is lengthy. The APSA's most recent volume summarizing the field, *State of the Discipline*, volume ran to 994 pages. (Katznelson and Milner 2002) The Centennial edition of the *American Political Science Review*, focused on contributions just from that journal, ran to 225 double column pages. (Sigelman 2006b) Rather than recreate the many arguments about the development of the discipline in the US, or to critique them, we here opt for a set of highlights about factors that have shaped the discipline in the US, with bibliographic reference to the more prominent of the literature.

There are many influences shaping the growth of political science in the United States. A number of the important ones follow;

- its early global and mixed intellectual heritage;
- the patterns of growth in US university systems in which it is largely embedded;
- the influence of national and cultural trends and imperatives that have shaped it;
- the trajectory of US national funding systems for scholarship: especially, private foundations and the role of the national science agenda (and, in its shadow, projects to support humanities);
- the contemporary breadth of the academic enterprise in the US; and
- intellectual and institutional directions of its own making.

Intellectual Heritage. The first political science department in the US was founded at Columbia University in 1880, where the roots were set earlier both by the intellectual leadership of a German émigré and scholar, Francis Lieber; and by the school of law. (Hoxie 1955; Farr 2003; Lepawsky 1964) Many Continental influences have been significant in the development of US political science, though they did not emerge from any single sources. Herbert Adams, who resolved in the 1870's to be the first "professor of historical and political science in America" was German trained. (Lepawsky 1964 p.

36) One of the earliest presidents of the American Political Science Association, Lord Bryce, was from the UK; he was APSA's fourth president holding office in the early years of 1907. (Farr 2002) US scholarship has drawn on many international threads.

Political science also grew out of a diverse array of disciplinary roots: history, law, sociology, and economics. (Schmidt 1998) The University of Kansas attempted to establish one of the early departments of political science in the US, but the university's regents would not tolerate a department of politics in the university because "they already had enough politics in the state." (Lepawsky 1964 p. 35) The compromised Department of History and Political Science eventually became the first department of sociology in the country. Political science was indeed a malleable subject at its outset.

Early directions of political science in the US were unsettled. Spinning-off from the American Social Science Association, the American Political Science Association was formed in 1903. The first proposed name for the new organization was the American Society of Comparative Legislations. Later in 1905, the organization faced calls internally to realign in a federation with the American Historical and the American Economic Associations. (Lepawsky 1964 p. 52)

University Systems. While US political science has its roots in European ideas, its growth took a widely different institutional turn. By becoming embedded in the emergent US university system, the discipline took a decidedly new turn. As James Farr noted, in the early years, around the start of the 20th century, the theoretical content of US political science remained European in flavor. But soon after, new institutional structures for the discipline emerged that were unmatched on the Continent. (Farr 2003)

The growth and role of universities in the US in the last century is a large story. (Bender 1997) Universities grew substantially in the US both as relatively stable and secure centers for research applied to national purpose, and also as homes for intellectual life generally. Intellectual independence and social reform found a home together in largely utilitarian institutions, reinforcing (if perhaps muffling) the normative voice. Energies

that might have become a voice for radical politics instead became married with mainstream social reform. (Elshtain 2001; Gunnell 2006 p. 772; Ricci 1984) We might quip that political scientists who could have been America's Marxists became behavioralists instead, in part because of the ameliorative climate of the American university.

The oldest universities are privately held, originally religious, institutions, though most of these are now secular or only nominally religious. Private universities are also often among the wealthiest (Ivy Leagues); although, they are not necessarily typical. Public institutions – so called land grant institutions – were created by the federal and state governments in the 19th century: “a land-grant college or university is an institution that has been designated by its state legislature or Congress to receive unique federal support.” (U.S. Department of Agriculture 2007) The USDA lists this as meaning more than 100 colleges and universities; they were created in a series of acts beginning in 1862 and 1890:

“On July 2, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln signed into law what is generally referred to as the Land Grant Act. ...[L]egislation introduced by U.S. Representative Justin Smith Morrill of Vermont granted to each state 30,000 acres of public land for each Senator and Representative under apportionment based on the 1860 census. Proceeds from the sale of these lands were to be invested in a perpetual endowment fund which would provide support for colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts in each of the states.” (*Higher Education Resource Hub* 2007)

The growth in these institutions was especially prominent after the American civil war.

New eras of growth have been added in the private and public sectors, but these categories help frame the character and the size of American higher education that distinguishes it from other nations. Therefore, the character of political science varies substantially within these types of institution, but it is also through them that the discipline has grown within the nation.

National Cultural Trends and Imperatives. In spite of the allegations of scientism and detachment often leveled at US political science, the discipline has in its own ways been deeply engaged with national politics, policy, and cultural life. It has both reflected the culture of the country it has developed in, and it has sought to engage with and transform that culture. It is not lost on the discipline that its foremost Association, the APSA, was formed at a time just after the Supreme Court had upheld *de jure* segregation. The Association was created at a conference in New Orleans, a city with institutionalized racial segregation and in hotels in which Blacks could not register, at a time when the South was institutionalizing Jim Crow and “institutions where the costs and consequences of segregation were not open to systematic discussion or dispute.” (Teichgraeber 2004) The lore has it that white scholars from the Northeast, travelling South to the meeting by train, stopped to meet with the distinguished African-American scholar W.E.B. Dubois in Atlanta before travelling further south to a conference he could not equally attend.

US political science emerged in the first half of the 20th century as a strongly gendered discipline. Opportunities to build the discipline on the neighborhood oriented democratic theory of community based intellectuals such as Jane Addams were foregone. Instead, the discipline became grounded in more technocratic and bureaucratic themes of finance and budgeting that were then the fashion in the province of the male dominated academia. It was not until the transforming and democratizing years of the late 1960s that these patterns genuinely began to change. Still today, the political science professoriate is barely more than one third female. (Elshtain 2002; Silverberg 1998; Tolleson-Rinehart and Carroll 2006)

Nevertheless for this history, the discipline in many other ways has been marked by its engagement with public life in the US, rather than its distance. As Rob Hauck has written:

APSA's founders were not only committed to developing a discipline, theirs was a practical end, as befit the Progressive era. Knowledge was to be applied to practice, the result, ‘good government,’ was one reason so many public servants were on APSA membership roles in its early years. The commitment

to 'good government' was maintained in Merriam's political activities during the 20s and the Association's advocacy of civic education during the Great Depression. It was most fully expressed in 1950 when APSA published "Toward a More Responsible Two Party System. (Hauck 1998)

These impulses persist with, for instance, an Association publishing series on what the discipline has to say on important issues of public life. This has produced annual volumes, and public documents, on civic engagement and American institutions, inequality in American democracy, inequality and difference in the developing world, and terror and domestic violence. (American Political Science Association 2006)

The changes in the discipline are reflected in the changes in the leadership of APSA Presidents. There have been 105 presidents. Fifty years after the association's founding, Ralph Bunche, the Nobel Prize winner, became the first black president. In 1992, Lucius Barker, a student of American constitutional law and black politics in the US, was the second. In 1998, Matthew Holden, a scholar of bureaucracy, administrative procedure, and energy policy, was the third.

In 1988, Judith Skklar, a political theorist who received her BA and MA from McGill, was the first women president. In 1996, Elinor Ostrom, an interdisciplinary scholar with work in political theory and policy analysis in comparative settings, was the second. In 2002, Theda Skocpol, whose work is also interdisciplinary, conducts her scholarly research in sociology, history and political science on social movements, social welfare, and public policy, was the third. The next year, Suzanne Rudolph, a supporter of the Perestroika movement and has concentrated on comparative politics and South Asia, was the forth. In 2004, Margaret Levi, whose research is associated with comparative politics and democratic theory, was the fifth women president.

In 2008, Dianne Pinderhughes became the Association's fourth black president and the sixth woman president. Her work centers on questions of inequality, addressing racial, ethnic, and gender politics in the US and in comparative settings such as Brazil. Also, she teaches and writes in the interdisciplinary field of African American studies.

The Trajectory of National Funding Systems for Scholarship. American political science or academic life in general, cannot be understood without also understanding the trajectories of funding for science, and to a lesser degree the humanities, in the United States. This complex story is marked by two largely independent forces – the singular role of private foundations sponsoring both basic and applied research, and, arising post World War II, the intense national public investments in science policy.

The growth of large private foundations, particularly Rockefeller, fueled major transformations in the discipline. (Bulmer 2001 p. 32; Fleishman 2007) This impact was magnified by some key intellectual choices in these foundations to shift in the first quarter of the twentieth century from funding “good works” to supporting and shaping the development of ideas. In one example, the development of the Social Science Research Council, which has shaped US approaches to comparative politics and thus our scholarly view of much of the world, arose in 1922 when a research committee of the American Political Science Association, chaired by Charles Merriam, recommended a cross-disciplinary collaboration (Ogg 1928), and financing materialized from the Rockefeller Foundation. (Fisher 1993) Foundation influence wasn’t limited to the practical. Rockefeller funds also fueled political theory (Hauptmann 2006); and many similar foundations have sustained the American Council of Learned Societies in its support of humanities.

The World War II years and the cold war aftermath produced different kind of resource consequences for academic and political science. US funding for scientific enterprise and public policy grew substantially, and stimulated the growth of higher education almost across the board. (Menand 2001 p. 8) National science funding in the US took an enabling orientation different from those in many European and Asian countries – emphasizing individual control of knowledge and ethics maintained by professional communities rather than organizational control and bureaucratic oversight. (Silberman 1993) And perhaps most significantly, the main national science funding organization formally embraced social and behavioral science and provided budgeted support for

political science research, doctoral training, and database development since 1965.
(National Science Foundation nd)

Breadth of Academic Enterprise. Today in the US, political science is embedded in a substantial enterprise of institutions that shape it collectively. (Brintnall 2008) Briefly put, this enterprise is an amalgam of institutions relating to the following sorts of activities:

- Academic Accreditation and accrediting bodies. (Eaton 2006)
- Corporate boards of universities, and the various public and business influences they bring to academic life. (Newfield 2003)
- Institutional Review Boards (IRBs), that monitors approve, and review research involving human subjects, to limit harm and seek informed consent of the subjects.
- Foundations and funding sources, as discussed above.
- Commercial markets and publishing. It can also be said that the scope of the US publishing industry was one of the reasons that has differentiated the extent and possible direction of scholarship in the US compared to Europe and other regions. (Lyons 1973)
- Numerous professional scholarly societies and networks of societies.
- Think tanks and "policy shops." Recently, academic type scholarship has embedded itself in institutions outside of the academy that bring scholarly work more closely in line with other publics, often ideologically defined ones. The growth of think tanks and policy "shops" has embedded the practice of academic work into policy, private sector, and social interest communities in new ways. (Elshtain 2001; DeMuth 2007)

This list is illustrative. It shows how the discipline operates in an environment not easily shaped by any one set of influences or directions, and accountable to more than the individual scholars that make it up.

Intellectual Directions of its Own Making. It was not until post-war years that political science in the United States fully professionalized, and developed a voice, or more accurately multiple voices of its own (Weintraub 2008 makes this point for economics as well.) Lee Sigelman claims, in his overview of the discipline from the perspective of the *American Political Science Review*, that the fertile period of American political science emerged in the 1960's and 1970s, marked both by significant intellectual work and by

important institutional developments. (Sigelman 2006a) Sigelman points to the canonical works of the late 1950s through 1970s, singled out by Goodin and Klingemann, as outstripping any body of intellectual work in political science in any other contemporary period. (Goodin and Klingemann 1996) These are the works of Almond and Verba, Campbell, Converse, Dahrendorf, Miller and Stokes, Dahl, Deutsch, Downs, Easton, Huntington, Key, Lane, Lindblom, Lipset, Moore, Neustadt, and Olson.

Some would claim, including seemingly Sigelman himself, that the discipline has been marking time since - engaged in a productive, perhaps essential, but not necessarily transforming period of “normal science.” (Sigelman 2006a p. 474) Others would point to captivating new analytical and conceptual approaches that have emerged in more recent years, which are transforming, or at least not seemingly “normal”, for the discipline. Some such ideas, with great power and promise, include experimental approaches to scholarship, and rational choice theories. (Druckman et al. 2006; Bueno de Mesquita 2006) There is also developing interest in diversified methodological approaches – that could be called post behavioral - some inherently qualitative in approach, and others focused on integrating a variety of quantitative and qualitative approaches. Workshops sponsored by the National Science Foundation on the Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models are one example. (*Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models*)

It may be that the advancement of the discipline needs to be thought of differently since that time, and it cannot well be judged today by the production of single great works or captivating insights. Today, we may need to turn to understanding the growth of political science in the US more in terms of an advanced academic community, richer and more complex scholarly networks, and a more diverse and inclusive professoriate.

For just one illustration, the development of gender politics, particularly from the 1970s to the present time, can only be understood as a process of active institutional change. It is marked for sure by outstanding intellectual contributions. But the intellectual change and transformation in understanding politics has also come from “the slow boring of hard

boards” as feminist scholars and fellow travelers – not all women and not all feminists – have organized formally and informally to build caucuses, provide self-support, expose discriminatory circumstances, create opportunities, and advocate for female scholars and feminist scholarship. Gradually, if not completely, the discipline has changed both in the ways women are represented in leadership roles and in the ways that gender has become engrained as a consequential intellectual theme. (Tolleson-Rinehart and Carroll 2006)

Women’s caucus “movement” activities are now paralleled, if not largely supplanted, by Feminist Theory workshops at major political science conferences. Papers with feminist themes now appear more widely on panels outside of the “women and politics” track of the APSA Annual Meeting than in it. Since the 1970s, Women’s Caucuses, which operate outside the disciplinary Associations, have been complemented by official committees “On the Status of Women” inside the Associations. They are now paralleled by research communities such as Organized Sections and established journals on gender and politics. Similar stories can be told, or more accurately are in the process of being told, for other areas where professional and intellectual inclusions intersect, notably race and sexuality. (Affigne 2000) The intellectual transformations of political science are institutional ones.

The transformations however have not always been smooth ones, and US political science has been marked by periods of intense conflict and institutional change – notably near the end of the 1960’s when both new methods and orientations toward disciplinary practice emerged, and new groups gained voice within the discipline, as illustrated above. These changes paralleled and drew energy from changes in the society at large. In the words of Adolph Reed, Jr., this opening of the discipline to new approaches and new voices “was fueled by the social dynamism of the time . . . (when broader social change) . . . created space for articulation of critical voices.” Though some, including Reed, think this period of change did not take political science far enough: “Ironically behavioralism consolidated into a triumphalist orthodoxy at the same time as it demonstrated its inadequacies for addressing, much less explaining, the contemporaneous events and movements that were rocking the society.” (Reed 2003)

Some thirty years later, another bottom up movement, labeled *Perestroika* after an anonymous manifesto by a member of the discipline, again challenged direction and access in the discipline. Some supporting this movement called for new methodological and intellectual frameworks for the discipline, particularly a retreat from scientism; others limited their call to one for greater opportunities for diverse expression, asserting that “gatekeeping” at key institutional checkpoints was limiting the variety of scholarly work possible. The *Perestroika* movement pointed to peak journals, doctoral dissertation approvals, and APSA leadership as major gatekeepers that inhibited new work in the discipline. (Monroe 2005) The APSA established a new peak journal in response to these claims, called *Perspectives on Politics* and revisited processes for leadership selection. A significant development was the articulation of a framework for graduate education that all parties found common ground in. Scholars with very different approaches to political science came together to affirm a common agreement on principles for political science. (American Political Science Association 2003) The following principles are among those affirmed in the ensuing APSA Report on Graduate Education in Political Science:

- the exploration of how far politics can help explain human experiences and help resolve human difficulties is one of the primary tasks of intellectual life. This belief in the importance of politics is what motivates most students to enter political science. Graduate education should equip them to pursue the questions this conviction raises.
- political scientists must seek to analyze politics in the most intellectually honest and rigorous ways they can attain. We may differ on how to pursue this goal – but not on its centrality to our work.
- the complex subject matter of politics must be studied using many methods.
- studies of ethical norms and normative commitments, including those in our own work, are central to the study of politics.
- the discipline today must address a diverse range of long-neglected subjects, including the political experience of traditionally marginal groups, using all appropriate methods.
- it is essential for political scientists to be able to communicate clearly to each other and to broader publics why and how the aspects of politics they are studying are helping us to achieve improved understandings of human life.

2. A Profile of US Political Science as an Institution

If contemporary political science in the US can be understood as a network of extensive and diverse institutional characteristics, how then might we describe it?

First, we might ask how many political scientists there are in the United States. If we assume a small degree of invincibility, and presume that all scholars who have earned their degrees in the last 40 years are still with us, then with some other modest assumptions, we can estimate that there are 20,495 political scientists in the United States. (Actually, 25,254 doctorates in political science and related fields were awarded in the last 4 decades – 4759 of these went to non-US citizens.) (NORC various years, compiled by Michael Marriott for APSA) About 1,100 new PhD's are produced annually in the US today, in combined fields of political science, public administration, international relations, and public policy analysis.

Of these 20,000, some doctorate holders, about half – 10,386 hold regular academic positions in US institutions. One-third of these academics are in doctorate-granting research departments, about a quarter are in departments offering a masters degree, including professional degrees in policy and public administration, and the rest are in undergraduate institutions of varying sizes.

Of these 10,000, some are academic political scientists and about 2900 are women. The percentages of women are just under 38 percent for assistant professors and 18 percent for full professors – reflecting both a generational development as more women move up in ranks, and a “leaky pipeline” as women leave the discipline before mid-career. (American Political Science Association 2001)

Race or ethnicity is self-reported to the APSA for about 8,400 of the academic political scientists. These data tell us that 6 percent of the professoriate is African American, 4 percent Asian Pacific American, and 3 percent Latino. Professors from traditionally underrepresented racial and ethnic groups comprise 11 percent of all full professors, and

15 percent of assistant professors. Distinctions here by rank are similar to those for women: percentages are higher at the lower ranks than higher. There are just 15 academics in political science altogether that have an American Indian or Alaskan Native heritage - .3 percent of the membership. About 1.4 percent of the US population is from this racial/ethnic background.

In spite of some global suspicions that *all* US political scientists do political science the same way, there are in fact broad differences in focus among the 10 thousand US academics. The APSA asks political scientists to identify two major fields of the discipline (thus the following percentages will total to more than 100 percent.) On this basis, 38 percent of academics claim American politics as one of their fields and an equal number 37 percent claim comparative politics; another third claim international politics. 17 percent identify political theory or philosophy as a major field for them; and about 10 percent claim to specialize each in public law or methodology.

There are no major differences in these proportions among scholars at different types of institutions with one exception. Three times as many academics at research institutions – 18 percent of them – claim methodology as a major field, compared to around 6 percent at other institutions.

Female scholars, especially junior women, do show different preferences. Many more have adopted comparative politics as a specialization than men. Almost half – 47 percent- of all female assistant professors are comparative politics scholars in the US today. Relatively fewer junior women are theorists – 14 percent of female assistant professors identify political philosophy or theory as a major field, compared to 20 percent of junior men or 18 percent of senior women.

Among African American, Asian Pacific American, Latino, and American Indian scholars, the differences are large between groups and across academic ranks – signaling new directions and perhaps generational change for scholars in these communities. To

the extent these communities continue to develop in holding leading roles in the discipline, this signals new energy for the discipline as a whole.

The indicators of general fields of interest here are very broad ones, and it may be difficult to interpret what differences mean. It is the presence of these differences that warrants highlighting. Some of the highlights are these: African American scholars are far more likely to identify American politics as one of their broad fields, than are Latino or Asian American scholars. And the African American interest in American politics is more pronounced among young African American scholars – assistant professors – than among senior ones. Almost 60 percent of African American assistant professors work in American politics.

On the other hand, two-thirds of young Latino scholars identify comparative politics as one of their fields, and less than one-third point to American politics. Asian Pacific American scholars also tend more to study comparative and international politics than American, but unlike Latinos, we see more of the younger Asian Pacific American scholars tending to American politics than their senior counterparts.

The very small numbers of American Indian/Native American scholars show a dramatic (and perhaps idiosyncratic) swing from almost 60 percent of senior academics working on American politics to 71 percent of young scholars working on comparative issues.

One should not jump to conclusions about what kind of work these scholars are doing based on the cues available here, such as labels as Americanists or comparativists. Old categories are being approached in new ways. Much of the new work is transforming these fields, with attention to topics that transcend traditional topical boundaries, such as immigration and social movements; and that integrate traditional themes, such as race and class in new, intersecting, ways.

The breadth of political science in the US can be measured in ways other than numbers of individuals and their characteristics and interests. Collaborative work is on the increase.

(Chandra and al. 2006) The discipline is richly structured, with perhaps 154 journals with lead editorial and publishing bases in the US. The APSA itself has 36 active Organized Sections. And, the discipline has 8 other regional political science associations, some quite large; and innumerable smaller specialty ones. The major ones vary in their organizational type; some meet specifically as regional associations of Political Scientists (e.g. the Southern). Others meet in varying interdisciplinary arrangements or with a distinctive subspecialty (e.g. the Southwestern Political Science Association and the Northeastern Political Science Association). Others because of their regional characters attract larger proportions of specific racial/ethnic groups.

While US political science is often described by observers outside the country as monolithic in its orientation, one way or another; inside the US it is more often criticized as being too fragmented. Indeed neither claim is strongly true, as there is both great diversity of approach in the discipline; and also an active array of integrating and networking institutions across it.

One way to understand recent developments is by considering the pattern of subfields established within the discipline since 1995. In the American Political Science Association, subfield specializations are represented through a network of semi-autonomous organized sections, all of which sponsor research paper panels at the annual meeting, and several of which publish journals. 39 such sections currently represent a combined total of 20,776 members. The largest is comparative politics with 1619 members, while the smallest —health politics and policy, founded in 2008 — has about 200 members.

Table 1. Largest Organized Sections (2008)	
<i>Section</i>	<i>Members</i>
Comparative Politics	1619
Political Methodology	1051
Qualitative and Multi-Methods Research	999
Public Policy	974
Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior	941

APSA rules allow members who share substantive or methodological interests which they believe are not currently (or adequately) represented in existing subfields, to create new sections. Analogous to a community organizing project, this organizational development process is “bottom-up,” led by small groups of entrepreneurs who define boundaries of the proposed field, recruit prospective members, and submit a minimum of 200 sponsoring names to APSA’s approval process.

Except when a proposed new field appears significantly to duplicate the mission and substantive interests of an existing section, the approval process is comparatively permissive and non-contentious. APSA’s leadership has generally viewed the creation of new sections as a net benefit for the organization. Continued proliferation of new subunits may at some point create logistical difficulties, but to date the process appears to have helped increase Association membership while limiting the need for separate organizations outside APSA.

For younger scholars, participation in new subfields may offer both risks and rewards. In newer, smaller subfields, it may be easier to establish reputations within a collegial, like-minded network. On the other hand, direct impacts on individuals’ career trajectories are still uncertain, as there may be some resistance within departments, for whom criteria for tenure and promotion may be oriented primarily around participation in older sections and publication in better-established venues.

Despite such concerns about fragmentation, or impacts on professional development, the emergence of new fields appears to have served an important intellectual purpose. New subfields allow emergent interests to develop naturally, within a broader discipline which is generally supportive of the process, offering diverse new milieu for scholars to pursue collaborative efforts around innovative theories, under-studied subjects, and alternative methods.

As can be seen in Table 2 (below), the discipline’s seven newest sections reflect important emerging subjects including racial and ethnic political studies, international

political history, democratization, and human rights, the study of sexuality and politics, and for scholars of public policy, attention to political dimensions of health care provision in the United States. Renewed attention to diverse methodological approaches is also reflected in the creation and rapid growth of the qualitative and multi-methods group, which is now the third-largest field in the entire Association — suggesting a greater degree of methodological diversity than is typically ascribed to U.S. political science.

The picture which emerges from this brief review of subfield development is one of change and diversification, where new directions coexist relatively peacefully with older tendencies. Traditional methods and subjects remain central to the discipline, but emergent approaches have been allowed to develop quickly, in response to changing interests and needs among the broader community of political science scholars.

<i>Section Name</i>	<i>Membership</i>
Race, Ethnicity and Politics (1995)	572
International History and Politics (2000)	470
Comparative Democratization (2001)	625
Human Rights (2001)	380
Qualitative and Multi-Methods Research (2002)	999
Sexuality and Politics (2007)	190
Health Politics and Policy (2008)	200

3. Conclusion: New Developments and Trends

So, where is political science in the United States headed? For one thing, we can expect continued growth,² though of course this is subject to many unpredictable factors. Just what form the disciplinary work takes within this large and healthy scholarly community invites speculation. In this speculative spirit, one can draw the following half a dozen claims about the future of political science in the US.

² Since 1980, US doctoral institutions have increased PhD production in political science and related fields by 20 students a year, to current levels of about 1100 per year.

Diversity and Differentiation in Scholarship. While US political science has never resembled the monolith that external observers have sometimes suggested it to be, the next generation of political science in the US will be marked by increasing breadth and diversity in theoretical issues and interests. Examples of these new directions include feminist theory, the study of identity, integration of theoretical and empirical models, and experimental methods. It is very hard to illustrate this breadth of scholarship, short of say, reprinting the hundreds of pages of the APSA Annual Meeting program. Since one indicator of long-term work is the emergence of long-term datasets, a quick list of some current work reported in APSA's Collaboration report is an indicator. (Chandra and al. 2006) That study cited the following "examples of recent or ongoing "team" collaborations, in no particular order, include the following:"

- TESS (Time-Sharing Experiments in the Social Sciences) based at the University of Michigan.
- The Varshney-Wilkinson database on ethnic riots in India initially based at Harvard.
- The War Initiation and Termination Project led by Tanisha Fazal and Page Fortna, based at Columbia.
- Collaborative ethnographic projects led by Rogers Brubaker (UCLA) in a forthcoming book manuscript on Romania and by David Laitin (Stanford) in *Identity in Formation*, published in 1998.
- A project on the Dynamics of Political Representation and Political Rhetoric led by, Burt Monroe (Michigan State), Kevin Quinn (Harvard), and Mike Colaresi (Michigan State), along with colleagues from computational linguistics.
- A field experiment on ethnic identifiability in Uganda led by James Habariyama (Economics, Georgetown University), Macartan Humphreys (Columbia), Daniel Posner (UCLA) and Jeremy Weinstein (Stanford).
- A project on the coding of party platforms led by Kenneth Benoit (Trinity College), Mik Laver (NYU) and Will Lowe (Harvard).
- The Africa research program led by Robert Bates (Harvard).
- The ACLP project on democracy and development, led by Adam Przeworski at NYU.
- A project on agent-based modeling led by Ian Lustick at the University of Pennsylvania.

- CDEI (Constructivist Dataset on Ethnicity and Institutions), a cross-national project on the measurement of politicized ethnic identities coordinated by Kanchan Chandra (NYU).
- Experimental work on party identification in Russia being planned by Joshua Tucker (Princeton/NYU) and Ted Brader (University of Michigan).

“Bottom up Development.” Not only can one expect the emerging political science discipline to encompass broad and diverse issues and interests, but it will do so in a way that continues to make it a bottom-up rather than top-down discipline. We can expect no dominant framework or paradigm that lends intellectual coherence to these broad and diverse issues and interests. Recent debates within political science in the US have certainly challenged whether certain dominant approaches had captured key gate-keeping roles with the discipline. (Monroe 2005) To the extent such claims may have been warranted, e.g. with respect to editorship of the *American Political Science Review* (and the claims are widely contested), the debates within the discipline illustrated remarkable self-corrective powers – as new publishing and research outlets were opened up and new voices heard in Association leadership. The energy is from the bottom up.

Racial and Ethnic Diversity. The academy in the US will become increasingly diverse racially and ethnically, and the discipline will continue to transform in response to this. These changes affect the composition of the professoriate, the character of leadership in the Association and the discipline, the content of teaching, and the thrust of research. One intellectual direction emerging from these changes is that the discipline will put great focus on the interconnections of issues associated with deep structures of American political life, including race, gender, class, and sexuality; and extend the reach of these issues cross-nationally. Some work has already begun on initiatives in the Americas pioneered the National Conference of Black Political Scientists. (National Conference of Black Political Scientists)

Interdisciplinarity. Every discussion of the discipline sooner or later turns to thoughts about interdisciplinarity. Indeed some have described political science as quintessentially the interdisciplinary discipline, sometimes more poetically put as the “Rainbow Science.”

(Andrews 1982 p. 4) What is changing is not just scholars' interest in reaching into new fields (e.g. with recent work in the *APSR* on genetic bases of political orientation, or fMRI scans of brain activity during political decision making,) but shifting institutional structures within universities, bring scholars across disciplines together in different ways, often in cross-disciplinary or policy oriented research centers. These centers, and the intellectual energy driving them, provide organized structures to sustain interdisciplinary work, while also raising questions about future organization of disciplinary peer review. We can expect increasing these linkages to sustain increased international linkages as well as cross-disciplinary ones. As graduate training in the US becomes more international, with both faculty and graduate students drawn from across the globe, we can expect scholars to be posing new and different questions.

Policy. The paramount grounding of political science in the US within a strong university system has provided remarkable opportunity and, often, privilege for US academics, as they work under the institutional protections of academic freedom. Political scientists have also recognized a price for this partnership, in the increasing risk of a scholasticism of their work and detachment from practical politics. Increasingly new models for linking scholarship and policy, and enhancing the public presence of political science research, are being sought. APSA is playing a growing role in this, with annual Task Forces focused on what political science has to say about important public issues. Think tanks are emerging with a more targeted focus. The internet is opening up more scholarship to public access and changing the way in which research, scholarship, and teaching is organized, designed and produced. We can anticipate that the discipline will grow in its awareness and attention to public issues, and research will become more policy focused.

Teaching and Learning. Finally, we can expect the discipline to embrace more fully the integration of its many professional roles – particularly teaching - with scholarship. Many political scientists find their professional role best described as the teacher-scholar, though support from the discipline itself in that role has not been strong. (Ishiyama et al. 2006) APSA's new Conference on Teaching and Learning in Political Science points to a more active disciplinary role in these prominent professional areas.

References

- Affigne, Tony. 2000. "Latino Politics in the United States: An Introduction," in *PS: Political Science and Politics*. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- American Political Science Association. *Report of the Task Force on Doctoral Education in Political Science* 2003. Available from <http://www.apsanet.org/about/governance/graduateeducation.pdf>.
- . 2006. "Annual Report." Washington. Available from http://www.apsanet.org/content_40667.cfm
- American Political Science Association, Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession. 2001. "The Status of Women in Political Science: Female Participation in the Professoriate and the Study of Women and Politics in the Discipline." *PS: Political Science and Politics*:319-26. Available from <http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/womeninpoliticalscience.pdf>
- Andrews, William G. 1982. "Introduction: Freaks, Rainbows, and Pots of Gold." In *International Handbook of Political Science*, ed. W. G. Andrews. Edited by W. G. Andrews. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Bender, Thomas. 1997. "Politics, Intellect, and the American University 1945-1995." *Daedalus* 126 (1):1-38.
- Brintnall, Michael. 2008. Academic Community and the Public. Presented at Western Political Science Association, Mar 20, at San Diego, CA.
Available from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p238500_index.html
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. 2006. "Game Theory, Political Economy, and the Evolving Study of War and Peace." *American Political Science Review* 100 (4):637-42.
- Bulmer, Martin. 2001. "Knowledge for the Public Good: The Emergence of Social Sciences and Social Reform in Late-Nineteenth- and Early-Twentieth-Century America, 1880-1940." In *Social Science and Policy-Making: a Search for Relevance in the Twentieth Century*, ed. D. L. Featherman and M. Vinovskis. Edited by D. L. Featherman and M. Vinovskis. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Chandra, Kanchan, and et al. 2006. "Report of APSA Working Group on Collaboration." Washington: American Political Science Association. Available from <http://www.apsanet.org/imgtest/CollaborationReport08-09-06.pdf>
- DeMuth, Christopher. 2007. "Think-Tank Confidential: What I learned during two decades as head of America's most influential policy shop." *Wall Street Journal*, October 11. Available from <http://opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110010718>
- Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2006. "The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 100 (4):627-36.
- Eaton, Judith. 2006. *An Overview of U.S. Accreditation*. revised ed. Washington: Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Available from http://www.chea.org/pdf/OverviewAccred_rev0706.pdf
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 2001. "Why Public Intellectuals?" *Wilson Quarterly*.
- . 2002. *Jane Addams and the Dream of American Democracy*. New York: Basic Books.

- Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models*. Available from <http://www.poli.duke.edu/eitm/>
<http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/ses/polisci/reports/pdf/eitmreport.pdf>
- Farr, James. 2002. The Historical Science(s) of Politics: the Method, Association, and End of an American Discipline. Paper read at Historicizing the Political: Anglo-American Approaches to a Historical Political Science since 1900, at Berkeley.
- . 2003. "Political Science." In *The Modern Social Sciences*, ed. T. M. Porter and D. Ross. *The Cambridge History of Science* Edited by T. M. Porter and D. Ross. 8 vols. Vol. Volume 7: Cambridge University Press.
- Fisher, Donald. 1993. *Fundamental development of the social sciences : Rockefeller philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fleishman, Joel L. 2007. *The foundation : a great American secret : how private wealth is changing the world*. 1st ed. New York: PublicAffairs. Available from <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip071/2006027765.html>
- Goodin, Robert, and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. 1996. "Political Science: the Discipline." In *A New Handbook of Political Science*, ed. R. Goodin and H.-D. Klingemann. Edited by R. Goodin and H.-D. Klingemann. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gunnell, John G. 2006. "The Founding of the American Political Science Association: Discipline, Profession, Political Theory and Politics." *American Political Science Review* 100 (4):479-86.
- Hauck, Robert J-P. 1998. "APSA Celebrates its Centennial." *PS: Political Science and Politics* XXXI (2):258ff.
- Hauptmann, Emily. 2006. "From Opposition to Accommodation: How Rockefeller Foundation Grants Redefined Relations between POLitical Theory and Social Science in the 1950s." *American Political Science Review* 100 (4):643-50.
- Higher Education Resource Hub* 2007. Available from http://www.higher-ed.org/resources/morrill_acts.htm
- Hoxie, R. Gordon. 1955. *A history of the Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University*. New York,: Columbia University Press.
- Ishiyama, John, Marijke Breuning, and Linda Lopez. 2006. "A Century of Continuity and (Little) Change in the Undergraduate Political Science Curriculum." *American Political Science Review* 100 (4):659-65.
- Katznelson, Ira, and Helen V. Milner. 2002. *Political science : state of the discipline*. New York
 Washington, D.C.: W.W. Norton and American Political Science Association.
- Lepawsky, Albert. 1964. "The Politics of Epistemology." *The Western Political Quarterly* 17 (3):21-52. Available from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/446009>
- Lyons, Gene M. 1973. "Globalizing the Social Sciences." *PS: Political Science and Politics*.
- Menand, Louis. 2001. "The Marketplace of Ideas." In *ACLS Occasional Paper, No. 49*: American Council of Learned Societies.
- Monroe, Kristen R. 2005. *Perestroika! : the raucous rebellion in political science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- National Conference of Black Political Scientists. Available from <http://www.ncobps.org/randd.htm>

- National Science Foundation. *A Brief History of the Political Science Program at NSF*. Available from <http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/ses/polisci/history.jsp>
- Newfield, Christopher. 2003. *Ivy and industry : business and the making of the American university, 1880-1980*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- NORC. various years. "Survey of Earned Doctorates." Available from <http://www.norc.org/projects/Survey+of+Earned+Doctorates.htm>
- Ogg, Frederic Austin. 1928. *Research in the humanistic and social sciences: Report of a Survey Conducted for the American Council of Learned Societies*. New York, London,: The Century Co.
- Reed, Adolph, Jr. 2003. "Reflections on Atlanta University Political Science." *The National Political Science Review* 9:236-45.
- Ricci, David M. 1984. *The tragedy of political science : politics, scholarship, and democracy*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.
- Schmidt, Brian C. 1998. *The political discourse of anarchy : a disciplinary history of international relations*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sigelman, Lee. 2006a. "The Coevolution of American Political Science and the *American Political Science Review*." *American Political Science Review* 100 (4):463-78.
- , ed. 2006b. *American Political Science Review*. Vol. 100 Issue 4.
- Silberman, Bernard S. 1993. *Cages of reason : the rise of the rational state in France, Japan, the United States, and Great Britain*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Available from <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/description/uchi051/92031653.html>
- <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/uchi051/92031653.html>
- Silverberg, Helene. 1998. "'A Government of Men': Gender, the City, and the New Science of Politics." In *Gender and American social science : the formative years*, ed. H. Silverberg. Edited by H. Silverberg. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Teichgraber, Richard F., III. 2004. "Black and White." *The Tulanian*, Spring. Available from http://www2.tulane.edu/article_news_details.cfm?ArticleID=5325
- Tolleson-Rinehart, Sue, and Susan J Carroll. 2006. "'Far from Ideal:' the Gender Politics of Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 100 (4):507-13.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. *Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service* 2007. Available from http://www.csrees.usda.gov/qlinks/partners/state_partners.html
- Weintraub, E. Roy. 2008. "First, Kill the Economists." *Science* 320.