

INTRODUCTION

Toward a More Eclectic, Pluralist and Cosmopolitan Political Science?

Ramona COMAN and Jean-Frédéric MORIN

The past, the present and the future of political science have always been a topic of inquiry for political scientists. This collection of essays is not the first to explore the evolution of the discipline. Since its inception, scholars of politics of all persuasions have (re)produced the story of the field as a discipline and as a profession (Farr et al. 1990: 598; Blondiaux 1997: 10; Gunnell 2002: 339; Dryzek 2002; 2006). They have explored the discipline's relation with its social and political environment, they have questioned its epistemological and ontological specificities, and more recently they have documented its professional standards, codes, and practices. As the discipline expands in different parts of the world, the attention devoted to its evolution and development has increased. Political science is a recognized object of study and "state of the discipline" studies are flourishing.

This book seeks to contribute to these recent debates about the evolution of the discipline by exploring three interrelated themes, namely (1) the discipline's co-evolution with politics, (2) its changing relations with sister disciplines, (3) and the transformation of its practices for knowledge production and dissemination. We argue in this volume that these topics are fundamental, as they directly address the core identity of political science.

Although this collection of essays builds on a growing body of scholarship and raises questions asked many times before, it is distinctive in three respects. Firstly, the volume focuses on the recent history of the discipline. We feel that the discipline's history before the end of the Cold War, and especially the behavioural revolution that took place in the 1950s and 1960s, are already well-documented by other studies (Hoffmann 1957; Easton 1953; 1969; Truman 1955; Dahl 1961). However, the most recent history of political science appears fuzzier and remains to be told in a structured manner.

Secondly, this volume explores the discipline in a resolutely empirical and methodologically-coherent manner. Some other accounts of the history of political science were written by key political scientists themselves, based on lifetime's observations and illustrated by anecdotal evidence (Almond 1988; Blyth and Varghese 1999; Deloye and Voutat 2002; Dryzek 1992; 2006; Leca 1982). Instead, contributions to this volume rely on academic journals as fields of investigation, as journals are arguably one of the most important sources of empirical data with which to document the evolution of a discipline. That said, the methods used by contributors are wide and diverse, ranging from content analysis of keywords and abstracts, statistical analysis patterns in authorship and semi-structured interviews with journal editors. In this sense, this collection of essays not only studies the empirical inclination and methodological eclecticism of contemporary political science, but is itself a reflection of these trends.

Thirdly, the volume looks at political science in its broad diversity. Most studies of political science focus on a specific country (Czaputowicz 2012; Eisfeld and Pal 2010; von Beyme 1991; Daalder 1991; Hayward 1991; Morlino 1991; Karlhofer and Pelinka 1991; Jobard 2002) or a specific subfield (Cini 2006; Jensen and Kristensen 2012; Vensesson 1998; Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner, 1998; Keeler 2005). In contrast, the geographical and thematic coverage of this volume is particularly wide. Some chapters look at journals which score very well in the international rankings, such as *American Political Science Review* and the *British Journal of Political Science*, while others look at journals that are limited to a national context, such as the *Revue française de science politique*, and still some others look at "niche journals", such as *Security Dialogue*. Among the specialized journals studied in this volume, some have a thematic focus, like *Electoral Studies*, and others give preference to regional political realities, such as the *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Thus, despite this volume's narrow focus on journals, it does not sacrifice the geographical breadth and thematic depth of the discipline.

By exploring academic productivity as it is mirrored through academic journals, this volume shows that each journal is, in a way, a different island in a vast, rich and more or less connected archipelago. Some islands are better known than others, but they all contribute in their own way and through their diversity to the liveliness and the fertility of the discipline. The assumptions that each journal is deeply rooted in its own specific social context and is not isolated from the problems of politics inform the essays in this collection.

The remainder of this introduction is divided into three parts. The first discusses the three broad topics examined in this volume by scrutinizing the development and the current state of political science. The second section discusses the methodological benefits and challenges of studying the evolution of political science through an examination of scholarly journals. The third section briefly summarizes the content and the orientation of the chapters.

1. Politics, pluridisciplinarity and professionalization

Over the last century, political science has witnessed different types of change, at different moments in time and with different intensities. Scholars with an interest in the

historiography of political science have depicted moments of intellectual enthusiasm and episodes of deception and disarray (Gunnell 2002: 341; Kaufman-Osborn 2006). The historiography of political science stresses not only progress and diversity, but also identity crises (Farr et al. 1990: 587). Political science has always been “in flux” and “in doubt” (Blondiaux 1997: 10).

To illustrate this incremental process of change punctuated by sudden revolutions, this book looks at three overarching themes in the evolution of political science: (1) the discipline’s co-evolution with politics, (2) its changing relations with sister disciplines, (3) and the transformation of its knowledge production and dissemination practices. Trying to scrutinize their implications, we argue in this chapter that these issues have important consequences for the ontological and epistemological identity of the discipline. They have always been determinant in the history of the discipline, and they remain crucial at the beginning of the 21st century.

1.1. Three challenges over the history of political science

Although the exact periodization varies according to national contexts, three phases can be identified in the history of political science: its emergence, its development, and its widening. In what follows, we show that during each of these phases, questions arose regarding political science’s relations with its political context, its relations with other disciplines, and its scientific practices.

There is a shared consensus that the genesis of the discipline was dependent on the political and social context in which it took place. Political science was born in order to put forward new democratic values and principles. The appearance of the discipline went hand in hand with the construction of the nation state and the establishment of democratic political regimes, if under the influence of different conceptions of democracy (Diamandouros and Spourdalakis 1991; Newton and Vallès 1991: 235). Since its early stages, political science has had a mission such that each generation of scholars has brought its own contribution to the definition of its vocation. Arguably, the initial task attributed to political science was not only to “create a public” (Gunnell 2006: 482) but also to contribute to the formation of both political elites and citizens (Leca 1982).

Given that the first scholars of politics were historians and constitutional lawyers (Bevir 2006) and the first scientific theory of politics was as much sociological as it was political (Warleigh-Lack and Cini 2009: 7), the origins of the discipline were marked by claims for intellectual independence and institutional autonomy. This process of institutionalization entailed a series of choices that contributed to the delimitation of the theoretical boundaries and to the definition of the empirical scope of the discipline (Leca 1982; von Beyme 1991; Gunnell 2006: 480). In their attempts to overcome the status of “little sister”, if not Cinderella, vis-à-vis well-established disciplines, political science gradually insulated itself from other fields of research (Newton and Vallès 1991: 234)¹. For example, in order to distinguish political science from

¹ The contributors to the special issue of *European Journal of Political Science* edited by Newton and Vallès in 1991 revealed that in some countries, the discipline rapidly grew up as a new field, outside the sphere of influence of other arts or social science traditions. In

sociology, topics such as inequality had been marginalized (Van Kersberben 2010: 50). In the same vein, in order to differentiate itself from history, political science focused on recent times and events. Put another way, during the first decades of the institutionalization of the discipline its “founding fathers” clearly gave preference to a series of specific research topics and pushed others to the margins. Both in terms of research and teaching, the onus was on political scientists to understand the role of the State in general and the role of government in particular (Leca 1982; McKay 1991; Dryzek 2006; Gunnell 2006). Disciplinary boundaries had been arbitrarily drawn (Hay 2002: 4).

This process of emancipation and institutionalization gave rise not only to crucial epistemological struggles, but also to a series of methodological concerns and debates about professionalization. Scholars endeavoured to define what constitute a “good discipline” and adequate research. They also tried to determine how to acquire scientific knowledge. They set themselves the daunting task of clarifying the relationship between political science and politics, as well as the relationship between normative judgments and empirical science.

The second episode in the history of the discipline is one of extensive development in the favourable context of the 1950s and 1960s. After the Second World War, the national communities of political scientists were relatively well established in most democratic political regimes. However, the Cold War favoured the centralization of the growing and expanding discipline around US academic circles. To political scientists dissatisfied with the traditional methods of the discipline, this post-war context and the ensuing Cold War offered new institutional opportunities (Dahl 1961). As Lowi pointed out, the intervention of the state in the development of the discipline explains why some topics became “hegemonic” (1992: 1). The US government, in particular, increased substantially its assistance to some subfields of political science in its fight against communism. As a result, area studies, game theory, cybernetics, political psychology, and comparative foreign policy all benefited from large public subsidies (Roberts 1964; Johnson 1974). As King put it, a country possessing weapons of mass destruction was of a special interest to foreign investors, governments, and scholars (1994: 292). Clearly, political science did not develop in a political vacuum. As Verdery notes, the Cold War was a form of knowledge and a cognitive organization of the world (1996: 330). Both the research agenda and the curriculum in political science were – directly or indirectly – under the influence of the ideological confrontation between East and West (see Verdery 1996; Czaputowicz 2012).

While in the former communist bloc social scientists tried to empirically demonstrate the advantages of communism over capitalism, in the United States and Western Europe political scientists started to devote particular attention to methods. Still in search of a distinct identity vis-à-vis other disciplines and eager to become “scientific”, some prominent scholars – most of them established in American universities – strongly advocated a certain kind of scientific rigour (Dahl 1961). This community of scholars contended that methods were supposed to “help to protect

other national contexts, political scientists struggled for emancipation from the tutelage of law, history, sociology, and political philosophy (see Newton and Vallès 1991).

the professional scientists from the pressure of society for quick answers to urgent if complicated problems” (Easton 1969: 1054). Therefore, in order to increase the relevance of political science, they recommended the use of quantitative techniques in the analysis of political data. In so doing, they clearly showed a preference for explanation and a strict delineation between empirical research and normative statements (Blondiaux 1997: 13). This behaviourist movement grew into a major influence in the 1950s, to the extent that it became the origin myth of the American political science (Dahl 1961; Almond and Genco 1977; Blondiaux 1997; Dryzek 1992; 2006).

These attempts to discover laws and regularities when exploring the “heart of politics” had non-negligible consequences on the relationship with other disciplines and on internal specialization in subfields. As Almond and Genco put it, “political theory, public law and public administration and descriptive institutional analysis have all become defensive, peripheral and secondary subject matters” (1977: 510). On the other hand, this “scientific mood” brought political science into closer affiliation with psychology and economics (Dahl 1961: 86). Sceptics deplored the wrong turns taken by political science, referring in particular to the process of narrowing and technicization of academic curriculum and research agendas. The behaviourist credo was criticized for being a “historical deviation” and for its “flirtation with mistaken metaphors that temporarily captured the imagination of social scientists” (Almond and Genco 1977: 522). These contrasting views about the methodological tools to be used in order to illuminate research puzzles lead to the professionalization of the field in general and to the development of specific ways of designing social inquiry.

The third episode in the history of the discipline is a time of interconnectedness with different theoretical perspectives and fields of study. The revival of the discipline during this stage resulted from a series of overlapping processes. The creation of the European Communities and the increased transformation of Western Europe as well as the collapse of communism and the disintegration of the Soviet Union had non-negligible implications for the evolution of the discipline. New puzzles attracted scholarly attention and led to the widening and deepening of the discipline. The European Communities – largely ignored at the moment of their establishment by the community of scholars – became a topic of interest for both specialists of comparative politics and IR partly thanks to the EU-funded Jean Monnet lectureships (Cini 2006: 43). On the other hand, both in the US and Western Europe, the end of the “short 20th century” was marked by “offences” (King 1994) with regard to the ability of political scientists to foresee the 1989 revolutions and their implications for the international order. These major political events had implications for scholars in IR and comparative politics in terms of both theoretical and methodological approaches. Those who argued that the mission of the discipline is to explain and to predict have had to admit the limitations of their role.

Arguably, the new political realities at the domestic and international level as well as the self-examination of the limitations and achievements of the discipline gave rise to a series of reconceptualizations with regard to the nature of the state, the international order, the nature of the actors and the relationship between them (see also Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner 1998: 647). The conceptual and methodological renewal of

the discipline was both outward and inward-looking. It was outward-looking in the sense that political scientists have increasingly tried to find fruitful ideas elsewhere, in anthropology, linguistics, and neuroscience (Mahoney and Larkin 2008; Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner 1998: 646). Conversely, it was inward-looking in the sense that the theoretical and methodological *renaissance* of political science also consists of putting together conflicting approaches (see Johnson 2002) and attempts to provide a theoretical synthesis (see Cini 2006)².

This theoretical renewal has been accompanied by methodological diversity. The sustained debates about what constitutes “good political science” allowed scholars to better understand their differences, and this clarification has in turn facilitated dialogue (Mahoney and Larkin 2008). On the one hand, the *rapprochement* between quantitative and qualitative methodologies has pacified one part of the field. On the other hand, more recently, postmodernism – which is known by a variety of names – became the new challenger to the discipline. The old cleavages of the discipline still exist, but political science is becoming organized around them to a lesser extent³. The image of a field dominated by warring factions and paradigm rivalry as well as the defence of a discipline isolated from other fields of research is old-fashioned (Dryzek 1992; 1996; Grant 2005: 979; Cini 2006). Instead of witnessing new attempts to demonstrate the superiority of one theoretical approach over another, political scientists are more inclined to promote theoretical and methodological dialogue and intra- and inter-disciplinary collaboration. Diversity is now embraced, praised and sought after rather than being a shameful flaw in the discipline (Sil and Katzenstein 2010). Political scientists express new ambitions in terms of research agenda, theoretical and methodological orientations and professionalization.

1.2. Towards eclecticism, pluralism and cosmopolitanism?

At the beginning of the 21st century, political science is in movement and the aim of this book is to explore its trajectories. What are the contours of the discipline? Is political science more inclined to advocate the dismantling of intellectual borders and new forms of dialogue with other disciplines? To what extent is the institutionalization of the discipline in different parts of the world giving rise to a more cosmopolitan profession? By addressing these questions, prominent political scientists have argued that the discipline is eclectic, pluralist and cosmopolitan as a result of (1) the discipline’s co-evolution with politics, (2) its changing relations with sister disciplines, (3) and the transformation of its knowledge production and dissemination practices. We argue in this volume that in spite of the rich and valuable contributions devoted to this topic, we still need more empirical evidence to shed more light on this new image for the discipline.

How eclectic is political science? The discipline is widening, integrating new areas and research topics (Trent 2011), under the influence of major political and social

² One of the most quoted illustrations is the challenge of bridging rational choice and constructivist approaches.

³ As Grant (2005: 385) pointed out, what brings together political scientists – in conferences, professional associations, research projects, and publications – is not an interest in similar methods, but their focus on similar topics.

changes. The 2008 financial crisis, the role of social media in political struggle, the rise of transnational actors and initiatives, the emergence of China and other economic powers, and growing concerns about climate change, for example, have pushed political scientists to revisit some of their previous assumptions and to investigate new empirical fields. This interplay between political science and the transformation of the “real world” remains however a challenge for the discipline. Keeping up with national and international transformations may have consequences for the boundaries of the field in general and for the topics to be addressed in particular (Smith 2004).

What are the concrete manifestations of this methodological and theoretical pluralism? Is pluralism an aspiration or an actual practice in the field? The answers to these questions are very diverse, reflecting the authors’ points of view and their field of research (see Flinders and John 2013). While Goodin and Klingemann (1996), followed by Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner (1998) portrayed the discipline as pluralist, more recently, Marsh and Savigny have argued that this is an “aspiration” rather than a reality (2004: 165). In the same vein, Johnson (2002: 234) has noted that “calls for methodological and theoretical pluralism” are more demanding than they often appear. There are countless examples of recent appeals to pluralism and interdisciplinary work – which is portrayed as an appropriate solution to the problems of the “real world’s” complexity and interdependence (Hay 2010). It has been argued that political science should rediscover political theory in order to “develop visions of how a good society might be designed and politically attained” (Eisfeld 2010: 220). It has also been suggested that political science should reconnect with psychology in order to understand dissatisfaction, disenchantment, disappointment, disaffection and disengagement in our democracies (Hay 2010). These synergies between disciplines vary from one field to another. While for some scholars interdisciplinarity is the new key to success, French political scientists retort that pluralism and interdisciplinarity are well-established practices in their field (see Favre 1995; Deloye and Voutat 2002; Billordo 2005: 186; Boncourt 2007: 292).

Last but not least, the widening of political science also has consequences on its knowledge production and dissemination practices. Political science has become a profession with well-defined standards for training and employment (Klingemann, Fuchs and Zielonka 2006; Klingemann 2007). It has established a common theoretical and methodological language as well as the means of critical assessment. This increased professionalization follows from a variety of national and international factors among which can be counted the establishment of new professional associations, academic journals, the increasing number of conferences facilitating dialogue between scholars from different parts of the world, the development of transnational research programs and teams, etc. However, it appears that at the beginning of the 21st century, political science is predominantly Western and male (Trent 2011: 196); more precisely, in terms of publications, it appears to be dominated by American scholars in general and academics in particular. Although there is an increased interest in collaboration with practitioners, the field is led by academics (Boncourt 2007: 280).

This collection of essays brings new empirical evidence to shed more light on the accuracy of this new image for political science – eclectic, pluralist and cosmopolitan.

2. Investigating scholarly journals

Several data sources can be used to examine the relationship between political science and the problems of politics, the relationship between political science and other disciplines, and the effects of these developments on the professionalization of the community of scholars. This section discusses the benefits and the limitations of using journals articles as primary sources.

2.1. *The benefits of exploring a discipline through its journals*

Arguably, international journals are the most prestigious form of knowledge dissemination in political science. This recognition is drawn from their double-blinded peer review process. Since the number of submitted manuscripts is ever-increasing but available space remains scarce, some political science journals end up with rejection rates of up to 90% (ISQ 2013). This fierce competition combined with scrupulous scientific screening result in a high likelihood that accepted articles are truly at the cutting edge of scientific advancement. Several high-quality manuscripts are rejected for a variety of reasons, but those accepted are usually innovative, thought-provoking and rigorous.

Of course, the selection process in other forms of political science communication, including books, edited volumes and conference presentations, is also guided by scientific merit. However, non-scientific criteria, such as market potential, personal connections, name recognition, and funding prospects typically play a greater role in their acceptance for publication. Patronage practices partly explain that book authors are on average older and more likely to be trained in elite universities than article authors (Clemens et al. 1995; Breuning et al. 2007). In contrast, a study of the *American Journal of Political Science* concludes that contributors' past publication record and institutional affiliation are poor predictors of article acceptance. The only strong and statistically-significant predictors appear to be reviewers' and editors' evaluations (Lewis-Beck and Levy 1993). Thus, publishing in the top journals of the discipline is more competitive, but apparently more egalitarian than book publishing.

The role and prestige of political science journals has even increased in the last decades due to the diffusion of standardized modes of evaluation. In an ideal world, the evaluation of the performance of academics, graduate programs, and departments would be done by a close examination of their production, whatever the support they attract. In practice, however, hiring decisions, promotion reviews, and university rankings are increasingly based on quantitative and easily-comparable metrics. The most readily available of these metrics are the rankings of journals and the number of citations of articles, used as indirect indicators of the quality of scientific production. In China, financial rewards are even offered to scholars for each article published in highly-ranked journals (Fuyuno 2006). Thus, an increasing number of scholars in various parts of the world have direct incentives to submit their best work to journals rather than to other outlets.

In addition to their scientific importance and social prestige, journals also offer empirical advantages to researchers interested in tracing the evolution of the discipline. First and foremost, journals – as opposed to most books – are accessible in digitized format. For example, articles published more than a century ago in the

American Political Science Review are available at researchers' fingertips from the website of their university libraries. This facilitates access, treatment and analysis of data since researchers can use search queries based on authors, titles, abstracts, keywords, references or full text searches to systematically find specific information in large numbers of texts. The standardized format of articles, in length, layout, and writing style, also eases systematic comparative analysis. Comparisons over time are especially simplified, as journals are serial publications appearing with relatively high frequency, regularity, and stability.

Moreover, researchers using journals as data to investigate the evolution of political science benefit in their case selections from a relative consensus about the best journals in the discipline. In the vast majority of rankings, a small group of elite journals earn very high marks, including the *American Political Science Review*, *International Organization*, *Comparative Political Studies* and the *British Journal of Political Science*. The specific ranking of these journals varies, depending whether it is made according to the number of citations or to the journal's reputation among scholars (Giles and Garand 2007), the country of residence and the subfield of scholars surveyed (Garand 2005; Garand et al. 2009), or the year the ranking was established (Garand and Giles 2003). These variations, however, are moderate and there is a broad and stable consensus about the prestige and impact of a journal among political scientists from different subfields and different countries.

2.2. Limitations in the study of scholarly journals

This being said, we readily acknowledge that scholarly journals are an incomplete data source with which to grasp and sketch the evolution of political science – as a discipline and as a profession. Publishing is only a subset of political scientists' activities, and journals are only one among several types of publication. Studies on the evolution of political science have looked at alternative data sources, including course syllabi (Robles 1993), textbooks and handbooks (Gunnell 2002), academic curricula (Bennet et al. 2003), PhD dissertations (Keller 2005), membership in political science associations (Grant 2005), panels at general conferences (Mead 2010), interviews with past presidents of political science associations (Hochschild et al. 2005), contributions to edited volumes (Mathews and Andersen 2001), and monographs (Rice et al. 2002).

One could argue that monographs, in particular, remain a significant vehicle for the publication of original ideas and analysis in political science. Since there is a slower pace of knowledge advancement in social sciences than in natural science, authors face less pressure from timeliness constraints when disseminating their results and are more inclined to cite relatively old literature. As a result, social sciences still heavily rely on books as venues for publication and as sources for citation. According to various estimates, books account for 40% to 50% of citations in social sciences (Huang and Chang 2008; Larivière et al. 2006; Nederhof et al. 2010). Social scientists write and read more books than do their colleagues in the natural sciences, and this difference is likely to continue.

Nonetheless, books are not simply longer and broader version of journal articles. Among other things, the former are more likely to favour qualitative approaches than the latter. Book authors are also more likely to cite other books while article authors

are more likely to cite other articles. In sum, books and journal articles belong to different publication worlds, each with their own distinct identity, and with only partial overlaps (Hicks 2004). Focusing solely on journal articles to make inferences about the entire discipline would miss not only a significant but also a distinctive share of the research output.

Another limitation of the exclusive use of journal articles to map the discipline regards the exclusion of locally-oriented publications. In social sciences, several publications address local issues, target a local audience, and use a local language (Norris 1997; Huan and Chang 2008). These publications include not only books and articles, but also blog posts, newspaper articles, and policy reports. Many of them neither engage in cross-country comparison nor aspire to universal generalization. Since most international journals are published exclusively in English and subscribe to a cosmopolitan view of political science, their collection of articles does not reflect this important stream of literature in political science.

A related issue concerns the bias in favour of North American contributors in internationally-recognized journals (Goldmann 1995; Waeber 1998). Judging by the Social Science Citation Index, for example, it appears that Canadian scholars publish far more articles in scientific journals than their French colleagues despite the fact that France has nearly twice the population of Canada. This asymmetry has several causes, including an uneven propensity to write in English and variations in the prestige associated with publishing in journals. In a recent survey where scholars of International Relations were asked which kinds of research outputs are the most important in advancing their academic career, 89% of Americans and 87% of Canadians answered peer-reviewed journal articles compared with 74% of French scholars (Maliniak et al. 2012). Still, the overrepresentation of North American scholars in internationally-recognized journals also has causes endogenous to the journals themselves. Most leading political science journals have their editorial offices in the US and their editorial board is filled with American scholars. The path dependency pattern favouring American authors is further accentuated by the tendency to request reviews from scholars who have already published in the same journals, the overwhelming majority of these being American.

While European journals tend to have a better balance between American and European contributors, they remain nationally biased. For example, the British journal *Political Studies* rarely publishes articles authored by French scholars and the French *Revue française de science politique* rarely publishes the work of British scholars (Boncourt 2007). Moreover, American and European journals are alike in their common ignorance of the work written by political scientists based in developing countries (Aydinli and Matthews 2000).

Even a researcher interested in portraying only the landscape of US peer-reviewed articles might have difficulty in finding representative journals. Most journals are relatively specialized within a narrow niche and are centred on a tight-knit community of authors and readers. Few American journals appeal to the entire community of American political scientists. Neither the flagship journal of the American Political Science Association, the *American Political Science Review*, nor journals with a broad generic name, such as the *American Journal of Political Science*, is representative of

American political science. Despite their claim to publish articles from all subfields and areas of the discipline, some are better represented than others (Bennett et al. 2003).

Members of the editorial boards of leading journals often object that published articles broadly reflect submitted materials (Steinmo 2005). If few published articles have a heterodox approach, it is presumably because few heterodox manuscripts are submitted to these leading and generalist journals in the first place. This argument, however, points to yet another limitation in studying the discipline through its journals: we have access only to accepted manuscripts, not to those that are rejected. In view of this, it is quite difficult to assess the degree to which published articles reflect patterns of submission, whether scholars self-censor their submissions, and whether editors exercise a bias toward certain approaches.

These limitations raise important implications for the purpose of this collection of essays. The sample of journals studied here is certainly not representative of the entire discipline. At best, each journal is associated with a different community of political scientists.

3. Content and orientation of this book

The chapters of this volume examine the widening and deepening of political science by looking at the emergence of new research topics and the transformation of the “real world”. Particular attention is paid to the relationship with other fields of study, disciplines and research traditions. The chapters question the myth of a unified, isolated and eclectic political science and its cosmopolitan appearance. Directly or indirectly, each contribution observes the professionalization of the field by looking at attempts at specialization and internationalization.

In Chapter 1 Clément Jadot examines the evolution of political science as it is reflected by *West European Politics (WEP)*. Drawing on keywords and on authors’ university affiliations, the chapter portrays the contours of comparative politics by looking at the topics addressed by the contributors. On the one hand, the chapter highlights the influence of two of the major phenomena of the 20th century – European construction and the collapse of communism – on the scope of the journal; on the other hand, it examines how *WEP* tries to find a balance between specialization and diversity. In order to counterbalance the dominant view according to which scholars located in UK and USA lead the field, the chapter explores the presence of European scholars in the pages of the journal. It demonstrates that political scientists are increasingly engaging in dialogue with one another and that the image of a journal dominated by scholars from UK and the United States is no longer accurate.

While in Chapter 1 Clément Jadot discusses the undisputed dominance of political parties in the pages of *West European Politics*, Chapter 2 examines the relationship between political parties and the problems of politics. Caroline Close argues that over the last decades several challenges have weakened traditional party organizations and have decreased the relevance of these organizations within the democratic process. For many, the “golden age” of political party literature appears to be behind us. Against this background, the chapter’s aim is to assess whether party research has experienced

a decline or resurgence in the last decades. Caroline Close verifies this assumption by drawing on an article published in the *British Journal of Political Science*.

In the same vein, in Chapter 3 Lidia Nunez discusses the pitfalls caused by the impact of the context on research. The chapter shows how the political context may impact on research in political science and how the context in which academics develop their research may have an impact on academic production. Three types of potential bias are discussed in the article: selection, specification and publication biases. In so doing, the chapter draws on an analysis of articles published in the journal *Electoral Studies* about the economic voting theory since 1984.

In Chapter 4 Manuel Cervera-Marzal examines the relationship between political science and political philosophy and illustrates the changing role of the latter within the discipline as a whole. Drawing on the articles published in the *Revue française de science politique*, the chapter explores the dialogue between Anglophone⁴ and French philosophy. It emphasises the lack of hostility between political science and political philosophy and points out the pluralism of intellectual traditions, in spite of the clear preference of the journal for a liberal political philosophy.

In Chapter 5 Camille Kelbel scrutinizes the evolution of European studies as mirrored by the *Journal of Common Market Studies (JCMS)*. By examining theoretical debates about the integration process, this chapter reflects the influence of mainstream political science on European studies. The author argues that existing debates regarding theoretical developments within the field are oversimplified. Drawing on articles published in *JCMS*, the chapter demonstrates that the community of Europeanists appears open to innovation and intellectual dialogue with other subfields of the discipline.

In Chapter 6 Lorenzo Angelini examines the evolution of one of the most influential journals in IR, *International Security (IS)*. Drawing on *who* publishes and *what* type of content is featured in this journal, the chapter scrutinizes the professional background of IS authors and the policy- and/or theory-driven character of the articles published. By doing so, it illustrates not only the interplay between policy and theory, but also the implications of the relationship between the problems of politics and security studies as regards professionalization. Although the author observes a steady decline of policy-oriented articles and an increasing interest in theory over time, the chapter emphasizes that the relationship between theory and policy recommendations remains important. With regard to the theoretical evolution of the journal, the chapter demonstrates that *IS* reflects the influence of mainstream IR rather than the most recent developments in security theory found in Europe.

In Chapter 7 Krystel Wanneau traces the evolution of the content of *Security Dialogue* articles in order to study the state of the international security studies (ISS) subfield of International Relations. This chapter shows how *Security Dialogue* mirrors both external contexts and internal debates amongst its epistemic community and

⁴ In this book we have used the term “Anglophone” in preference to the French-language usage “Anglo-Saxon” to refer to works originally published in English by scholars working in English-speaking countries, especially the UK and the USA.

demonstrates that the key to the co-transformation of the field and the journal lies in innovation.

In Chapter 8 Marie-Catherine Wavreille looks at foreign contributions to the study of American politics. To this end, the chapter scrutinizes the *American Political Science Review*. Drawing on the sociological background of a non-American who publishes in the pages of this academic journal, the author argues that professional socialization matters and that careers and reputations in the discipline of political science are made within the boundaries of one country. While many scholars claim the benefits of interdisciplinary work and pluralism, obstacles to internationalization still exist. Foreign-based authors do not populate American politics. In this chapter Wavreille shows that the study of American politics is still very much a field restricted to nationals and that “there is no Asian, European or Latin American science of American politics”.

