

## **Towards A More Cosmopolitan Political Science?**

**Pippa Norris**

Harvard University

European Journal of Political Research Spring 1997 Vol 30(1): 17-34

Since Aristotle, the aim of cosmopolitans has been to develop a science of politics based on concepts, theories and empirical generalizations, which travel beyond the national boundaries of any particular political system. Indeed, it can be argued that this is the sine qua non of any mature science. Developments, which should lead towards a more cosmopolitan political science, include the growth of regional and international organizations, the professionalisation of the discipline, and technological developments, which expedite global communications. The international exchange of data, scholars and publications should facilitate the ability of political scientists from different countries to share a body of knowledge, methodological approaches, and intellectual concerns.

Yet although some pressures pull the discipline towards cosmopolitanism, others may reinforce localism. Deep-rooted intellectual traditions and ideological differences may continue to divide political scientists in different regions of the world (McKay 1988, 1991). Increased specialization, the proliferation of the literature, and an overall fragmentation of the field, may reinforce parochialism (Almond 1990). The historical ties, which rooted the founders of the profession in both the Old and New Worlds in the post-war era, may have been eroded by the entry of the younger generations of technocrats lacking this experience. Rather than cosmopolitans, this may have swung the profession towards more loyalists focusing on what happens immediately around them, with a primary concern to delineate political processes within the context of a particular nation state. In particular, there are plausible reasons to suppose that in recent decades European political science may have strengthened multilateral links within its borders, yet this very development may have severed some of the older ties linking Europe and the United States.

To explore this thesis this article will consider these arguments, and then analyze trends since the early seventies towards convergence or divergence between the professions in Europe and the United States based on journal publications. Data is drawn from a content analysis of articles in the European Journal of Political Research and the American Political Science Review, the official journals of the ECPR and APSA. We conclude by reflecting on the broader implications of this analysis for the future of the profession. The 25th anniversary of the European Journal of Political Research provides an appropriate occasion to take stock and assess how far European and American political science have come together, or remained intellectual oceans apart, during the last quarter century.

### **The Globalization of Political Science?**

The institutionalization of political science can be expected to strengthen cross-national links. The profession developed in most advanced industrialized democracies during the last half century, although the process started earlier in the United States with the creation of the American Political Science Association in 1903 (for the early history see Sniderman 1985; Ricci 1984; Farr, Dryer and Leonard 1995). The growth of the profession in Europe occurred with the creation in universities of separate departments of political science distinct from related disciplines such as law, history, social administration, philosophy, or sociology (for the development of the discipline in Europe see the special issue of EJPR 1991). The nature of the discipline today continues to bear the genes of its parentage: a more historical, sociological and philosophical orientation in many European countries compared with stronger links with social psychology and economics in the United States.

Departments of political science formed the building blocks for national professional associations, and regional or international organisations. Following an initiative by UNESCO, the International Political Science Association was founded in 1949 (Trent 1979), and gradually expanded until it links together over forty national associations and about 1,000 individual members worldwide. The main focus of IPSA's activity remains the triennial World Congress which provides the major forum bringing together between 2,000-3,000 political scientists from countries all over the world. IPSA Research Committees and Study Groups, focus on the major sub-fields of research, linking smaller networks of colleagues on a more regular basis through meetings, newsletters, and occasional joint

publications. IPSA attempts to transcend divisions between established and emerging democracies, between advanced industrialised and developing economies, as well as between East and West. For political scientists scattered in diverse universities without well-established learned societies, IPSA provides a lifeline to meet other colleagues in the discipline. Yet the World Congress, because of its relative infrequency, peripatetic location, and international diversity, cannot provide the intellectual coherence or social networks of national or regional meetings. Panels at the World Congress often present a plurality of cultural traditions, political agendas, and theoretical approaches, all compounded by the problems of language, so that they may produce a Tower of Babel rather than a true meeting of minds.

The European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR), established in 1970 by a core of eight institutions, was designed to foster cross-national scholarship within the region (for details see Newton 1991). Within a few years of its founding the ECPR developed a range of activities - the summer training school, annual joint workshops, joint research projects, publications, and data archiving networks - which institutionalised multinational links among political scientists throughout Europe. The Consortium brings together a federation of universities, research centres, and departments. Subsequent expansion developed a network of over 200 institutions in Europe, and associate members elsewhere. The consortium links about 4,000-5,000 political scientists from more than two dozen countries. The largest institutional membership is from Britain, Germany and Scandinavia, although, following the process of democratisation, recent years have seen growing expansion into Mediterranean Europe, as well as central and eastern Europe. The annual Joint Workshops provide a research forum attracting about 400-500 participants. In the 1950s and 1960s, when European departments of political science were few and far between, colleagues from Leiden, Essex, or Oslo turned to Michigan, Chicago or Berkeley for part of their methodological training, the political science equivalent of the 18th century Grand Tour. In contrast in the 1990s younger European political scientists may be more likely to spend time in summer school at Essex, Lille or Budapest, visiting the European University Institute in Florence, or exchanging places with colleagues in Berlin, Dublin, or Stockholm. In the 1960s a few senior scholars had the resources and contacts to maintain international connections (see ISSJ 1973), but as a result of these developments it has become far easier for more and more younger scholars to interact in international networks on a routine basis.

The professionalisation of political science should also strengthen cross-national ties. By 'professionalisation' we mean the development of a coherent body of knowledge that defines the subject as a discipline; the recruitment, training and certification by recognised standards (usually a doctorate) that individuals are qualified in that body of knowledge; the full-time employment of these scholars as teachers and researchers in the field; the promotion of individuals according to professional standards (recognised publications and awards) by an internal process of peer review; and the formal organisation of the discipline into learned societies, in order to defend the interests of its members and advance the status of the discipline (for a discussion see Seideman 1985; Ricci 1984). This process marks a significant shift away from the intellectual interests of isolated and untrained amateurs, no matter how talented or creative, towards a collective enterprise with its own formal boundaries, rewards and careers (Rose 1990). Professionals in learned disciplines share a similar education, common language, read the same types of journals, recognise who belongs and who does not, and therefore form part of a community.

Professionalisation should encourage a global standardisation of the discipline which creates a trans-national job market. Experienced surgeons, biochemists or software engineers, although certified in one country, can use portable skills to practice elsewhere. Yet political science careers are usually locked within national boundaries. As McKay notes: "There is a small international job market. For the most part, however, careers and reputations are made in one country" (McKay 1991, 459). Surveys of British political scientists found that very few (less than one percent) moved from, or to, an overseas academic post in any one year (Norris 1990). National differences in the level of professionalisation, such as training in technical skills, may hinder cross-national exchanges, for example from Eastern to Western Europe.

Technological developments should also lead towards a more cosmopolitan political science, just as many argue it has led towards a globalisation of popular culture (Featherstone 1995). In the

age of the much-vaunted information super-highway, for those with access, international communications have never been faster or easier. Colleagues in Mannheim, Melbourne, and Michigan can now collaborate on research projects as effectively as though they were face-to-face in the same department, not continents and time-zones apart. The wider availability of cross-national machine-readable data-sets in Data Archives, like the World Values Study, the EuroBarometer, or the International Social Survey Programme, facilitates genuine cross-cultural collaboration at relatively low cost. Access to political information on the World Wide Web, such as 'virtual party conferences', campaign pages, opinion polls, aggregate economic and demographic data, and electronic newspapers, as well the capacity to download established data-sets like national election studies, also facilitates cross-national research. Just as the much-vaunted electronic 'paper-less office' has produced an avalanche of printing, far from replacing personal communications, electronic communications have probably encouraged a proliferation of international conventions for face-to-face interactions. Some have characterised these developments as 'collapsing space and time' (Brunn and Leinbach 1991), which may break down geographic barriers between national communities of political scientists.

### **Or the Continued Strength of Localism?**

As a result we might expect a globalisation of the discipline where political scientists in Europe and the United States have grown closer together in recent years. Nevertheless, despite easier communications, recent decades may have seen a growing divergence across the Atlantic, while at the same time producing more multilateral linkages within Europe. Intellectual traditions, political institutions, and the growing specialisation in political science, may keep us apart.

Different intellectual traditions in the New and Old Worlds may contribute to a transatlantic rift. In particular the American profession is permeated throughout by the assumptions of classical liberalism where the individual lies at the heart of the analysis. From the political theories of Madison, through the methods of behaviourism, to the current vogue for rational choice analysis, the focus has reflected methodological individualism. In contrast European political science follows a more complex ideological mix, reflecting deep divisions in European political culture. As McKay argues (1988, 1991), empirical political science in Europe remains extremely diverse, although perhaps strongest in structural comparative politics, or the search for systematic patterns of behaviour within different institutional contexts. Europe provides a natural laboratory for this comparison. Much of the classic work this has produced has focussed on understanding party and electoral systems, although remarkably little of this has resonated with mainstream American scholarship (see Janda 1993). Perhaps this literature seems irrelevant to American politics because of the lack of serious challenges (not withstanding Perot) which had a realistic chance of undermining the predominant two party system and changing the majoritarian electoral system in the United States.

Moreover methodological developments adopted by the American profession, particularly the rapid growth of the rational choice paradigm, may have produced greater technical sophistication but a failure of communications with an international readership where the assumptions behind these approaches are seen as less appropriate. Much of the rational choice literature is so abstract that it produces 'landless' theory which cannot be tested by cross-national empirical analysis (Rose 1991).

Most comparative research in the United States and Europe has focussed on advanced industrialised democracies. Within this universe political institutions may play a critical and insurmountable role in limiting comparability. In the familiar phrase, it is easiest to compare like with like, controlling for common institutional features (such as parliamentary democracies, developed economies, authoritarian regimes) to explain variance in the dependent variable (Dogan and Pelassy 1990). From the European perspective, the 'exceptionalism' of the American political system has always made it difficult to fit into comparative frameworks which accommodate either consociational democracies, (characterised by multi-party systems, coalition governments, federalism, weak legislatures, and a division of powers), or 'majoritarian democracies' (characterised by responsible two-party government, a centralised state, and majoritarian executives). In this context, the United States is neither fish nor fowl (see, for example, Lijphart 1984).

The way the institutional context permeates the assumptions, theories, and concepts in political science can be illustrated from many different sub-fields. The immense and sophisticated American

literature on Congressional recruitment, careers and behaviour, for example, has had relatively little impact on legislative studies elsewhere. Formal theories of individual roll call voting, for example, provide few significant insights in Europe given the context of strong party discipline within most parliaments (see, for example, Mezey 1993). The literature on the US Presidency should prove increasingly relevant for comparative research -- given the growth of new democracies with presidential systems in Central and South America, -- but again the core concepts within this body of work rarely contribute towards studies of executives in parliamentary systems (see, for example, Campbell 1993; Lijphart 1992). American research on the political role of the judiciary also has limited impact beyond its borders.

As Rose (1991) notes, Europeanists have tended to adopt those parts of American political science which prove most apposite for their political systems. International relations and political economy may perhaps be subfields marked by a particularly fruitful and productive transatlantic interchange (Rogowski 1993). In the field of voting behaviour, the Michigan model has been immensely influential, generating a series of national election studies. But even here, from a European perspective, US elections have become more difficult to fit into comparative frameworks since the late sixties following the decline of American parties as organisations which recruit their own representatives, the growth of primaries, the rise of political entrepreneurs, and the significant consequences this has had for campaigns, the role of the media, the functioning of Congress, and ultimately for governance in the United States. American elections were always different to their European counterparts in critical respects, and they have become even more so. We often compare voting behaviour, by disregarding these differences, but it is not clear that the choice of a candidate for Presidential nomination within a non-partisan primary is in any way comparable to the choice of a party list in a parliamentary election. Modernisation may have produced the wider adoption of some typically 'American' campaign techniques in many countries, -- such as the growth of opinion polling in democracies, -- but the impact of these innovations depends largely upon the legal, party and electoral systems, hence the national context within which they operate, and it is difficult to generalise on the basis of American experience (for a discussion see, for example, Swanson and Mancini 1996; LeDuc, Neimi and Norris 1996).

From the American perspective, interest in West European 'area studies' may have gradually waned with the changing balance of world power. In the 1950s many American comparative textbooks commonly devoted large sections to some of the major political systems of Europe: Britain, France, Italy, and Germany. The 'Westminster model' of strong party government was once widely admired as an exemplar for America (APSA 1950). In contrast, in the 1990s comparative textbooks are drawing material from a wider range of countries, such as China, India, Mexico and Nigeria among developing countries, as well as Russia, Japan, and some smaller industrialised states (Wilson 1995). This development has been spurred by the obsolescence of the old Cold War framework dividing the globe into liberal democracies, centrally planned socialist societies, and developing countries. Diversification has also been encouraged by growing interest in emerging democracies, new waves of migration (and therefore students) into the United States, awareness of the ethnocentric limitations of the older tradition, and the long-term decline of the great European powers (compare, for example, Almond and Powell in 1966 and 1992).

Of course this process should not be exaggerated. In political science, as in politics, developments can be characterised as a growing rift, but not yet a divorce, in the European-American relationship. Transatlantic links continue; many European colleagues attend the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association on a regular basis, while about 25 North American universities are associate members of the ECPR (or about one in ten institutional members). Colleagues continue to move back and forth across the Atlantic, for sabbaticals or longer periods. Area specialist groups at APSA continue to thrive. Of all APSA Organised Sections, Comparative Politics easily heads the pack with almost 900 members (Brintnall 1991), although this could be because Americanists are divided into subfields such as sections on Presidency Research or Legislative Studies. In a consistent pattern for the last decade among graduate political scientists starting their academic careers in American universities, just over a quarter are comparativists or area specialists, about the same proportion as Americanists (Brintnall 1996). A handful of political scientists, like Stein Rokkan, Arend Lijphart, Anthony King and Richard Rose, are probably equally well-known on both sides

of the Atlantic. Nevertheless the growth of European political science, exemplified by the thriving activities of the ECPR, means that many of the younger generation of European political scientists may regularly turn towards European countries, not the US, as the natural forum for comparative research, training and collaboration.

### **Data and Methods**

To examine the interchange of political science in the United States and Europe more systematically we can compare the range of articles published in the official journals for the ECPR and APSA. If there has been the growth of a more cosmopolitan political science during the last quarter century we might plausibly expect to find evidence for the following developments:

- (i) A movement towards greater convergence of methodological approaches, as colleagues in different countries come to share similar professional standards and techniques of analysis.
- (ii) A convergence in the agenda of political science, meaning the substantive concerns, driven by intellectual and political developments, which focus our research and publications.
- (iii) A significant growth over time in publications about comparative politics, meaning the systematic study of more than one country. There can be many units of comparison, but cross-national research forms the natural basis for most work since the nation state is the primary forum for the resolution of political conflict. This may involve comparisons of two nations, a particular region (such as members of the European Union), countries sharing a common political system (such as parliamentary systems or advanced industrialised democracies), or, more rarely global comparisons of all nations.
- (iv) Greater internationalisation of publications, with more political scientists based in institution in the United States publishing in the EJPR, while increasing numbers of colleagues based in Europe publish in the APSR.
- (v) An expansion in the number of publications involving cross-national collaboration, bringing together political scientists drawn from different societies. Of course much comparative work is often published in books, especially edited collections, but we would also expect to find this trend in journals.

Previous studies based on bibliometric analysis provide reasons to be skeptical about some of these hypotheses. Comparisons of journal evaluations (Crewe and Norris 1991, Norris and Crewe 1993) have established that American and British political scientists tend to read a different range of journals, and hence, by implication, to become familiar with a different literature, theoretical discourse and research agenda. Based on surveys of political scientists, the study measured evaluations of journal quality and familiarity, combined into a summary indicator of journal impact. Crewe and Norris found the national provenance of journals was a significant predictor of readership. Somewhat more American political scientists were familiar with US-based journals (39 per cent) than with UK-based ones (25 per cent), whereas considerably more British political scientists were familiar with UK-based journals (39 per cent) than US-based journals (11 per cent).

Other studies reinforce these conclusion. LaPonce (1980) compared the American Political Science Review with the official journals of Canada, India, France and Britain. He found that all national journals are ethnocentric, but the APSR was particularly so. Giles, Mizell and Patterson (1989) surveyed faculty in graduate departments in the United States, and found that less than 7 per cent were familiar with the European Journal of Political Research. The EJPR editorial report, by Mair and Laver, noted no steady increase in the proportion of non-European submissions to the journal from 1980-1995, but rather a pattern of trendless fluctuations. The most detailed recent examination of publications in the APSR, by Miller et al. (1996), reported that during the last forty years the proportion of 'foreign/comparative' articles sharply plummeted, from about 26 per cent in 1954-8 down to under 5 per cent in 1979-83, before slightly recovering in recent years.

To examine cross-national differences more systematically we can compare the contents of the key journals in each profession, the European Journal of Political Research in Europe and the American Political Science Review in the United States. To broaden the perspective these can also be compared with Political Studies, the journal of the Political Studies Association of the UK. These

official publications are distributed to all members of their professional associations. They should not be treated as representative of all political science journals: European colleagues may prefer to publish in the main journals within their country or region, such as Acta Politica, Revue Française de Science Politique, or Scandinavian Political Studies, or in more specialised publications within their sub-field such as Electoral Studies or Political Communication. But the EJPR and the APSR are the official journals of the European and American professional associations, highly rated by colleagues, and their contents can tell us something about the mainstream approaches in the United States and Europe. The thorough process of peer review used by these journals should insure that the articles published in their pages represent the collective judgments of their professions, rather than perhaps the more idiosyncratic preferences of particular editors and editorial boards.

To compare change during the last decade, the study analysed the contents of all articles and research notes (N.587) in a sample of volumes drawn at five yearly intervals from 1971 to 1995, excluding thematic special issues, book reviews, and professional notes like letters or obituaries. The classification required a number of careful judgments: for example where three or four countries were mentioned in passing, as brief illustrations, the article was not classified as cross-national, whereas if they were given extended treatment, or the comparison was integral to the results, it was so classified. So what do these journals tell us about the nature of political science? What are the main trends in terms of coverage of sub-fields, methodological approaches, and geographical range? And have transatlantic differences widened or narrowed in recent decades?

## Results

### A Convergence of Methodology?

If we have developed a more unified discipline we might expect common methods of analysis, yet the results of this study show that some of the most striking contrasts between journals are in terms of methodology (Table 1). The cross-national differences are not unexpected, but still noteworthy. Articles in the EJPR were divided between those favouring a broadly behavioral approach, involving the systematic empirical analysis of surveys or aggregate data, and those adopting a more institutional, descriptive or qualitative approach. The differences in methodology could be related to the availability of suitable data, with articles in political economy and voting behaviour most commonly using empirical analysis. In contrast the EJPR contained very few articles providing a conceptual analysis of normative theory, the historical exegesis of classic texts in political thought, or rational choice approaches to formal theory.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Political Studies had by far the highest proportion of articles involving philosophical discussions of normative theory, and historical studies of political thought based on interpretative textual analysis. Descriptive or institutional accounts were also common in this journal. The 'behavioral revolution' never took a strong grip in Political Studies, and seems to have declined during the last decade, while rational choice models have always been a minority interest. As a result of these developments the humanistic tradition of political theory, long preeminent in British political studies, seems to have strengthened its influence over time.

The history of the behavioral revolution's rise and fall in American political science has been well documented (Farr, Dryzek and Leonard 1995). No matters the decline, the broad legacy of this paradigm continues to imprint the mainstream profession in the United States. Systematic empirical analysis, testing theories using survey or aggregate data, remained the predominant approach in APSR in the 1970s and 1980s. Nevertheless during the last decade this approach has come under strong challenge following the rise in rational choice or formal theories using models based on deductive logic with sophisticated techniques for testing predictions. In the last decade almost a third of all articles in the APSR used this form of analysis. In sharp contrast the institutional-descriptive category has almost become extinct. Most strikingly, there were almost no articles focussing on 'area studies' outside of the United States, providing the sort of rich and detailed historical accounts of specific processes, institutions, or the politics of particular countries common in such journals as West European Politics, Government and Opposition, or Parliamentary Affairs.

Therefore during the last decade the methodological rift between European and American

political science, always strong, may have grown stronger. A glance through current issues of both journals shows how far we are literally speaking a different language, which reflects alternative assumptions about the nature of political science. The danger is also that, like the discipline of economics, American political science may have become more technically sophisticated but as a result unintelligible to a wider public readership. In terms of cosmopolitanism, this suggests that in recent decades, far from moving together, American and European political science have become more divergent in their methodological approaches.

### **The Agenda of Political Science**

The 'agenda' of the discipline refers to the substantive concerns which drive our research programmes. Like the agenda-setting process in public policy, certain topics are regarded as important in political science, therefore worthy of funding and publication, while others are downplayed. The agenda may arise from political development, such as the rise of social movements in the 1960s, the fragmentation of party systems in the 1970s, or the explosion of democratic states in the late 1980s. The growth of sub-fields may also be spurred by intellectual fashions, like post-modernism or feminism.

Localism can be expected to produce distinctive agendas for political science in different countries and regions. For example, colleagues from the United States working on British politics often bring concerns, such as a focus on the politics of race, constituency casework, or MPs roles, which are driven primarily by the dominant agenda in American, not British, political science. In the same way, European colleagues may work on American politics to understand class cleavages in voting behaviour, party organisations, or party platforms, which reflect the mainstream European agenda. In other words, we travel, in comparative political science, but like package holiday makers, we bring out intellectual bag and baggage with us. Americans looking at Britain, and Britons looking at America, are not the same as Americans looking at America, or Britons looking at Britain. What is prosaic and familiar for one, strikes the other as novel and interesting. From de Tocqueville onwards, some of the most acute observers may be outsiders. This agenda conflict may bring a fresh perspective to understanding the politics of the country we are studying, but it may also reduce the impact of such work within that country. In contrast to localism, cosmopolitanism should result in the growth of a shared agenda across different national communities of political science.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

To analyse these patterns the primary subject of journal articles was classified into fifteen main categories (see Table 2). The results show that most articles in the EJPR focussed on four main subjects: party systems and organisations, elections and voting behaviour, public policy, and public opinion. In sharp contrast there were almost no articles in this sample covering judicial politics, federal and local government, international relation, or normative theory. The APSR shared a focus on mass behaviour, including elections and public opinion. Nevertheless, perhaps reflecting the American political system, this journal gave more emphasis to legislatures, the judiciary, and international relations, and far less to party systems. Lastly Political Studies focussed on normative theory, and to a lesser extent, public policy. There are therefore regional differences in the agenda of political science, which suggests that the contrasts penetrate what we talk about, as well as how we talk about it, and to whom.

### **The Internationalisation of Publications?**

A more cosmopolitan political science should encourage colleagues to publish in a wide range of professional journals of high status, irrespective of their regional origins. If we analyse the provenance of articles, defined by the listed institutional location of the first author, this reveals a striking pattern (see Table 3). All these journals publish mainly from members within their own region. But evidence for a more international profession can be found in the EJPR and Political Studies. In recent decades Americans have been publishing in growing numbers in the EJPR and Political Studies, so that today more than a fifth of all articles in these journals come from this region, and Political Studies has also seen a rise in contributions from other parts of the world.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Nevertheless the American Political Science Review has resisted the trend towards

internationalisation. The APSR draws almost exclusively (94-97 percent) on articles written by colleagues based in universities in the United States or Canada. The APSR represents the main forum where American political scientists are speaking to each other, but not where the world speaks to American political science. Colleagues in Iowa, Ohio or Illinois, who depended for their information about political science on the main journal of their profession, could be forgiven for thinking that there was no other political science than American. Like popular culture, America exports political science but it is usually a one-way traffic.

This process can be understood as similar to the flow of international news (Mowlana 1985). In these models, the large 'producer countries' control resources which allow the transmission of information (the predominant language for scientific discourse, the sheer size of the profession, as well as control of many research foundations and journals for political science). The 'center' countries publish their literature which reaches the periphery, (and indeed, like the work on democratisation in Eastern and Central Europe, may be about the periphery countries), but there is little flow of publications from the periphery back towards the center. Just as the developing world is exploited for raw materials like copper or oil, so peripheral regions provide political science with raw 'data' which is then manufactured into research products (articles) which are reexported. There need not be a single center: just as Americans export to European journals, so Britain (one of the larger communities of political science in Europe) may export its literature to the smaller Scandinavian and Benelux countries, but there is not a reciprocal interchange of political science. Colleagues in Norway, Ireland or Belgium may be expected to know something about American politics: colleagues in the United States may not be expected to know much about the politics of Norway, Ireland or Belgium.

The pattern of American contributors dominating US journals could be mitigated if we consider all the collaborators on an article. As noted by Miller et. al. (1996) there has been a substantial rise in the proportion of jointly authored articles in the APSR. If international networks of scholars are developing we would expect a growth in cross-national teams of authors. As shown in Table 4, the proportion of collaborative articles has more than doubled in recent decades in both the EJPR and the APSR. Professionalisation may have encouraged a pooling of complex data sets, expertise, and technical skills which results in more joint publications. Only Political Studies has resisted this trend so far.

[TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

Nevertheless if we analyse the basis for this collaboration, the overwhelming pattern is for colleagues to work together with others in their own region, and usually within their own country. Out of almost six hundred articles, there were only a handful involving trans-Atlantic collaboration. The potential for global communications and professional networks should facilitate this process, but in practice collaboration across national communities of political scientists remains surprisingly rare.

### **The Growth of Comparative Politics?**

Journals proved less parochial in term of the geographical coverage provided by articles, but still each publication bears a strong regional imprint (see Table 5). Articles were classified according to the national subject focus of their research. 'International' articles spanned different regions as they focussed on issues like civil wars, regime change in emerging democracies, or economic performance in advanced industrialised democracies. 'Landless' articles included normative and positive theories, which did not contain any sustained or systematic national coverage, except perhaps for a few passing examples.

Based on this classification, in the APSR about 47 percent of articles focussed on North America, 7 percent analysed European states, 5 percent covered countries in another region, 9 percent were international, and 30 percent were landless. There were almost no 'area studies' articles focussing in depth on the politics of one other country. In the EJPR about 60 percent of articles focussed on Western Europe, 3 percent covered North America, 4 percent covered another region, 21 percent were international, and only 11 percent were landless. Political Studies included the largest proportion of 'landless' articles (due to the predominance of normative political theory), and many of the rest were about Western Europe. Therefore readers of the APSR would learn little about Europe, while readers of the EJPR would learn even less about the United States. Of course this may not matter, in

the sense that those interested in particular regions can easily pick up the expansive and expanding literature which is available. But patterns of familiarity with journals, already mentioned, show that the national provenance of publications was a significant predictor of readership (Crewe and Norris 1991, Norris and Crewe 1993, Giles, Mizell and Patterson 1989). This suggests that despite all the trends discussed earlier facilitating the growth of a more cosmopolitan political science, many of us remain locked within the familiar culture of communities of national political scientists.

[TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]

### **Conclusions**

In the post-war decade European-American connections in the Western Alliance seemed to extend to political science. Some of these links continue: probably most European politics undergraduates encounter American politics as part of their course-work. Standard American courses in comparative politics usually include European politics, at least some of the 'big four', as part of the curriculum. Transatlantic colleagues maintain regular contacts and collaboration. Above all, the sheer size of the output from America, produced by more than 20,000 political scientists, ensures its continued influence on the European literature.

Nevertheless, despite easier communication, and cultural connections, political scientists in United States and Europe seem no closer today, and perhaps even methodologically further apart. Multilateral links may have strengthened within Europe, but even here it is more common for colleagues to come to meetings of the ECPR to talk about the politics of their own country, -- the decline of class voting in Sweden, changes in Austrian corporatism, or the growth of the extreme right parties in France -- than it is to present the results of comparative research. For those who regard localism as a way of encouraging theoretical pluralism and cultural diversity, this may be regarded as healthy. For Tip O'Neil, all politics is local. Perhaps inevitably, so is political science. But for those who believe that a more cosmopolitan political science will lead to greater intellectual enrichment, stronger general theories, and more international interchange within the discipline, the results are discouraging. We have easier means to communicate, for sure, but whether we can actually surmount and breakdown the boundaries of national political science remains under doubt.

Table 1

**Methodology**

```

=====
                EJPR                APSR                PolStud
                -----                -----                -----
                1970s 1980s 1990s  1970s1980s1990s  1970s1980s1990s
=====
Descriptive/institutional  39   45   44     9   9   5     44  34  37
Behavioural/empirical     50   49   50     56  58  46     17  22   6
Philosophical/conceptual   6           2     18  17  19     39  34  52
Rational Choice/Deductive  6    6    4     17  16  30      0   8   6

                100  100  100     100 100 100     100 100 100
=====

```

Source: Content Analysis of articles in the European Journal of Political Research, Political Studies, American Political Science Review. N. 587.

Table 2

**Primary Subject of Articles (%)**

	EJPR	APSR	PolSt
Party Systems and Organisations	22	5	8
Elections and Voting Behaviour	21	17	9
Public Policy	16	8	13
Public Opinion and Attitudes	11	16	4
Methodology	6	3	5
Legislatures	5	10	1
Political Economy	4	4	4
Interest Groups and Social Movements	4	2	4
Democracy/development	3	3	2
Executives and Bureaucracy	2	3	1
Political Elites	2	1	1
Normative Theory	1	16	35
International Relations	1	6	7
Federal/Local Government	1	1	3
Courts, judiciary, constitution	1	5	2
	100	100	100

Source: See Table 1.

Table 3

**Institutional Location of First Author (%)**

```

=====
                EJPR                APSR                PolStud
            -----            -----            -----
            1970s 1980s 1990s  1970s1980s1990s  1970s1980s1990s
=====
North America          6   13   20      96  94  97      19  20  26
Western Europe        94   83   76       2   2   2      72  74  59
Rest of the World     0    4    4       2   4   1       8   7  15

                100  100  100      100 100 100      100 100 100
=====

```

Source: See Table 1

Table 4

**Number of Co-Authors**

```

=====
                EJPR                APSR                PolStud
            -----            -----            -----
            1970s 1980s 1990s  1970s1980s1990s  1970s1980s1990s
=====
One                86    72    61        78   72   54        81   90   91
Two                14    22    35        22   25   28        17   11   7
Three or More      0     5     4           3   19           3     2

                100   100   100        100 100 100        100 100 100
=====

```

Source: See Table 1.

Table 5

**Geographic Coverage of Articles (%)**

	EJPR	APSR	PolSt	All
North America	3	47	4	25
Western Europe	60	7	34	27
Central and Eastern Europe	1	1	2	1
Asia and Pacific	0	2	3	2
Central and South America	2	1	1	1
Africa	1	1	1	1
Middle East	0	1	1	1
International/More than One Region	21	9	9	12
None	11	30	46	31
	100	100	100	100

Source: See Table 1.

## Notes

- Almond, G. A. (1990). A Discipline Divided: Schools and Sects in Political Science. London: Sage.
- Almond, G. A. and G. Bingham Powell, Jr. (1992). Comparative Politics Today. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- APSA. 1950. Committee on Political Parties. 'Towards a More Responsible Two-Party System'. American Political Science Review. September, supplement.
- Bingham Powell, G. (1995) 'Report of the Managing Editor of the American Political Science Review, 1994-95' PS: Political Science and Politics 28(4):764-768.
- Brintnall, M. (1996). 'Job Prospects for Political Scientists: Placement Experience in 1995' PS: Political Science & Politics. June 29(2): 211-215.
- Brunn, S. and Leinbach, T.R. (eds). (1991). Collapsing Space and Time: Geographic Aspects of Communication & Information. London: HarperCollins Academic.
- Campbell, C. (1993). 'Political Executives and their Officials' in A. W. Finifter Political Science: The State of the Discipline II. Washington, DC: APSA.
- Crewe, I. and Norris, P. (1991). 'British and American Journal Evaluation: Divergence or Convergence' PS: Political Science and Politics XXIV (3) September: 524-531.
- Dogan, M. and Pelassy, D. (1990). How to Compare Nations Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- EJPR. 1991. 'Political Science in Western Europe' European Journal of Political Research 20.
- Far, J., Dryzek J.S., and Leonard, S.T. (eds). (1995). Political Science in History. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Featherstone, M. (ed). (1995). Global Culture. London: Sage.
- Giles, M.W., Mizell, F. and Patterson, D. (1989). 'Political Scientists' Journal Evaluations Revisited' PS: Political Science and Politics 22: 613-617.
- ISSJ. (1973). 'Autobiographical Portraits' International Social Science Journal 25 (1/2).
- Janda, K. (1993) 'Comparative Political Parties: Research and Theory' in A. W. Finifter Political Science: The State of the Discipline II. Washington, DC: APSA.
- LaPonce, J.A. (1980) 'An Import-Export Analysis of Journals and Footnotes' Political Studies 28: 401-419.
- Leduc, L., Niemi, R. and Norris, P. (1996). Comparing Democracies: Voting and Elections in Comparative Perspective CA: Sage.
- Lijphart, A. (1984) Democracies: Patterns of Majoritarian and Consensus Government in Twenty-One

- Countries. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lijphart, A. (ed) (1992). Parliamentary versus Presidential Government. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, D. (1988). 'Why is there a European Political Science?'. PS:Political Science and Politics, XXI, Fall: 1051-56.
- McKay, D. (1991). 'Is European political science inferior to or different from American political science?' European Journal of Political Research 20: 459-466.
- Mezey, M. (1993). 'Legislatures: Individual Purpose and Institutional Performance' in A. W.Finifter Political Science: The State of the Discipline II. Washington, DC: APSA.
- Miller, A., Tien, C. and Peebler, A.A. (1996). 'The American Political Science Review Hall of Fame Assessments and Implications for a Evolving Discipline' P.S.: Political Science and Politics March pp.73-83.
- Mowlana, H. (1985). International Flows of Information: A Global Report and Analysis. Paris: UNESCO.
- Newton, K. and Valles, J.M. (1991). 'Introduction: Political Science in Western Europe' European Journal of Political Research 20: 227-238.
- Newton, K. (1991). 'The European Consortium for Political Research' European Journal for Political Research 20: 445-458.
- Norris, P. and Crewe, I. (1993). 'The Reputation of Political Science Journals: Pluralist and Consensus Views' Political Studies XLI (1). March: 5-23.
- Norris, P. (1994). 'Political Science in Britain and America: The Decline of the Special Relationship?' PSA News Autumn pp.15-17.
- Norris, P. (1990). 'Survey of Political Studies' PSA News 2:2 Winter pp.29-31
- Ricci, D. M. (1994). The Tragedy of Political Science. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rogowski, R. (1993) 'Comparative Politics' in A. W.Finifter Political Science: The State of the Discipline II. Washington, DC: APSA.
- Rose, R. (1990). 'Institutionalising Professional Political Science in Europe: A Dynamic Model' European Journal of Political Research 18: 581-603.
- Rose, R. (1991). 'Comparing Forms of Comparative Analysis' Political Studies 34(3): 446-462.
- Seidelman, R. (1985). Disenchanted Realists: Political Science and the American Crisis, 1884-1984. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Swanson, D. and Mancini, P. (1996). Politics, Media and Modern Democracy New York: Praeger.

Trent, J. (1979). 'Political Science beyond Political Boundaries: the International Institutional Development' in Stein Rokkan (ed). A Quarter Century of International Political Science. New Delhi: Concept Publishing, 180-199.

Wilson, F. L. (1995). 'Teaching Comparative Politics in the 1990s' PS: Political Science and Politics March 28(1), 79-80.

[6600 words]