

In-And-Outers and Moonlighters: A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation of the Impact of Policymaking Exposure on IR Scholarship

Bradley C. Parks
Department of International Relations
London School of Economics and Political Science
b.c.parks@lse.ac.uk

Alena Stern
The College of William and Mary
amstern01@email.wm.edu

March 13, 2011

Some international relations (IR) scholars lament the divide that exists between the academic community and the policy community. Others celebrate it. In this paper, we test a core proposition advanced by advocates of bridging the policy-academy divide: that direct engagement in the policymaking process will make international relations scholars more adept at designing, undertaking, and communicating research in ways that are useful and relevant to policymakers. Using a quasi-experimental estimation strategy, we evaluate whether and to what extent direct exposure to the policymaking process influences how IR scholars select publication outlets. We define and evaluate policymaking exposure in two ways: periods of public service in which faculty members temporarily vacate their university positions to work for governments or inter-governmental organizations; and instances in which faculty members undertake substantial consulting assignments for government agencies and inter-governmental organizations. Our findings suggest that "in-and-outers"—faculty members who temporarily leave the ivory tower to accept policy positions—return to the academy with new perspectives and publication priorities. By contrast, we find no policymaking exposure effect among "moonlighters." Our results suggest that IR scholars are no more likely to publish in policy journals after doing part-time consulting work for governments and IOs.

Paper presented at the 2011 Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) Workshop and the International Studies Association Convention in Montreal, Québec.

* The authors owe a debt of gratitude to Justin Anderson, James Page, James O'Leary, Lauren Hoy, Kate McGinnis, Emily Wilson, Steven Linett, Will Brannon, Mark Jordan, and Lindsay Hundley for their excellent research assistance. We would also like to thank Rich Nielsen for his constructive suggestions on the methodological section of this paper. All errors in this paper are solely the responsibility of the authors.

Introduction

In the spring of 2009, Joseph Nye published an op-ed in *The Washington Post* entitled "Scholars on the Sidelines," which criticized international relations (IR) scholars for their growing insularity and irrelevance to policymakers (Nye 2009a). Noting that "[professional] advancement comes faster for those who develop mathematical models, new methodologies or theories expressed in jargon that is unintelligible to policymakers," he called for a full-fledged effort to alter the professional norms of the discipline. Nye also issued a rallying cry for IR scholars to become more directly engaged in the policymaking process. The article sparked a heated debate—in email exchanges, private conversations, weblogs, and professional journals—among members of the discipline. Scholars expressed strong and diverse opinions about both the causes and consequences of the policy-academy divide, with different factions lining up in opposition to and in support of Nye.¹ Daniel Drezner (2009a) noted on his *Foreign Policy* blog that "Joe Nye has clearly touched a nerve."

This recent flash point highlights the uneasy relationship that has long existed between IR scholars and policymakers. Paul Nitze (1993: 3), co-founder of the Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), argued nearly twenty years ago that most IR research in the post-World War II era was "of limited value, if not counterproductive, as a guide to the actual conduct of policy." David Newsom, a seasoned State Department diplomat who later served as Director of Georgetown University's Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, echoed this view several years later, noting that "much of today's [IR] scholarship is either irrelevant or inaccessible to policymakers" (Newsom 1995/6: 62).²

By most accounts, the gap between scholars and policymakers has shown few signs of narrowing. In a review of a recent survey of 2,724 IR scholars, Peterson et al. (2009: 84) concluded that "the walls surrounding the ivory tower have never seemed so high." And many IR scholars seem perfectly content to maintain an arm's-length relationship with policymakers. Common pitfalls associated with efforts to cross the policy-academy chasm include: a loss of intellectual integrity; politicization of the discipline; habits of quiet contemplation, patient labor, and scientific rigor being replaced with the quest for short-term policy relevance; and mid-range theories and regional (or issue-specific) expertise crowding out more abstract, parsimonious, and generalizable approaches to international relations (George 1993; Stein 2000; Jentleson 2002;

¹ For example, Vreeland and Desai (2009) take issue with Nye's assertion that IR scholars are out of touch with the needs of real-world decision-makers, arguing that "[methodological] rigor ... has allowed modern political science to improve its forecasting power—something that is presumably vital to policymaking" and that "governmental agencies need to focus some effort on recruiting individuals who have the background and skills needed to apply modern political science to their daily work." For other responses to Nye's Washington Post op-ed, see Walt (2009), Carpenter (2009), Jones (2009), Mahnken (2010), and Murray (2010). Nye later noted on *The Huffington Post* website that "I received more positive responses to this op-ed than almost any I have written."

² Newsome elaborates on this point, explaining that IR scholars "appear caught up in an elite culture in which labels, categories, and even the humor have meaning for 'members only.' Their writings are filled with references to other scholars' writing; they speak to each other rather than to a wider public" (Newsom 1995/6: 62).

Keohane 2009). Additionally, IR scholars receive little or no professional credit for publications in policy journals, such as *Foreign Affairs* and *Foreign Policy*, and this incentive structure yields predictable results: members of the discipline spend the vast majority of their time conducting research and writing for audiences that value theoretical novelty, methodological innovation, and empirical rigor. Policy relevance is at best a secondary consideration and at worst a distraction or mark of second rate scholarship (Krasner 2009; Jentleson and Ratner forthcoming). Walt (2009) speaks of a "cult of [policy] irrelevance" within the professional IR discipline.³

Of course, policymakers are hardly clamoring to seek counsel from IR scholars. In a book entitled *Blind Oracles*, Bruce Kuklick (2007) examines the relationship between scholarly ideas and policymaking during the Cold War and concludes that intellectuals exerted very limited influence on major U.S. foreign policy decisions.⁴ He argues that, even in those rare historical cases where the ideas of an intellectual appear to have directly influenced policy, a closer analysis often reveals that these ideas were simply used to provide legitimacy for policy decisions based on political considerations.⁵ And contemporary IR scholars seem to have few illusions about their level of policy influence. The 2008 TRIP survey reveals that only 1% of IR faculty members believe that policymakers will accept their advice "when a broad consensus on a foreign policy issue exists" within the discipline (Jordan et al. 2009). Farrell and Finnemore (2009: 67) note that "[w]hen practitioners want academics' advice on how to reform, for example, the International Monetary Fund or the Appellate Body of the WTO, they typically turn to economists or legal scholars rather than to scholars of international political economy." A failed attempt in 2004 to "speak with one voice" to U.S. policymakers on the folly of concentrating scarce resources in Iraq seems to have also reinforced a collective sense of policy impotence among IR scholars (Jackson and Kaufman 2007).

³ This may be a consequence of the discipline's largely positivist epistemological orientation (Cohen 2010). Sigelman (2006) reports that, whereas 10-20% of the articles published in the *American Political Science Review* (APSR) prior to 1947 dealt with policy criticism or prescription, less than half of one percent of the articles published in APSR between 1967 and 2006 included any form of policy criticism or prescription. Somit and Tanenhaus (1967: 5) detected the early signs of this trend, noting that "a sizable segment of the [American political science] profession [has begun to] seriously ... reflect on the possible incompatibility between the scientific pursuit of knowledge and participation in programmatic and applied policy undertakings."

⁴ If U.S. IR scholars have had limited influence on U.S. foreign policy, the influence of non-U.S. IR scholars has been even weaker. According 2008 TRIP survey, the ten IR scholars who have had the greatest influence U.S. foreign policy over the last twenty years are all Americans (Jordan et al. 2009)

⁵ In fairness, there are some policymakers who are interested in leveraging the wisdom of IR scholars. U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates announced in 2008 that the U.S. Defense Department would provide substantial new funding for social science research and called upon the U.S. government to "again embrace eggheads and ideas." (Gates 2008). Michael McFaul, a former Professor of Political Science at Stanford University who is currently serving as Director for Russia and Eurasian Affairs at the U.S. National Security Council, has also informally convened a group of academics to help the Obama administration better understand the implications of the popular revolutions currently underway in the Middle East and North Africa (Wilson 2011).

Despite these obstacles, IR scholars continue to traverse the academy-policy divide in non-trivial numbers. 6 of the 25 IR scholars who are believed to "have had the greatest influence on the field of IR in the past 20 years" have temporarily vacated their university positions to work for governments or international organizations: Stephen Krasner, Joseph Nye, Michael Doyle, John Ikenberry, Samuel Huntington, and John Ruggie (Jordan et al. 2009).⁶ Of the 445 scholars who published at least 2 articles in the discipline's 12 leading journals between 1980 and 2008, we found that 65 (15%) of them had at some point temporarily interrupted their scholarly careers to accept full-time positions with governments or international organizations.⁷ The 2008 TRIP survey reveals that 23% of IR scholars have worked as paid consultants for their own governments, while 28% have served as unpaid consultants to their governments. Many more IR scholars have worked in some capacity for inter-governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, think tanks, interest groups, or private firms (Jordan et al. 2009).

Notwithstanding these efforts to bridge the divide, direct engagement with policymakers remains controversial. Indeed, an examination of published statements by leading IR scholars suggests that a fault line runs right through the middle of the profession. While there are those who believe attempts should be made to bridge the policy-academy divide, others remain wary—or even disdainful—of efforts to engage real-world decision-makers. We refer to these groups as the "bridge the gap" camp and "mind the gap" camp, respectively. The 2008 TRIP survey suggests that these groups are almost evenly split in terms of numbers. 49% of respondents believe that IR scholars should contribute to the policy-making process as either formal participants or informal advisers (Jordan et al. 2009: 60). 43% of respondents reported that they themselves had recently worked in a paid capacity for a government, international organization, non-governmental organization, think tank, interest group or private sector outfit.⁸ Maliniak et al. (forthcoming) summarize these results, noting that "IR scholars appear conflicted about the link between their work and the policy arena."

Our own experience is consistent with these top line TRIP survey findings. During the primary data collection phase of this research project (described at greater length below), we corresponded with hundreds of leading IR scholars via email and telephone and were struck by the fact that a brief and rather bland description of our research objectives seemed to elicit exceptionally strong and diverse reactions. There was clearly a desire among many leading IR scholars to discuss and debate the causes and consequences of the policy-academy divide, if not

⁶ If one broadens the definition of policymaking experience to include substantial consulting assignments, at least 11 of the 25 most influential IR scholars have ventured across the academy-policy divide. Scholars included in this additional category include Robert Jervis, Kenneth Waltz, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce Russett, and Hans Morgenthau. Robert Cox, who is also on the list of the 25 most influential IR scholars, worked at the ILO for twenty five years as Director General and Chief of the International Labor Organization's Program and Planning Division. However, this period of participation in the policymaking process preceded his entry into the academy.

⁷ For the purposes of this paper, we employ the TRIP definition of the discipline's "12 leading journals." See pg. 13 for details.

⁸ 49% said they had worked in an unpaid capacity for one of these groups.

to participate in some sort of cathartic exercise. Some individuals conveyed, in no uncertain terms, that sustained policy engagement had substantially diminished their prospects for tenure and promotion and limited their professional success in the academy. Others took issue with our definition of exposure to the policymaking process, noting that IR scholars can influence or be influenced by the policymaking process in a variety of indirect, but nevertheless significant ways.⁹ Still others expressed a strong preference for total isolation from policymakers. In short, we were left with the impression that the field remains quite divided on (a) whether the policy-academy gap is a problem, and (b) how, if at all, it should be addressed.

The remainder of this paper is organized into four sections. Section 1 provides a brief summary of the views held by members of the "bridge the gap" and "mind the gap" camps. In Section 2, we introduce our empirical puzzle: whether and to what degree direct engagement in the policymaking process improves the ability of IR scholars to design, undertake, and communicate research that is useful and relevant to the policy community. Section 3 summarizes our methods and findings. Finally, Section 4 concludes with a discussion of the limitations of our study and potential avenues for future research.

Section 1: Gap-Bridgers and Gap-Minders

A large and distinguished group of IR scholars bemoans the divide that exists between the academic community and the policy community. Joseph Nye is probably the most visible and vocal proponent of efforts to bridge the gap between IR scholars and policymakers. He argues that so-called "in-and-outers"—scholars who temporarily vacate the ivory tower to accept policy positions—provide "one of the most effective transmission belts for ideas to travel from the academy to government" (Nye 2008: 600). He also suggests that direct participation in the policymaking process can yield significant intellectual benefits for individual scholars and the IR discipline as a whole. Reflecting on his own experience, Nye (2008: 600) explains that "my writing and teaching were enriched rather than diminished when I returned to the university. I had a better sense of the relationship between theory and the real world than some others." Other members of "bridge the gap" camp include George (1993, 1997), Zelikow (1994), Betts (1997), Leggold and Ninic (2001), Jentleson (2002), Putnam (2003), Walt (2005), Shapiro (2005), Goldman (2006), Vogel (2006), Wilson (2007), Desch (2009), Mahnken (2010), and Jentleson and Ratner (forthcoming).

According to Krasner (2008: 6), members of the "bridge the gap" camp advance two core propositions: that "the academy would be able to contribute more to policy if academic research were more focused on the needs of policymakers; and research would be more focused on the needs of policymakers if the reward structure within the academy were changed." Stephen Walt identifies himself as a gap-bridger and advocates for "a conscious effort to alter the prevailing norms of the discipline" (Walt 2005: 41). He is not alone. Nye (2009), Drezner (2009), and

⁹ A small, but substantial, minority of scholars indicated that our focus on "in-and-outers" and "moonlighters" was appropriate and would likely yield interesting and valuable results. However, several scholars cautioned that many academics would likely systematically underreport or misrepresent their actual levels of policy engagement.

Jentleson and Ratner (forthcoming) argue that journal editors and peer reviewers should make policy relevance a more central consideration in publication decisions; academic departments should account for the policy relevance and policy impact of research when making hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions; faculty members should be encouraged to engage policymakers or even participate in the policymaking process themselves; and concrete steps should be taken to make it easier for policymakers to access IR research with minimal jargon, math, or methodological detail.¹⁰

An opposing school of thought proposes that IR scholars would probably serve themselves—and their countries—better by getting out of the way and letting policy professionals solve real-world problems (Bull 1959; Keohane 2009; Krasner 2009; Gartzke 2011; Hurrell forthcoming).¹¹ A common departure point for members of the "mind the gap" camp is that scholars and policymakers possess a different set of skills, which render most "crossover" attempts unsuccessful. Effective policymakers are trained and socialized to take consequential decisions with limited time and information (Nye 2009; Vogel 2006). They seamlessly combine causal and normative arguments (Keohane 2009). They rely on emotional intelligence to manage and motivate large teams with diverse interests (Greenstein 2000). They know when to compromise, not letting the perfect be the enemy of the good. But they also know when and how to protect organizational equities, manage turf battles, and outsmart intransigent bureaucratic actors (Haas 1999).

IR scholars generally lack most of these skills. They spend a significant amount of time reading, quietly contemplating, and writing. They rarely make time-sensitive decisions with far-reaching consequences. They tend to work poorly in team settings and possess low levels of emotional intelligence.¹² They are often heavily invested in particular ideas, making compromise difficult. Additionally, whereas policy practitioners knit together causal and normative arguments, IR scholars "tend to compartmentalize ethical [issues] from empirical issues" (Keohane 2009: 125-126).

¹⁰ Walt (2005) argues that IR and political science departments should follow the lead of Harvard's Kennedy School of Government and "stop the tenure clock" for junior members of the faculty who temporarily accept policymaking assignments. We sense little appetite for this type of change within most political science and international relations departments, but there are certainly pockets of support within the academy for allowing scholars to engage policymakers in a more substantial way. In June 2011, Duke University, George Washington University, and the University of California at Berkeley will launch "an International Policy Summer Institute geared to post-docs and junior faculty interested in learning further about major foreign policy issues, the U.S. policy process, policy relevant research methodologies, policy briefing strategies, media training and other skills to enhance engagement with the policy community" (Jentleson and Ratner forthcoming).

¹¹ Stanley Hoffman is also an unashamed member of this camp. In a recent interview with *Harvard Magazine*, he explained that "[w]hen I'm in Washington, I want to take the next plane out of there.... People who come back from this Washington world take a good time to become normal again. I study power so as to understand the enemy, not so as better to be able to exert it" (Lambert 2007).

¹² Krasner (2009: 115) makes this same point somewhat indelicately, noting that "misanthropes can thrive in a university setting."

Given these differences, members of the "mind the gap" school generally believe in a rigor-relevance tradeoff and argue that IR scholars who dabble in policy-making should not expect to enjoy great success as practitioners (Krasner 2009). Keohane (2009: 126) goes even further, arguing that scholars-cum-policymakers run a significant risk of becoming less effective scholars when they return to the academy: "The academic's scholarship may suffer simply as a result of competing demands on his or her time, even after returning to academia. Creative scholarship cannot be done in little bits of time, here or there, while spending most of one's time on other issues. The creative scholar needs to be entirely bound up in solving their intellectual problem, not pondering how to network effectively at their political party's national convention or what op-ed to write on a topic that will bring them to the attention of influential leaders." Gartzke (2011), Stein (2009), and Hill (1994) make a related, but separate, point. They argue that scholars who seriously engage in policymaking run the risk of being intellectually co-opted or even corrupted.¹³ Similar arguments have been made since the early days of IR as a scholarly discipline. Hedley Bull argued in the 1950s that "it is ... this prostitution of academic inquiry to practical ends that is the foremost obstacle to the development of a science of politics" (Bull 1959: 587).

Significantly, membership in the "mind the gap" camp is not limited to IR scholars who lack experience in the policy world. Krasner (2009: 116) emphasizes that his periods of public service—at the State Department's Office of Policy Planning and the National Security Council—"only reinforced my conviction that the 'gap' between academia and the policy world is unbridgeable." Janice Gross Stein (2009), a longstanding member of the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade's Middle East Working Group, has warned IR scholars who value policy relevance of the dangers of hubris and false confidence.

Section 2: The Empirical Puzzle

Rather than directly engaging in any of these normative debates between the gap-bridgers and gap-minders, our objective in this paper is to evaluate an empirical question regarding the causes and consequences of the policy-academy divide. Advocates of bridging the policy-academy divide often argue that direct engagement in the policymaking process will make IR scholars more adept at designing, undertaking, and communicating research that is useful and relevant to policymakers. Our goal is to determine whether this assertion is true.

¹³ Keohane (2009: 127) makes no attempt to suppress his disdain for such individuals: "At this point, the academic has become the political equivalent of a prostitute and should lose all status and respect in the university." Successful co-option, of course, does not require that the individual who is being co-opted willingly relinquish his or her independence. For example, Lawrence Freedman, a Professor of War Studies at King's College in London, is widely credited with drafting key sections of a speech in which Tony Blair made the case for military intervention in countries ruled by dictators, such as Saddam Hussein and Slobodan Milosevic (Daddow 2009; Hines 2010). Critics have charged that British government officials used Freedman's intellectual credibility to justify its policy direction; however, no one to our knowledge has accused Freedman of developing intellectual arguments in order to support his government's policy agenda.

Nye (1998) refers to the value of "moving back and forth between thought and action and letting each fertilize the other." Betts (1997) and Walt (2005) make very similar exhortations for "cross-fertilization." But it is often difficult to discern how precisely gap-bridgers believe that policymaking experience influences scholarship.¹⁴ Daniel Drezner, (2007: xii), who worked in the U.S. Treasury's Office of International Banking and Securities Markets in 2000-2001, is perhaps an exception to the rule. He acknowledges in the preface of *All Politics is Global* that direct participation in the policymaking process influenced his theoretical perspective. In particular, he notes that he re-entered the academy with a new appreciation for the role that great power governments play in creating and policing global regulatory regimes.¹⁵ Nye (2008) more obliquely suggests that his period of public service led him to focus more on ethical and normative issues.¹⁶ Therefore, based on individual anecdotes and general intuition, we might expect direct exposure to the policymaking process to affect an IR scholar's theoretical approach, normative orientation, and/or methodological priorities.¹⁷

As we indicated earlier, our goal is to determine whether policymaking experience causes academics to devote more of their intellectual time and energy to preparing and publishing articles for journals widely read by policymakers. We believe that evidence of such an effect would constitute a rather demanding test, as IR scholars face exceptionally strong professional incentives not to publish in such journals. Jentleson and Ratner (forthcoming 2011) note that "[e]ven after tenure and over the course of academic careers, disciplinary incentives for policy engagement are limited." Krasner (2008: 5) makes the same point in stronger and more explicit terms: "Political science places little value on policy oriented work. An article in a refereed

¹⁴ For example, Lawrence Summers (2007: xxii), who is not an IR scholar but has crossed the policy-academy divide several times, has said that participation in the Kyoto Protocol negotiations as a policymaker "broadened my perspective beyond the economist's narrower view that I have previously taken."

¹⁵ Drezner's period of service at the U.S. Treasury also appears to have had some impact on his subsequent methodological choices. In *All Politics is Global*, he uses interview data and primary and secondary source materials from his U.S. Treasury "fieldwork" in order to explain how powerful states create and enforce global regulatory regimes (Drezner 2007).

¹⁶ He writes that "when dealing with nuclear nonproliferation in the Carter Administration, I had no time to explore the broad ethical issues when foreign officials would ask why it was all right for the United States to have nuclear weapons while trying to prevent them from obtaining the bomb. When I returned to the university, I used the lack of pressure on time and politics to teach a course and then write a book on Nuclear Ethics. And after I returned from the Pentagon and my work on East Asia in the Clinton Administration, I turned my attention to a book about the future distribution of power in *The Paradox of American Power*. For better or worse, both works were heavily influenced by my experience in government" (Nye 2008: 601).

¹⁷ In the interest of full disclosure, one of the authors of this paper (Parks) worked in the Office of Development Policy at the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) from 2005 to 2010. His experience also had a substantial impact on his subsequent theoretical and methodological priorities. Since returning to the academy, he has devoted more time to elite survey research, causal process-tracing, and issues of data quality and measurement. He has also self-consciously engaged theoretical approaches that better account for the outsized agency of individual policymakers, which he witnessed firsthand during his period of public service.

journal counts for a lot; an article in *Foreign Affairs* counts for little. New Ph.D.'s are hired entirely on the basis of their scholarly work; policy related writing or service in government counts for nothing."

Section 3: Methods and Findings

Defining and Measuring the Treatment Variable

In order to assess whether, to what degree, and how policymaking exposure influences IR scholarship, one must first define "policymaking exposure." Scholars can participate in the policymaking process in a variety of ways: serving on policy advisory boards or government taskforces; informally advising executive branch officials or legislators; consulting for governments or international organizations; or perhaps even working in a full-time capacity for a government or international organization.

Nye and Walt assert that so-called "in-and-outers" are an increasingly rare breed in the United States. However, our own empirical research suggests that these crossover attempts may be a bit more common than they assume. The current Director of the U.S. State Department's Policy Planning Staff is Anne-Marie Slaughter, a distinguished scholar of international relations. Stephen Krasner also served as the State Department's Director of Policy Planning (2005-2007) after completing a short stint at the National Security Council. Robert H. Johnson (1951-1962), Richard Feinberg (1977-1980), Francis Fukuyama (1981-1982, 1989), Richard Herrmann (1988-1990), John Ikenberry (1991-1992), Bruce Jentleson (1993-4, 2009-2011), Gideon Rose (1994-1995), Charles Stevenson (1999-2000), and Richard Ullman (1999-2000) have also occupied staff positions in the Policy Planning Office.¹⁸ In the late 1980s and early 1990s, Michael Mastanduno and Joseph Grieco served in the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR): Mastanduno as a Special Assistant for Europe and Japan and Grieco as an International Affairs Fellow.

The National Security Council and the Department of Defense are also popular destinations for IR scholars seeking policy influence. Charles Hermann (1969-1970), Richard Betts (1977), Samuel Huntington (1977-1978), David Shambaugh (1977-1978), F. Stephen Larrabee (1978-1981), Phillip Zelikow (1989-1991), Amy Zegart (1993), Charles Kupchan (1993-1994), Peter Feaver (1993-1994, 2005-2007), James Goldgeier (1995-1996), James Lindsay (1996-1997), Robert Uriu (1996-1997), Kenneth Lieberthal (1998-2000), Victor Cha (2004-2007), Mary Habeck (2008-2009), Jeremy Weinstein (2009-present), and Michael McFaul (2009-present) all held—or currently hold—staff positions at the U.S. National Security Council. Numbered among those who currently serve or previously served at the U.S. Department of Defense are Lawrence

¹⁸ Other notable IR scholar-practitioners include Aaron Friedberg, who served as Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs and Director of Policy Planning in the Office of the U.S. Vice President from 2003 to 2005; Thomas Christensen, who served as U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs from 2006-2008; and Barry Blechman, who served as Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency from 1977-1980.

Korb (1981-1985), Robert Art (1982), Graham Allison (1985–1987, 1993–1994), Eliot A. Cohen (1990), Joseph Nye (1994-1995), Colin Kahl (2005-2006), Michael Doran (2007), Thomas Mahnken (2006-2009), Celeste Wallander (2008-present), and Matthew Kroenig (2009-present). From our limited sample of 445 IR scholars, we found that approximately 15% had worked in a full-time capacity for government agencies.

We also found that it is not particularly uncommon for IR scholars to accept positions with inter-governmental organizations. John Ruggie (Assistant Secretary-General for Strategic Planning, 1997-2001; Special Representative on Human Rights, 2005-present) and Michael Doyle (Special Adviser to the Secretary-General, 2001-2003) have both held senior posts at the U.N.¹⁹ Anthony Lake is currently the Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Others have worked for the World Bank, the IMF, the WTO, and the EBRD (e.g. Miles Kahler, Beth Simmons, Joseph Grieco, Theodore Moran, Steven Weber, Axel Dreher, Robert Wade, David Leblang, Michael Ross). From our limited sample of 445 IR scholars, we found that approximately 6% had worked for an IGO.²⁰

If one broadens the definition of exposure to the policymaking process to include scholars who have undertaken substantial consulting assignments for governmental agencies or international organizations, the list grows much longer. Hans Morgenthau, Ernst Haas, and Kenneth Waltz were consultants to the U.S. Department of State. Friedrich Kratochwil, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, and Daniel Deudney have all served as consultants to the U.S. Department of Defense. Dimitri Simes was a foreign policy adviser to Richard Nixon. Robert Jervis was commissioned in 1978 and 1979 to lead an "Iran post-mortem" after the CIA failed to predict the Shah's fall from power (Jervis 2008). Tedd Gurr, Jack Goldstone, Robert Bates, Marc Levy, Monty Marshall, and Barbara Harff are all longtime consultants to the CIA's Political Instability Task Force (formerly known as the White House-sponsored State Failure Task Force). From our sample of 445 IR scholars, we found that approximately 34% had worked or consulted for a government or IO.²¹

¹⁹ Nor is it unusual for IR scholars outside of the United States to assume positions of public service. Ariel Levite, a distinguished IR scholar from Israel, previously served as Principal Deputy Director General at the Israeli Atomic Energy Commission (2002-2007), Deputy National Security Advisor (1999-2000), and Head of the Bureau of International Security at the Israeli Ministry of Defense (1998-1999). IR scholar Brigid Laffan advises the Irish Parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee on issues of EU enlargement. Woosang Kim, an IR scholar from South Korea, is presently serving as his country's Ambassador to Australia and previously served as then-President-elect Lee Myung-Bak's Special Envoy to the United States. Pál Dunay was Head of the Security Policy and Disarmament Department of the Hungarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs in 1991, and more recently, a member of the Hungarian Prime Minister's foreign and security policy board (2007).

²⁰ If one includes consultants, approximately 12% have "worked" for an IGO.

²¹ This is almost certainly an under-estimate, as we relied on the periods of employment and consulting assignments *reported* by the individuals in our sample. Some scholars likely omitted or underreported the extent of their policy experience.

In this paper, we employ two definitions of direct exposure to the policymaking process. Our first treatment variable measures the most *intensive* form of exposure to the policymaking process: full-time employment in a government or intergovernmental organization. These are the "in-and-outers" described by Nye (2009) and Walt (2005). Our second treatment variable broadens the definition of policy exposure to include significant consulting assignments undertaken for governments or intergovernmental organizations. We call these individuals "moonlighters."

Our dependent variable is a scholar's "policy-journal-publications-to-total-journal-publications ratio". We selected this variable to measure the extent to which a scholar is interested in making his or her research accessible to policymakers. In order to construct the variable, we first recorded the total number of journal publications that a scholar achieved each year from the beginning of his or her career to the end of his or her career.²² We then recorded the total number of *policy journal* publications that the scholar achieved each year from the beginning of his/her career until 2011 or the end of his/her career.²³ Values were assigned to the dependent variable by dividing a scholar's total number of policy journal publications in a given year by his or her total number of journal publications in a given year.

The Model

In order to estimate the effect of policymaking exposure on IR scholarship, we employ a difference-in-differences approach. This estimation technique is attractive in that we are using observational data to approximate the conditions of an experiment. In a true experiment, one can assume that there are no systematic differences between the "treatment" group and the "control" group apart from the variable of interest. A differences-in-differences strategy mimics this approach in that the investigator can evaluate two groups, one of which is exposed to a treatment, and another with similar characteristics that is unaffected by the treatment. The second group approximates a control group to the degree that the investigator can either (a) include exogenous variables that adjust for systematic differences among sample observations, or (b) select observations in a manner that allows the investigator to match individuals in the treatment and control groups based on similarities in observed characteristics. In effect, the observed changes

²² We generated this measure by collecting curricula vitae and publication data from a group of leading IR scholars (a procedure described at greater length in footnote #23).

²³ For the purposes of this paper, we treated the following publication outlets as "policy journals": *Foreign Affairs*, *Foreign Policy*, *SAIS Review of International Affairs*, *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, *The National Interest*, *The American Interest*, *World Policy Journal*, *The Wilson Quarterly*, *The Washington Quarterly*, *Orbis*, *International Affairs*, *Internationale Politik*, *Politique Internationale*, *The International Spectator*, *Journal of International Affairs*, *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, *Survival*, *MERIA Journal*, *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, *The World Today*, *Current History*, *Policy Options*, *The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, *Columbia International Affairs Online*, *Middle East Policy*, *Contemporary Security Policy*, *Asia Policy*, *Global Policy*, *Nonproliferation Review*, *Israel Affairs*, and *the Yale Journal of International Affairs*. All other journals were treated as "academic" journals. More detailed measurement procedures are documented in our codebook, which is available upon request.

over time for individuals in the control group provide the counterfactual for individuals in the treatment group.

One of the most important problems associated with non-experimental research is individual unobserved heterogeneity. In a non-experimental study of cross sectional data, causality is determined by comparing $Y_{i,t_0T} - Y_{j,t_0C}$, where T= treatment and C= control. But this will only provide the true causal effect if the assumption of unit homogeneity (no unobserved heterogeneity) holds. With panel data, we can improve on this by using $Y_{i,t_1T} - Y_{i,t_0C}$. In using panel analysis, unit homogeneity only needs to hold in an intrapersonal sense. In order to prevent period effects from damaging causal inference, we can use a difference-in-differences (DID) approach:

$$(Y_{i,t_1T} - Y_{i,t_0C}) - (Y_{j,t_1C} - Y_{j,t_0C}).$$

A DID approach involves calculating the mean value of each group's outcome before and after the treatment is assigned and then calculating the "difference-in-differences" of the means. This approach essentially allows us to replicate the process of causal determination with experimental data. To identify the causal effect of the treatment in question, we rely on a within-person comparison (the before-after difference). To rule out the possibility of maturation or period effects, we compare the within difference of the treatment group and control group.

DID therefore allows us to assess the causal effect of our treatment (policy exposure) on the subsequent publication patterns of leading IR scholars by controlling for individual unobserved heterogeneity and by controlling for the maturation effect. We have a priori reasons to believe that these two controls are important to the validity of our study. We believe it is fair to assume that leading IR scholars are a heterogeneous group: some value policy engagement more than others and this likely influences one's propensity to publish articles in policy journals, such as *Foreign Affairs* and *Foreign Policy*. The before-after difference controls for this heterogeneity by comparing the post-policy exposure publication patterns of scholars against *their own* pre-policy exposure publication patterns. Controlling for the maturation effect is also important because there are reasons to believe that more "established" scholars, in terms of job security and tenure attainment, have greater latitude to publish in policy journals.

Our sample consists of international relations scholars who (a) published at least 2 articles in the TRIP journal database between 1980 and 2007,²⁴ and (b) have made their curricula vita and

²⁴ The TRIP database currently only includes articles that have been double coded and reconciled. This includes all articles published in the first and third issues of these 12 journals between 1980 and 2007. Therefore, our sample does *not* include all IR scholars who have published at least two articles in the discipline's leading journals. However, given the random nature of the selection of journal issues, we believe this sample is reasonably representative of leading scholars in the discipline.

publication data publicly available.²⁵ The TRIP journal database includes *the American Political Science Review*, *the American Journal of Political Science*, *the British Journal of Political Science*, *the European Journal of International Relations*, *International Organization*, *International Security*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *the Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *the Journal of Peace Research*, *the Journal of Politics*, *Security Studies*, and *World Politics*.

445 scholars published at least 2 articles in the TRIP journal database between 1980 and 2008. Of these 445 individuals, 358 either published their curriculum vitae online or provided us with a copy of their curriculum vitae upon request. From this group of 358, we then eliminated 10 scholars who were unable to provide a reasonably comprehensive list of their academic and policy journal publications and/or sufficiently detailed information on the timing and nature of their involvement in the policymaking process. Additionally, since the DID approach relies on the determination of a before-after difference, we had to drop 33 scholars who were either exposed to the policymaking process before they became professors or very recently began working for a governmental or inter-governmental organization.²⁶ Our final sample therefore includes 315 scholars.

Our research differs from the general DID approach in that not every individual in the treatment group was exposed to the treatment group at the same time. The typical DID approach uses a treatment that affects the treatment group simultaneously, such as a policy change targeting a specific subset of the larger population. Our treatment, however, is not only given to the individuals in the treatment group in different years, it is given to these individuals at varying durations from the start point of our analysis (either the year in which an individual publishes his or her first article or the year in which an individual receives his or her doctoral degree, depending on which year comes first). This has two implications for our study: First, the “cut point,” or the point dividing the before period from the after period, varies throughout the treatment group. Second, this variance makes it more complicated to determine the cut points for individuals in the control group, or the points at which publication patterns would change if not for the absence of the treatment (isolating the causal effect of the treatment from the maturation effect).

The ideal method for determining the cut points for individuals in the control group is the process of Levenshtein distance. This process involves matching each scholar in the control group with a “statistical twin” in the treatment group who possesses the same time-varying characteristics. Because of their similarity in these relevant factors, we would expect these “twin scholars” to exhibit similar publication patterns over time, until one scholar receives the treatment while the other remains in the control group. This procedure (the DID-matching estimator) eliminates the simultaneity bias. Another means of assigning the cut points for the

²⁵ We collected curricula vita and publication lists from faculty member websites and through direct email correspondence with those scholars who do not publish such information online.

²⁶ For example, Daniel Byman was one of the individuals who met our sample inclusion criteria, but he served as political analyst at the CIA for several years before receiving his Ph.D..

control group is to determine the average amount of time between receiving a Ph.D., D.Phil., or equivalent and receiving the treatment for the individuals in the treatment group. Once this average is determined, it is applied as the cut point for every individual in the control group. Though less perfect than the Levenshtein distance, this averages method also mitigates much of the simultaneity bias. For the purposes of this paper, we have chosen to adopt the averages method.

In order to better isolate the causal effect of policy exposure on publication patterns, we adopt a DID model "with regression" for our analysis. This approach differs from the standard DID model by controlling for variables that are *both* correlated with the dependent variable (publication patterns) and with the treatment variable (direct exposure to the policymaking process). We have identified several variables that we suspect correlate with a scholar's "policy-journal-to-academic-journal-publication ratio" (our DV) and a scholar's propensity to self-select into—or be selected for—a policymaking position (our treatment IV). The first two control variables measure the nature and location of the university at which a scholar has chosen to teach and conduct research. We expect that, by opting to teach and conduct research at a “policy school” or a school located in the capital city of a country, a scholar may be choosing a university setting that is more conducive to policy engagement, both in terms of holding policy positions and publishing in policy journals.

We also control for paid and unpaid employment/affiliation with think tanks. We do not equate think tank work with direct exposure to the policymaking process, since think tanks do not directly formulate or execute policy. However, it is certainly plausible that a scholar who works at a think tank would both be more likely to publish in policy journals and consider public sector job opportunities. The same logic applies to IR scholars who advise political candidates: while this does not itself constitute a policy position (since it does not entail direct exposure to the process of formulating and implementing policy), it may very well increase one's propensity to publish in policy journals and accept work with governmental and intergovernmental organizations. As such, we include an additional control variable for whether and when an IR scholar advises a political candidate.

Additionally, we include a control variable that measures whether or not the university where a scholar is employed is located in the United States. The basic intuition behind this variable is that the scholarly IR community in the United States is generally positivist in its epistemological orientation, which we suspect may make scholars less likely to generate policy recommendations (proxied in this paper by number of policy journal publications) and less inclined to see a role for themselves in the "practice" of international relations as appropriate.²⁷ By contrast, the post-

²⁷ Lee Sigelman, the editor of the *APSR*, has documented in some detail the retreat of U.S. political science from normative questions and policy debates. He concludes in a broad review of *APSR* publication patterns from 1906 to 2006 that "if 'speaking truth to power' and contributing directly to public dialogue about the merits and demerits of various courses of action were still numbered among the functions of the [American political science] profession, one would not have known it from leafing through its leading journal" (Sigelman 2006: 467).

positivist IR community, which is largely based in universities outside of the U.S., may perhaps be more inclined to engage in normative and policy debates (Cohen 2007: 198-200).²⁸

Our last two control variables are designed to capture a scholar's "freedom of action." We control for the length of time an individual has possessed a Ph.D. (or functional equivalent) and whether that scholar received university tenure (or its functional equivalent). Our basic prediction is that more "established" scholars—either through tenure or length of time as a Ph.D.—have more flexibility to accept policy work and publish in policy journals.²⁹ We expect these variables to demonstrate a strong correlation, but they remain conceptually distinct. Possession of tenure obviously provides a university professor with more "freedom of action." However, one might also expect to observe some differences between newly-minted Ph.D.s with and without university jobs. One would expect newly-minted Ph.D.s seeking university employment to studiously avoid policy work and policy journal publications, while those who already enjoy gainful university employment may have a bit more "freedom of action." Jentleson and Ratner (forthcoming) point out that "when it comes time to hit the job market, search committees give far more weight to a dissertation's theoretical question than policy significance, and readily ignore, if not look down upon, policy-oriented publications outside of the scholarly peer-reviewed domain." Table 1 provides a summary of our independent variables, including our treatment variables and our control variables, and a brief explanation of how we derived these measures.

Table 1. Variables used to Predict Publication Patterns

Independent Variable Name	Long Description
inout	A dummy variable that measures whether an individual ever vacated or took leave from a university position to hold a full-time position with a governmental organization or inter-governmental organization directly engaged in the policymaking process. 0 = No. 1 = Yes.
moonlight	A dummy variable that measures whether an individual ever worked for or advised a governmental organization or inter-governmental organization while simultaneously working at a university. This includes part-time consultancies, and participation in government advisory boards, advisory councils, study groups, and task forces (e.g. the Iraq Study Group, the Defense Policy Board Advisory Committee to the United States Department of Defense, the CIA's External Advisory Board, the U.S. Government's Political Instability Task Force). 0 = No. 1 = Yes.

²⁸ Farrell and Finnemore (2009: 67) turn this argument on its head, noting that the strongly post-positivist "English school" of international relations "may identify (with some reason) engagement with the policy process in its current form as tantamount to selling out to the enablers of global capitalism."

²⁹ Krasner (2008: 5) notes that "the standard advice for any younger scholar interested in government service is: get tenure first."

after	This variable measures the timing of <i>initial</i> policy exposure for in-and-outers and moonlighters.
afterinout	This is the in-and-out treatment variable. It is an interaction effect between <i>inout</i> and <i>after</i> .
afternoon (treatment variable)	This is the moonlighting treatment variable. It is an interaction effect between <i>moonlight</i> and <i>after</i> .
tenure	This variable measures a scholar's "freedom of action" by recording whether and when he/she possessed university tenure or the functional equivalent of tenure (e.g. "permanency" or appointment in principle until retirement in the U.K. system). 1 = Individual possesses university tenure. 0 = Individual does not possess tenure.
PhDYr	This variable measures the length of time of time a scholar has possessed his/her highest postgraduate degree (e.g. Ph.D., D.Phil., J.D.)
Capital	This variable measures whether and when a scholar was employed by a university in the country's capital city. 1 = Employed in Capital City or Greater Metropolitan Area. 0 = Not Employed in Capital City or Greater Metropolitan Area.
PolSch	This variable measures whether and when a scholar was employed at a "policy school". 1 = Policy School. 0 = Not a Policy School. We consider policy schools to be either policy-oriented terminal masters programs, or explicit public policy programs at either the graduate or undergraduate level. We provide more detailed guidance in our codebook, which is available upon request.
ProfTrain	This variable records whether the author completed his/her highest postgraduate degree in the United States. 0=All other countries, 1= United States.
ThinkTank	This variable records whether and when a scholar worked at a policy-oriented think tank. 1 = Yes. 0 = No.
Advisor	This variable measures whether and when a scholar served at an advisor to a political candidate running for elected office. 1 = Yes. 0 = No.

The Findings

Table 2 reports two sets of DID regression estimates. In Models 1-3, in-and-outers constitute the treatment group. In Models 4-6, the treatment group is made up of moonlighters.³⁰ The positive and statistically significant effect of the in-and-out treatment variable (*afterinout*) in Model 1 indicates that faculty members who temporarily leave the ivory tower to accept policy positions do indeed return to the academy with new perspectives and priorities. Specifically, when they return to the academy, they invest significantly more of their time and energy publishing articles in policy journals, such as *Foreign Affairs* and *Foreign Policy*. This finding may not, at first blush, strike readers as particularly surprising. But one must remember that IR scholars are sailing into a strong headwind by giving greater priority to publication outlets widely read by

³⁰ In Models 1-3, we exclude moonlighters from the treatment group. In Models 4-6, we exclude in-an-outers from the treatment group.

policymakers.³¹ The discipline has created strong disincentives for scholars to undertake this type of "applied" work. Publishing more research in policy journals is rarely rewarded, and in some quarters, this type of work may even invite professional disapproval. Therefore, one might interpret the in-an-out treatment effect as evidence of a fundamental reorientation of scholarly values.

The contrast between models 1 and 4 also suggests that the distinction between in-an-outers and moonlighters is an important one. Model 4 does not provide evidence of a positive effect of moonlighting on the subsequent publication patterns of IR scholars. IR scholars are no more likely to publish in policy journals after doing part-time consulting work for governments and IOs. One potential explanation of this result is that consultants are rarely exposed to the inner-workings or impacts of the policymaking process. Instead, they are usually asked to undertake a discrete task or set of tasks without being able to directly influence a policy outcome. In many cases, consultants may not even be granted the opportunity to "see the forest for the trees" (i.e. how their input supports a policymaking output outcome). To the extent that moonlighters are exposed to a weaker version of the policymaking treatment, it is perhaps not unreasonable to expect these individuals to remain focused on the types of journal publications that will improve their odds for tenure, promotion, and professional recognition.

Readers will also recall that the key identifying assumption in the DID model is that the counterfactual trend is the same for the treatment group and control group. That is, without the policymaking "intervention", we would not observe systematic differences in the treatment group's "propensity to publish in policy journals" trend and the control group's "propensity to publish in policy journals" trend. But it is certainly possible that the policy-journal-publications-to-total-journal-publications ratio could change at different rates across the treatment and control groups if these groups vary across other dimensions. As such, we have included a series of control variables in models 2-3 and 5-6 that may help explain variation in a scholar's "policy-journal-to-academic-journal-publication ratio" (our DV) *and* a scholar's propensity to self-select into—or be selected for—a policymaking position (our treatment IV).³²

The first key finding is that the in-and-out treatment variables remain positive and statistically significant after including the control variables. Second, to our surprise, the model results suggest that neither of the "freedom of action" variables (tenure or the length of a scholar's career) has a consistently positive and statistically significant effect.³³ This finding raises some questions about the conventional wisdom (e.g. Krasner 2008; Jentelson and Ratner forthcoming).

³¹ Krasner's commentary on this topic bears repeating: "Political science places little value on policy oriented work. An article in a refereed journal counts for a lot; an article in *Foreign Affairs* counts for little" (Krasner 2008: 5).

³² In this context, control variables are employed not only to explain the outcome variable, but also treatment status. By including additional variables on the right-hand side of the equation, we can relax the crucial "parallel trend" assumption (that, in the absence of the treatment, the average change in the DV would have been the same for the treatment group and control group) underpinning the simple DID method.

³³ We introduced these variables in separate equations because they are highly correlated (.58).

Consistent with our predictions, models 2-3 and 5-6 demonstrate that *where* you work also has a substantial impact on whether you engage in the policymaking process and the extent to which you focus your energies on policy or academic publication outlets. Scholars who work for think tanks are more likely to self-select—or be selected—into both of our treatment groups and more likely to publish research in policy journals. We find the same basic result for scholars who work for policy schools (e.g. Harvard's Kennedy School of Government). By contrast, the effect of university employment in the capital city (e.g. George Washington University, American University) is inconsistent across the in-an-out and moonlighting models. Finally, the models suggest that neither a scholar's professional training (US vs. non-US) nor his or her involvement as an adviser to a political candidate has a consistent impact.³⁴

As a robustness check, we applied a 3-year time lag to the "cut points" (the points at which scholars enter the policy arena) to account for the amount of time it may take a scholar to prepare and publish a journal article. In other words, if a scholar was exposed to the policymaking process in 1990, we considered publications from 1993 onward to be her "post-treatment" period. Our results remain virtually identical when we implement this lag structure.

Section 4: Conclusions

In this paper, we offer suggestive evidence that direct, sustained engagement in the policymaking process has a substantial impact on IR scholarship. But we also acknowledge the limitations associated with this study. First, our objective in this paper was relatively modest: to assess whether varying levels of policy exposure steer academics toward different types of publication outlets and audiences. In future work, we plan to use content analysis of IR journal articles in order to assess the impact of policymaking exposure on the epistemological, theoretical, methodological, and normative priorities of IR scholars.³⁵

Second, our decision to employ a DID estimation strategy in this paper necessarily excluded a non-trivial number of IR scholars with significant policymaking experience. This methodological approach is attractive in that we are using observational data to approximate an experiment. However, an important disadvantage of this approach is that scholars who participated in the policymaking process *before becoming IR scholars* cannot be included in either the treatment group or the control group. Including them in the sample would have effectively constituted "contamination", thereby undermining our ability to approximate a true experiment. Stated differently, one cannot isolate the scholarship impact of the policymaking treatment if the treatment has already been assigned prior to the pre-treatment period.

³⁴ In model 6, we do find some evidence that US-trained IR scholars may be more likely to accept policy positions and publish in policy journals.

³⁵ This type of analysis will be greatly facilitated by double-coding and reconciliation of *all* articles in the TRIP journal database.

From a methodological standpoint, exclusion of these individuals from our sample gives us greater confidence in our findings. However, discarding a non-trivial number of IR scholars with significant policymaking experience is problematic in two respects. First, we lose a significant number of potential observations, which diminishes estimation efficiency. The second and potentially more important concern is that the individuals who pursue an academic career in IR *after* participating in the policymaking process (i.e. scholars excluded from our sample) are potentially influenced by policymaking exposure in ways that are very similar to those individuals in the "treatment" group. If this is true, we are systematically underestimating the impact that policymaking exposure has on IR scholars' publication patterns. We expect that this is indeed the case. We dropped 26 scholars from our sample because of "contamination" concerns and casual empiricism suggests that these scholars are very similar (in terms of publication patterns) to the individuals in our treatment group *after they have received the treatment*.

Third, our dependent variable strictly measures academic and policy journal publications. We excluded op-eds in newspapers, publications in magazines, such as *The New Republic* and *The New Yorker*, and weblog contributions. Here again, casual observation suggests that IR scholar-practitioners spend substantially more time and effort placing articles in these types of non-traditional publication outlets than their ivory tower peers. This reorientation of intellectual effort is not captured in our model.

Finally, the methodological design of this paper raises a more fundamental question about "who counts" as an IR scholar. We defined IR scholars as individuals who published at least two articles in the discipline's 12 "leading" journals between 1980 and 2008 (based on the double-coded and reconciled articles in the TRIP journal dataset). Consequently, we are unable to make any claims about (a) IR scholars who chose not to publish in the discipline's "leading" journals during this period, and (b) IR scholars who unsuccessfully attempted to publish in the discipline's leading journals during this period. These two groups are potentially very large. They include many IR scholars outside the American academy who primarily publish in journals outside the TRIP journal dataset (e.g. Robert Cox, Barry Buzan, Andrew Linklater, Brigid Laffan); IR scholars who died before 1980 (when the TRIP journal dataset begins)³⁶; and IR scholars who did not publish much in "leading" IR journals after 1980 (e.g. Thomas Schelling).

Our sample also excludes a fair number of individuals whose professional experiences are relevant to the question of how exposure to the policymaking process influences IR scholarship, but who presently are not full-time academics or did not hold university positions during the TRIP journal dataset period. Specifically, our methodology excludes a large number of scholar-practitioners who possess a Ph.D. in IR or political science, but never returned to the academy after entering the policy world (e.g. David Petraeus, Henry Kissinger, Paul Wolfowitz, Susan Rice, Marin Strmecki); scholar-practitioners who possess a Ph.D. in IR or political science, but never returned to the academy after entering the think tank/public intellectual world (e.g. Fareed

³⁶ We also had to exclude several IR scholars who passed away *after* 1980 and never published a detailed curriculum vitae (e.g. Ernst Haas).

Zakaria, Richard Haas, Richard Solomon); scholar-practitioners who eventually returned to the academy, but then published mostly in policy-oriented journals or other journals outside the TRIP dataset (e.g. Ezra Vogel, Jendayi Frazer, Mark Lagon); scholar-practitioners who study both comparative politics and IR and did not publish much in the TRIP journal dataset between 1980 and 2008 (e.g. Larry Diamond, Jeremy Weinstein); scholar-practitioners who held policy positions prior to the beginning of the TRIP journal dataset period of measurement (e.g. George Keenan, E.H. Carr); and scholar-practitioners who only recently vacated their university posts to accept positions in the public sector (e.g. Peter Cowhey, Anne-Marie Slaughter).³⁷

Nevertheless, we believe the methodological approach employed and results reported in this paper improve our understanding of both the causes and consequences of the policy-academy divide. IR scholars often express strongly held opinions about the wisdom of efforts to bridge the policy-academy divide, but they seldom marshal systematically-collected evidence to support arguments. This article represents an initial attempt to address this gap in the literature. Given the dearth of empirical research on this topic and its practical significance, we believe this line of inquiry that merits continued exploration.

³⁷ We are also aware that our definition of the policy-making process is perhaps unduly "closed" in the sense that it privileges public sector experience over non-governmental experience. For example, IR scholars who have never worked for governmental or intergovernmental organizations work, but who consult or work for Human Rights Watch or the World Economic Forum, are excluded from our treatment groups. Additionally, our approach ignores the unique role that military colleges play in the policymaking process. For this point, we are indebted to David Auerswald and Audrey Cronin of the U.S. National War College.

References

- Aaron, Henry J. 1978. *Politics and the Professors: The Great Society in Perspective*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Betts, Richard. 1997. Should Strategic Studies Survive? *World Politics* 50 (1):7-33.
- Bull, Hedley. 1959. What is the Commonwealth? *World Politics* 11(4): 577-587.
- Carpenter, Charli. 2009, Revenge of the Geeks. *Duck of Minerva*. 19 April 2009. http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2009/04/revenge-of-geeks_19.html.
- Cohen, Benjamin. 2007. The Transatlantic Divide: Why are American and British IPE so Different? *Review of International Political Economy* 14: 197–219.
- Cohen, Benjamin. 2010. Are IPE Journals Becoming Boring? *International Studies Quarterly* 54: 887–891.
- Daddow, Oliver. 2009. 'Tony's War'? Blair, Kosovo and the Interventionist Impulse in British Foreign Policy. *International Affairs* 85(3): 547-60.
- Deleon, P. 1987. The Influence of Analysis on United-States Defense Policy. *Policy Sciences* 20 (20): 105-28.
- Desai, Raj M. and James Raymond Vreeland. 2009. Coaching from the Sidelines. The New ForeignPolicy.com: Daniel W. Drezner- Global politics, economics, & pop culture. 17 April 2009.
- Desch, Michael. 2009. Professor Smith goes to Washington. *Notre Dame Magazine*. April 2009. <http://magazine.nd.edu/news/11174-professor-smith-goes-to-washington/>
- Drezner, Daniel. 2009. The Academy Strikes Back. The New ForeignPolicy.com: Daniel W. Drezner- Global politics, economics, & pop culture. 17 April 2009.
- Drezner, Daniel. 2009. Joe Nye is right!! That is to say, he's mostly right!! Well, it kind of depends, actually... The New ForeignPolicy.com: Daniel W. Drezner- Global politics, economics, & pop culture. 14 April 2009. http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/04/14/what_if_scholars_cant_play_the_game
- Drezner, Daniel. 2007. *All Politics is Global: Explaining International Regulatory Regimes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Farrell, Henry and Martha Finnemore. 2009. Ontology, methodology, and causation in the American school of international political economy. *Review of International Political Economy* 16 (1): 58–71

Freedman, Lawrence. 2003. America needs a wider coalition, however difficult. *The Independent*. 29 March 2003.

Gartzke, Erik. 2011. Zombie Irrelevance. The New ForeignPolicy.com: Daniel W. Drezner-Global politics, economics, & pop culture. 27 February 2011.
http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/02/27/gartzke_on_policy_political_science_and_zombies

Gates, Robert. 2008. Speech delivered to the Association of American Universities in Washington, D.C. 14 April 2008. <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1228>

George, Alexander. 1993. *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy*. Washington: United States Institute of Peace Press.

George, Alexander. 1997. Knowledge for Statecraft: The Challenge for Political Science and History. *International Security* 22(1): 44-51.

Goldman, Emily O. 2006. Closing the Gap: Networking the Policy and Academic Communities. *Asia Policy* 1: 16-24.

Greenstein, Fred. 2000. *The Qualities of Effective Presidents: An overview from FDR to Bill Clinton*. *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 30 (1): 178-185

Haas, Richard. 1999. *The Bureaucratic Entrepreneur: How to Be Effective in Any Unruly Organization*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Hill, Christopher. 1994. "Academic International Relations: The Siren Song of Policy Relevance." in *Two Worlds of International Relations: Academics, Practitioners and the Trade in Ideas*, edited by Christopher Hill & P.Beshoff. London, UK: Routledge. pp. 3–28

Hines, Nico. 2010. Member of Inquiry 'wrote Blair speech on military intervention'. *The Times*. January 18, 2010.

Hurrell, Andrew. forthcoming 2011. The Theory and Practice of Global Governance: The Worst of All Possible Worlds? *International Studies Review* 13(1).

Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus and Stuart Kaufman. 2007. Security Scholars for a Sensible Foreign Policy: A study in Weberian activism. *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (March): 95-103.

Jentleson, Bruce. 2002. The Need for Praxis: Bringing Policy Relevance Back In. *International Security* 26(4): 169-83.

- Jentleson, Bruce and Ely Ratner. forthcoming. Bridging the Beltway-Ivory Tower Gap. *International Studies Review*.
- Jervis, Robert. 2008. *Why Intelligence Fails: Lessons from the Iranian Revolution and the Iraq War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Jones, Lee. 2009. International Relations Scholarship and the Tyranny of Policy Relevance. *Journal of Critical Globalisation Studies* 1: 125-131.
- Jordan, Richard, Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, and Michael J. Tierney. 2009. One Discipline or Many? TRIP Survey of International Relations Faculty in Ten Countries. Williamsburg, VA: College of William and Mary.
- Keohane, Robert. 2009. 'Beware the Bad Fairy': Cautionary Notes for Academics in the Policy Realm. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 22 (1): 124-128.
- Krasner, Stephen. 2003. Conversations with History. <http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/people3/Krasner/krasner-con0.html>
- Krasner, Stephen D. 2008. Policy-Making and Academic Research: Why Wisdom May No Result in Action. Bridging the Gap Working Paper #1. The Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law.
- Krasner, Stephen D. 2009. Government and Academia: Never the Twain Shall Meet, Well Almost Never. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 22 (1): 111-116.
- Kruzel, Joseph. 1994. More a Chasm than a Gap. *Mershon International Studies Review* 14: 179-81.
- Kuklick, Bruce. 2007. *Blind Oracles: Intellectuals and War From Kennan to Kissinger*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lambert, Craig. 2007. Le Professeur. *Harvard Magazine*. July-August 2007.
- Lepgold, J., and Nincic, M. 2001. *Beyond the Ivory Tower: International Relations Theory and the Issue of Policy Relevance*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lindvall, Johannes. 2009. The Real but Limited Influence of Expert Ideas. *World Politics* 61 (4): 703-730.
- Mahnken, Thomas G. 2010. Bridging the Gap Between the Worlds of Ideas and Action. *Orbis* 54(1): 4-13.

Maliniak, Daniel, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, and Michael Tierney. forthcoming. International Relations in the US Academy. *International Studies Quarterly*. June 2011.

Murray, Matthew. 2010. On Chickens and Eggs: A Response to Joseph Nye. *e-International Relations*. 5 November 2010.

Newson, David. 1995/6. Foreign Policy and Academia. *Foreign Policy* 101: 52– 67.

Nitze, Paul. 1993. *Tension Between Opposites: Reflections of the Practice and Theory of Politics*. New York, NY: Scribner.

Nye, Joseph. 1998. Conversations with History.
<http://conversations.berkeley.edu/content/joseph-s-nye>.

Nye, Joseph S. 2008. Bridging the Gap between Theory and Policy. *Political Psychology* 29(4): 593-603.

Nye, Joseph S. 2009a. Scholars on the Sidelines. *The Washington Post*. April 13, 2009. A15.

Nye, Joseph S. 2009b. Autobiographical Reflections On The Policy-Academy Divide. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 22 (1): 117-120.

Nye, Joseph S. 2011 "Biography" from Personal Website.
<http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/jnye/fullbio.html>

Peterson, Sue, Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, and Michael J. Tierney. 2009. Inside the Ivory Tower. *Foreign Policy* March/April 2009. Pg. 84-86.

Putnam, Robert D. 2003. APSA Presidential Address: The Public Role of Political Science. *Perspectives on Politics* 1:249-255.

Shapiro, Ian. 2005. *The Flight from Reality in the Human Sciences*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sigelman, Lee. 2006. The Coevolution of American Political Science and the American Political Science Review. *American Political Science Review* 100: 463–78

Siverson, Randolph. M. 2000. A Glass Half-Full? No, but Perhaps a Glass Filling: The Contributions of International Politics Research to Policy. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 33(1): 59-64.

Somit, Albert, and Joseph Tanenhaus. 1967. *The Development of American Political Science: From Burgess to Behavioralism*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Stein, Arthur. 2000. "Counselors, Kings, and International Relations: From Relevance to Reasons and Still No Policy Relevant Theory," in *Being Useful: Policy Relevance and International Relations Theory*, edited by J. Leggold and M. Nincic. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press. pp. 50-74.

Stein, Janice. 2009. Evolutionary Hubris, False Certainty, and Structural Scepticism: The Academic-Policy Divide. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 22 (1): 120-124.

Summer, Lawrence. 2007. "Preface" in *Architectures for Agreement: Addressing Global Climate Change in a Post-Kyoto World*, edited by Joseph Aldy and Robert Stavins. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Trachtenberg, Marc. 2010. Social Scientists and National Security Policymaking. Paper presented at a mini-conference sponsored by the Notre Dame International Security Program. April 22-23 2010.

Vogel, Ezra F. 2006. Some Reflections on Policy and Academics. *Asia Policy* 1: 31-34.

Walt, Stephen M. 2005. The Relationship between Theory and Policy in International Relations. *Annual Review of Political Science* 8: 23-48.

Walt, Stephen M. 2009. The cult of irrelevance. *The New ForeignPolicy.com*. 15 April 2009.

Wilson, James Q. 1978. "Social Science and Public Policy: A Personal Note." In *Knowledge and Policy: The Uncertain Connection*, edited by Laurence E. Lynn, Jr.. Washington: National Academy of Sciences.

Wilson, Scott. 2011. Obama administration studies recent revolutions for lessons applicable in Egypt. *The Washington Post*. 14 February 2011

Wilson, Ernest J. 2007. Is There Really a Scholar-Practitioner Gap? An Institutional Analysis. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40:(1): 147-151.

Zelikow, Philip. 1994. Foreign Policy Engineering: From Theory to Practice and Back Again. *International Security* 18(4): 143-171.

Table 2. Difference-in-Difference Regression Estimates of the Effect of Policymaking on Scholarship

	Models					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
inout	.071*** (4.43)	.048*** (2.97)	.046*** (5.36)			
moonlight				.001 (0.07)	.002 (0.17)	.000 (0.03)
after	.006 (0.91)	-.004 (-0.49)	.001 (-0.13)	.006 (1.19)	.009 (1.23)	-.003 (-0.53)
Afterinout (treatment)	.076*** (5.85)	.058*** (4.51)	.060*** (3.67)			
Afternoon (treatment)				.003 (0.38)	-.003 (-0.37)	-.000 (-0.03)
Tenure			.005 (0.69)			.015*** (2.62)
PhDYr		.000 (1.18)			-.000 (-0.60)	
Capital		.010 (0.91)	.010 (0.92)		.019** (2.25)	.019** (2.24)
PolSch		.121*** (9.31)	.120*** (9.30)		.053*** (5.38)	.050*** (5.00)
ProfTrain		.006 (0.61)	.006 (1.25)		.013 (1.94)	.013** (2.03)
ThinkTank		.094*** (9.42)	.095*** (9.50)		.017** (2.20)	.022*** (2.80)
Advisor					-.040 (-0.28)	-.049 (-0.34)
R ²	.07	.12	.12	.00	.01	.02
N	3999	3949	3970	4235	4146	4196

Notes: ***, **, and * denote significance at the 99%, 95%, and 90% levels. The *Advisor* variable was dropped from models 2 and 3 due to insufficient data.