

November 1978

Teaching Political Scientists: Their Background and Politics

Charles D. Hadley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hadley, Charles D. (1978) "Teaching Political Scientists: Their Background and Politics," *Journal of Political Science*: Vol. 6 : No. 1 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops/vol6/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Politics at CCU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Political Science by an authorized editor of CCU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact commons@coastal.edu.

Teaching Political Scientists: Their Background and Politics *

CHARLES D. HADLEY
University of New Orleans

Our colleges and universities rapidly expanded in the 1960s. From 1960 to 1969, the combined undergraduate and graduate student enrollments increased 108 percent while the number of political science degrees awarded increased at an even faster pace—B.A.s grew by 233 percent, M.A.s by 178 percent, and Ph.D.s by 112 percent. Faculty expansion, 75 percent, was unable to keep up with the student explosion though political science faculty may have witnessed commensurate growth as indicated by the 112 percent increase in the American Political Science Association membership.¹

In the latter part of this decade, the American Political Science Association entered a period of readjustment, as a result of pressures both from within and from society at large. Reacting to the behavioral orientation of political science, a group of Association members, in 1968, formed the Caucus for a New Political Science, a group dedicated to a re-emphasis of "value" in the political science. The same year and March 1969, the Association established Committees on the Status of Blacks and Women in the Profession. Hence, political science entered a period of self-examination. There was an awakened interest in who are political scientists. At the same time Heinz Eulau and James G. March with a panel of distinguished political scientists of the behavioral persuasion examined, under the sponsorship of the National Academy of Sciences and the Social Science Research Council, "recent developments and current practices" to carry out their "assignment (which) was to identify,

* I wish to thank Mrs. Jan Davis who typed the manuscript expeditiously with utmost care. The data were made available by Professor Everett C. Ladd, Jr., Director of the University of Connecticut's Social Science Data Center; and, the analysis was conducted at the University of New Orleans Computer Research Center which is supported, in part, by National Science Foundation Grant GJ-131.

¹ The percentage increases were compiled from data presented by: U.S., Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1970* (91st Edition) Washington, D. C., 1970, pp. 107, 128; Heinz Eulau and James G. March, eds., *Political Science* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), p. 70; American Political Science Association, *Biographical Directory* (Fifth Edition; Washington, D. C.: American Political Science Association, 1968), p. 885; and, Evron M. Kirkpatrick, "Report of the Executive Director, 1969-1970," P.S., III (1970), p. 584.

estimate, and appraise the discipline's research and research-training needs and opportunities in the next decade."²

This article describes the "advance of the discipline" in this period of expansion, change, and present self-examination. From where are teaching political scientists recruited? What are their present social characteristics? What are their political characteristics? What are the characteristics of the environment in which they work? The article, then, unfolds a composite picture of the profession as a teaching discipline and establishes a common base for other scholars who are attempting to analyze specific aspects or developments of political science.³

What Are Their Origins?

In the middle 1950s, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., observed that social scientists came from predominantly middle class families (measured by father's occupation); in fact, 71 percent had fathers whose occupations were "professional" or "managerial."⁴ The middle class nature of political scientists alone was confirmed in the sample survey drawn from the 1953 APSA *Directory* and conducted in 1959 by Henry A. Turner, Charles G. McClintock and Charles B. Spaulding. The authors found that 58 percent of the Association membership had fathers whose principal occupation was "professional" or "managerial."⁵ Hence, political scientists appear to have had somewhat lower class origins than the social scientists surveyed years earlier by Lazarsfeld and Thielens. It is evident from Table 1 that political science faculty as an aggregate became more middle class in origin over the decade of the 1960s—66 percent coming from families whose head held "professional" or "managerial" occupations.⁶

² *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

³ On this point see the exchange between Donald D. Barry and James G. Bommer with Joseph LaPalombara, "Letter to the Editor," P.S., IV (1971), pp. 97-99.

Using the 1969 data in conjunction with national surveys of graduate and undergraduate students, Everett C. Ladd, Jr., and Seymour Martin Lipset extensively analyzed the American political science "community" in comparison to a wide range of academic disciplines. See their two part "Portrait of a Discipline," *Teaching Political Science*, II (1974, 1975), pp. 3-39, 144-171.

⁴ *The Academic Mind* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958), pp. 7, 10. See also, John D. Millet, *The Academic Community* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962), pp. 67-68.

⁵ "The Political Party Affiliation of American Political Scientists," *Western Political Quarterly*, XVI (1963), p. 663.

⁶ The data analyzed in this piece were collected by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in Spring 1969. The political scientist subset, numbering 1,267 respondents, represents one out of five who taught that Spring. The representativeness of the data for 1972, moreover, is pointed out by Everett Carl Ladd, Jr., and Seymour Martin Lipset in their *The Divided Academy* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), p. 222, note 1. For the Questionnaire and a detailed exposition of the sampling see Alan E. Bayer, *College and University Faculty: A Statistical*

TABLE 1

*The Principal Occupation of Political Science Faculty Members
Fathers, 1959 and 1960, and the Principal Occupation of
Members of the Male Labor Force, 1950*

	1959 ^a (n = 213)	1969 ^b (n = 1267)	Male Labor Force 1950 ^c
Professional and Technical	40%	27% ^d	7%
Managers, Proprietors and Officials	18	39	11
Farm Owners and Managers	12	5	10
Skilled Workers	13	13	19
Clerical and Sales	10	7	13
Service	5	..	6
Unskilled	1	6 ^e	34 ^e
Other	1	2	..
	100%	99%	100%

^a See note 5.

^b See note 6.

^c U.S., Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1966* (87th Edition) Washington, D. C., 1966, pp. 232-235.

^d Of this percentage, 6 percent are connected with colleges and 2 percent with secondary or elementary schools.

^e Includes semi- and unskilled wage workers and farm laborers.

In direct contrast, 18 percent of the male labor force held such occupations in 1950; in fact, 59 percent held "skilled", "service", or "unskilled" occupations. The table shows a reversal in fathers' occupations from "professional" in 1959 (40 percent) to "managerial" in 1969 (39 percent).

It is more revealing to break down the political scientists by intervals in which they received their highest degrees to develop clear trends.⁷ Quite striking is the steady decline of political science faculty from families whose fathers hold jobs classified "managers, proprietors, and officials" by nine percent in the 1967-1969 period. A decline is also evident in the professional and technical" category to 25 percent in this period though it holds pretty steady from 1949-1966. In the same respect

Description, ACE Research Reports, Vol. V, No. 5. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1970. The questionnaire, as well as that for the 1972 survey by Ladd and Lipset, and selected background and attitudinal characteristics are included in *The Divided Academy*, Appendices A-C, pp. 315-369.

⁷ This technique was used by Norval D. Glenn and David Weiner in "Some Trends in the Social Origins of American Sociologists," *American Sociologist*, IV (1969), pp. 291-302.

TABLE 2

The Principal Occupation of Political Science Faculty Members Fathers by Intervals When the Faculty Received Their Highest Degree

Father's Occupation	All	Highest Degree Year					
		Before 1949	1949-1953	1954-1958	1959-1963	1964-1966	1967-1969
Professional and Technical	27%	30%	27%	24%	28%	29%	25%
Managers, Proprietors, and Officials	39	44	43	39	40	33	35
Farm Owners and Managers	5	8	5	7	5	5	3
Skilled Workers	13	7	11	15	13	13	16
Clerical and Sales	7	6	8	7	7	7	9
Semi- and Unskilled	6	1	3	7	7	6	7
Other/NA	2	3	3	1	0	2	6
	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%
N	(1267)	(136)	(130)	(157)	(252)	(298)	(288)

the category of "farm owners and managers" hit a low of three percent while "skilled workers" and "clerical workers and sales" as family origins reached highs of 16 and nine percent respectively in the 1967-1969 interval. The last decade and a half experienced a marked decline in the middle class origins of political science faculty from a high of 74 percent who earned their highest degree before 1949 to a low of 60 percent who received them in the 1967-1969 interval. Hence, political scientists should come from humbler origins in the 1970s

In contrast, the overall picture of the educational background from which political scientists came remains relatively stable as measured by their father's educational attainment. Half the faculty sample had fathers who at least attended college; of this group 11 percent of their fathers graduated from college and 23 percent had some graduate school training.

Broken down by the intervals in which they received their highest degrees, political scientists came from families whose fathers had a slight increase in college attendance with two exceptions. First, fewer in the 1949-1953 period had fathers that attended college than any other time (41 percent). Second, the only other decline in college attendance for political scientists' fathers was during World War II; this is reflected in the 1967-69 period when 46 percent attended college. While college enrollments increase 49 percent from 1926 to 1942, college attendance by the faculty's fathers increased but four percent. The only evident trend, the decrease in the proportion whose fathers had an eighth grade education or less from 28 to 11 percent, is the exact proportionate decrease (17

TABLE 3

The Education of Political Science Faculty Members Fathers By Intervals When the Faculty Received Their Highest Degree

Father's Education	All	Highest Degree Year					
		Before 1949	1949-1953	1954-1958	1959-1963	1964-1966	1967-1969
Eighth Grade or Less	20%	28%	25%	27%	23%	17%	11%
Some High School	12	10	12	12	10	12	13
High School	17	14	18	15	14	15	26
Some College	15	15	17	15	16	14	14
College Graduate	11	6	6	10	12	14	11
Advanced Studies	23	28	18	22	24	25	21
No Answer	2	1	3	0	2	3	4
	100%	101%	99%	101%	101%	99%	100%
N	(1267)	(136)	(130)	(157)	(252)	(298)	(288)

percent) for the American public from 1926 to 1942. With the proportions in all other educational categories remaining stable, the educational picture gives some slight indication that political scientists were drawn increasingly from lower status families.⁸ This corroborates the occupational background shifts previously mentioned.

Another family background characteristic which has received some attention is religion. In a very early study of faculty in selected social science disciplines (sociology, history, and psychology), James H. Leuba found that, at a minimum, 37 percent of the historians did not believe in God in contrast to 52 percent of his aggregate sample which also included scientists.⁹ Forty five years later, in 1959, Turner, McClintock, and Spaulding found striking similarities among political scientists, 40 percent of whom indicated they were indifferent toward religions or unreligious.¹⁰ Even so, as Table 4 indicates, 69 percent of political scientists sampled indicated a Protestant religious preference with Catholics and Jews respectively nine and 10 percent. Only five percent listed no religious preference. By 1969 the percentage of political science faculty opposed or indifferent to religion had risen 13 points to 53 percent. In response to the 1969 question: "In what religion were you raised?", it appears there was some change over the 1960s; the profession became

⁸ The education percentages for the population from 1926 and 1942 were compiled from data presented by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957* (Washington, D. C.: 1960), pp. 207, 210.

⁹ *The Belief in God and Immortality* (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1921), pp. 249-260.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 662.

TABLE 4

The Religious Preference of Political Scientists 1959 and 1969

<i>Religion</i>	<i>Religious Preference 1959^a</i>	<i>Religion Raised 1969^b</i>	<i>Religious Preference 1969^b</i>
Protestant	69%	61%	36%
Catholic	9	13	8
Jew	10	16	11
Other	3	4	7
None	5	5	33
No Answer	5	2	5
	—	—	—
	101%	101%	100%
N	(213)	(1267)	(1267)

^a See note 5, p. 661.

^b See note 6.

50 percent more Catholic and Jewish and slightly declined in Protestantism (eight percent).

A drastically different, and more accurate picture of political scientists' religious affiliation is reflected in their response to the question: "What is your present religion?" This shows a dramatic reversal with Protestant identifiers dropping from 69 to 30 percent while Catholic and Jews remained about the same—eight and 11 percent respectively. The commensurate increase is revealed in the category "None" which went from five percent (1959) to 33 percent (1969)! Has this been an abrupt change? No. Is it a continuing trend? Yes. When broken down by the intervals in which political scientists earned their highest degrees, those indicating "None" for their present religious preference steadily increased from 25 percent (before 1949) to 37 percent (1964-1966 and 1967-1969), the only exception being the 1949-1953 period in which the figure was 40 percent.¹¹ To be sure, the religious affiliations of all respondents showed a decline from the several religions in which they were raised. The Protestants show an erratic decline from 48 percent (before 1949) to 30 percent over the middle and late 1960s. The Catholic political scientists number about eight percent since 1954 and the Jews 11 percent since 1949 with slight variation.

¹¹ On this point see C. Edward Noll and Peter H. Rossi, "General Social and Economic Attitudes of College and University Faculty Members," University of Chicago, National Opinion Research Center, November 1966, p. 5. Nearly one fourth of their faculty sample indicated no religious preference.

Tabulating the religion in which the faculty were raised against their present religion, shows the Jews remaining most faithful to their upbringing (66 percent), followed by the Protestants (57 percent) and Catholics (53 percent). The commensurate movement within each of these religious groups to "None" is respectively 29, 31, and 37 percent. The question of trends concerning the religious background from which political science faculty came, however, remains largely unanswered. The decline in the overwhelming Protestant background of political scientists was previously pointed out. In addition to showing this trend, Table 5 illuminates the steady growth in the proportion of political scientists from Catholic backgrounds; a proportion rising from five percent before 1949 to 15 percent in the 1959-1969 period. Hence, the gap between those with Catholic and Jewish backgrounds was closing over the past 10 years; moreover, those political scientists from Jewish backgrounds jumped eight percent to 18 after World War II and, with the exception of 1954-1958, remained fairly steady through the 1960s.

TABLE 5

The Religious Origins of Political Scientists

<i>Religion Raised</i>	<i>Highest Degree Year</i>					
	<i>Before 1949</i>	<i>1949- 1953</i>	<i>1954- 1958</i>	<i>1959- 1963</i>	<i>1964- 1966</i>	<i>1967- 1969</i>
Protestant	78%	59%	69%	58%	58%	56%
Catholic	5	10	10	15	15	15
Jew	10	18	13	18	17	17
Other	2	2	4	4	3	6
None	2	8	3	5	5	3
No Answer	3	2	1	0	1	3
	100%	99%	100%	100%	99%	100%
N	(136)	(130)	(157)	(252)	(298)	(288)

Who Are They?

Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus found "the clearest evidence of this trend (toward a younger profession) . . . when (they) classify the membership by date of doctoral degree." In the nine year period 1953-1961, the authors found that 53 percent of the political science academicians earned their doctorates; at the same time, "79 percent of the profession received their doctorates within the last fifteen years" (1947-1961).¹² This picture is confirmed. Using their scheme, 11 percent of

¹² "Trends in American Political Science: Some Analytical Notes," *American Political Science Review*, LVII (1963), p. 938.

those teaching political science today earned their Ph.D.s before 1949 in contrast to 62 percent over the last decade. In fact, 42 percent of those teaching political science during the spring term, 1969, had received their Ph.D. between then and 1964. One can still say, then, that three quarters of the political science faculty received their Ph.D. in the last fifteen years!

From another perspective, however, only 67 percent of those teaching political science had received their Ph.D.s when the present faculty data were collected; 22 percent of the sample held M.A.s, while two and four percent respectively held LL.B.s and B.A.s. From Table 6 it is evident that the demand for higher education faculty resulted in fewer faculty attaining Ph.D.s from 1949 to 1966 (from 82 to 58 percent). The commensurate decrease in Ph.D.s was picked up by those who earned M.A.s (six to 32 percent over the period). Few lawyers and bachelors degree holders taught political science in college over the entire period as one should expect. The 1967-1969 period, in addition, begins to show the reemphasis of the necessity of holding a Ph.D. to obtain an academic position. This new trend should continue through the 1970s.

TABLE 6

*Political Scientists According to Their Highest Degree Earned
By the Intervals in Which They Were Received*

<i>Highest Degree</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Highest Degree Year</i>					
		<i>Before 1949</i>	<i>1949- 1953</i>	<i>1954- 1958</i>	<i>1959- 1963</i>	<i>1964- 1966</i>	<i>1967- 1969</i>
Ph.D.	67%	71%	82%	75%	67%	58%	66%
M.A.	22	13	6	15	21	32	25
LL.B.	2	8	2	3	1	1	2
B.A.	4	1	3	5	6	3	3
Other/NA	5	7	7	2	5	6	4
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	(1267)	(136)	(130)	(157)	(252)	(298)	(288)

Eulau and March noted the fact that the median age of those in the profession (belonging to the Association) was 35 in 1967 in explaining the "intellectual transformation of political science" coming "into full bloom in the sixties."¹³ The same is true at the end of the sixties; 59 percent of those teaching political science were under age 40 and 43 percent were younger than 35 years old. Moreover, the academic rank of the faculty points to this youthfulness as the largest group is the

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 80.

Assistant Professors (34 percent) followed by Professors, Associate Professors and Instructors which were respectively 27, 19, and 12 percent. In fact, over 54 percent of the faculty sample hold ranks below Professor and Associate Professor.

The formation of the Committees on the Status of Blacks and Women in the Profession point to shortcomings in those areas. As shown in Table 7, Black political scientists are few; they comprise one percent of the faculty in the sample and represent a constant percentage in every period shown in Table 7 except 1954-1958 when no Blacks presently teaching earned their highest degrees and 1959-1963 when two percent were awarded their highest degrees. Their absolute numbers have increased; but, the relative position of Blacks in political science remains unchanged. One might expect the 1970s to witness a steady increase in the percentage of Blacks teaching political science, however, due to a present demand and encouragement given by the American Political Science Association with its Black Fellowship program, initiated for the 1969-1970 academic year, and by the Ford Foundation with its support of Black graduate students. An irony of the situation is the presence of twice as many orientals teaching political science in our colleges and universities.

TABLE 7

Political Science and Its Minority Groups

<i>Minority Group</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Highest Degree Year</i>					
		<i>Before 1949</i>	<i>1949-1953</i>	<i>1954-1958</i>	<i>1959-1963</i>	<i>1964-1966</i>	<i>1967-1969</i>
Women	7%	8%	3%	2%	7%	6%	10%
Oriental	2	1	1	1	2	2	2
Blacks	1	1	1	0	2	1	1
N	(1267)	(142)	(130)	(157)	(252)	(298)	(288)

Victoria Schuck, in her examination of women in political science, revealed that they represented five percent of the membership in the American Political Science Association in 1967; 56 percent had received their Ph.D.s from 1960 to 1967. At the same time, she found that 8.4 percent held faculty appointments in 1969.¹⁴ The data presented in Table 7 show a slightly different picture in that women were seven percent of the political science faculty. Table 7 does show a clear trend toward an increased proportion of women political scientists from three percent who earned their highest degree in the 1949-1953 period to 10 percent

¹⁴ "Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations," *P.S.*, II (1969), pp. 645, 48.

from 1967-1969. The data presented by Schuck on the increasing number of women in political science education—23 percent in undergraduate and 18 in graduate school in 1969—lend further evidence to a trend into the 1970s. This picture is confirmed by Ada W. Finifter in her extensive analysis of the status of women in the profession.¹⁵

From the standpoint of salary, 50 percent of the sample earned less than \$12,000 per year (nine months) in 1969; in fact, according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census the median salary for college faculty at all ranks was \$11,745 in 1970.¹⁶ The percentages of political scientists who earned \$12,000-\$13,999; \$14,000-\$16,999; and \$17,000-\$19,999, were respectively 15, 14, and 10. Those who earned \$20,000-\$24,999 were six percent and half that percentage earned over \$25,000 per year.¹⁷

What Are Their Political Persuasions?

As pointed out by Seymour Martin Lipset, a great number of academicians, "particularly those in the social sciences," have had a liberal orientation during the present century.¹⁸ In support of this argument, among other literature, he cites a study conducted by Arthur Kornhauser in 1937 which "reported pro-New Deal sentiments among 84 percent of professors of social science. . . ." Lazarsfeld and Thielens, in talking about the 1952 Presidential vote, noted that of those social scientists surveyed, 58 percent voted for Stevenson and 30 percent for Eisenhower—a two to one Democratic margin.¹⁹ In their survey of political scientists, Turner, McClintock, and Spaulding charted Democratic presidential voting with a low of 59 percent in 1948 and high of 74 percent in 1956 over the presidential elections from 1932 to 1956; and, the authors went on to predict a 70 percent Democratic vote in 1960.²⁰

The liberal orientations of political scientists are formed, irrespective of family influences, at a relatively early period in their lives. Only 23 percent come from politically liberal oriented families, yet by the time

¹⁵ "The Professional Status of Women Political Scientists: Some Current Data," P.S., VI (1973), pp. 406-419.

¹⁶ *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1970*, p. 128.

¹⁷ See my "Teaching Political Scientists: The Centrality of Research," P.S., V (1972), pp. 262-270, for an analysis of the relationship of salary and other academic rewards to publication, especially to the quantity of publications.

¹⁸ *Political Man* (Anchor Edition; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1963), pp. 236-337. For a general treatment, see pp. 336-361.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 14.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 652-653. For a general treatment see Lawrence C. Howard, "The Academic and the Ballot," *School and Society*, LXXXVI (1958), pp. 415-419; Conrad Joyner, "Political Party Affiliation of University Administrative and Teaching Personnel," *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, XLIII (1962), pp. 353-356; and especially, Charles B. Spaulding and Henry A. Turner, "Political Orientation and Field of Specialization Among College Professors," *Sociology of Education*, LXI (1968), pp. 247-262, for a good comparative perspective.

they are college seniors 64 percent are so oriented. This percentage had further increased to 72 percent by the time they began teaching. Conversely, Table 8 shows the decline in conservatism from a family orientation of 43 percent to a present orientation of but nine percent. Breaking down that present political orientation by the periods in which political scientists earned their highest degrees, a dichotomy emerges—those earning their highest degrees before 1953 record themselves as less liberally oriented (60 percent are “left” or “liberal”) than those who earned their degrees after that date (78 percent “left” or “liberal”).

TABLE 8

The Political Socialization of Political Scientists

<i>Political Persuasion</i>	<i>Father's</i>	<i>As a College Senior</i>	<i>Present</i>
Left	3%	11%	14%
Liberal	22	53	58
Middle-of-the-Road	27	20	16
Moderately Conservative	34	12	8
Strongly Conservative	9	2	1
No Answer	5	3	3
	100%	100%	100%
N	(1267)	(1267)	(1267)

In order to get a better perspective on the “liberal” orientation of those teaching political science, ²¹ our attention should shift to their 1968 candidate support which reveals an 87 to nine percent margin favoring Nelson Rockefeller over Richard Nixon in the Republican National Convention. More illuminating, though, is the division of support in the Democratic National Convention (Table 9), especially when broken down over time. The trend, nearly forming plateaus by decade, brings out the changing political world of political scientists. The further one moves from the Great Depression, the greater is the support for Senate dove Eugene McCarthy. He received the support of 23 percent of those who earned their highest degrees before 1949, 36 percent from those in the 1950s, 45 percent from those in the early 1960s, and a majority (55 percent) from those receiving their highest degrees in the late 1960s.

²¹ With these same data Ladd and Lipset assess the liberal orientations of those teaching political science on major national and campus political issues of the 1960s. Constructing scales—liberalism-conservatism (based on national concerns from the Vietnam war to legalization of marijuana and busing), campus activism, student role, and university policy toward blacks—they found that academic generation and religious background most powerfully differentiated a liberal discipline. “The Politics of American Political Scientists,” *P.S.*, IV (1971), pp. 135-144.

TABLE 9

*Political Scientists and Candidate Support in the 1968
Democratic National Convention*

Candidate	All	Highest Degree Year					
		Before 1949	1949- 1953	1954- 1958	1959- 1963	1964- 1966	1967- 1969
Humphrey	53%	74%	59%	61%	53%	49%	38%
McCarthy	43	23	36	37	45	46	55
No Answer	4	4	5	2	2	5	7
	100%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	(1267)	(136)	(130)	(157)	(252)	(298)	(288)

Voting is another matter. In the 1964 presidential election, 81 percent of the political science faculty in our sample voted for President Lyndon B. Johnson while Senator Barry Goldwater was able to muster but four percent. Former President Richard M. Nixon did better, but not much, by tripling the support given Goldwater; Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, on the other hand, cornered 71 percent of the votes cast by political scientists in 1968. What about Governor George Wallace? He received *one vote* among those in our sample. In both elections 10 percent of the political scientists did not bother to vote. (Four percent did not answer the vote inquiry.) Humphrey consistently received his greatest support from those who earned their highest degrees in the 1954-1958 period (82 percent) and least support from those in the latest period—64 percent. What is most noticeable in Table 10 is the increasing tendency for political scientists not to vote the later they earned their highest degree—from two percent in the period before 1949 to 16 percent in the 1967-1969 period; the phenomenon quite likely is due to the peace issue and general dissatisfaction with the Democratic contender. Also, Nixon, what support he did receive, was lowest during the period of his Vice Presidency.

Hence, political scientists are liberal Democrats who split over the war issue in 1968 with one die-hard conservative respondent who voted for George Wallace.²²

What Is Their Work Environment?

In describing the concentration of political science faculty, one almost instinctively considers physical location—the West Coast, Northeast,

²² Though not broken out by specific field, Ladd and Lipset present a comprehensive analysis of the 1972 academic vote. *The Divided Academy*, Chapter 9, pp. 219-242.

TABLE 10

Political Scientists and the 1968 Presidential Vote

<i>Candidate</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Highest Degree Year</i>					
		<i>Before 1948</i>	<i>1949- 1953</i>	<i>1954- 1958</i>	<i>1959- 1963</i>	<i>1964- 1966</i>	<i>1967- 1969</i>
Humphrey	71%	76%	78%	82%	84%	67%	64%
Nixon	12	18	11	9	9	13	12
Other	3	0	4	0	3	4	4
Non-Voter	10	2	4	5	10	11	16
No Answer	4	5	3	4	2	6	5
	100%	100%	101%	101%	99%	100%	100%
N	(1267)	(136)	(130)	(157)	(252)	(298)	(288)

Midwest, or South. Such trends are shown in Table 11 which breaks the United States into standard Census Bureau regions (with the exception of including Maryland in the Northeast and Missouri in the South) by the intervals in which political scientists received their highest degree. The Northeast has the highest concentration, erratic though steady, at 32 percent while political scientists are fairly evenly distributed among the other three regions. The only discernible trends are the gradual increase in the South over the last two decades from 18 percent to 25 percent and the decrease in the West over the last decade from 26 percent to 18 percent.

In turning to a description of the schools at which political scientists work, one must first make the distinction among universities, four year colleges, and junior colleges which each respectively employ 73, 24 and 3 percent of the political science faculty. Looking at employment

TABLE 11

The Trends in Regional Production of Political Science Faculty

<i>Region</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Highest Degree Year</i>					
		<i>Before 1948</i>	<i>1949- 1953</i>	<i>1954- 1958</i>	<i>1959- 1963</i>	<i>1964- 1966</i>	<i>1967- 1969</i>
Notheast ^a	32%	32%	36%	33%	30%	35%	29%
Midwest ^b	23	23	12	25	22	21	28
South	22	23	18	21	22	20	25
West	24	23	34	20	26	24	18
	101%	101%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%
N	(1267)	(136)	(130)	(157)	(252)	(298)	(288)

^a New England, Middle Atlantic, Maryland, and Washington, D. C.

^b North Central excluding Missouri, which is in the South.

from another perspective, 17 percent teach in "elite" private colleges and universities (by reputation), 49 percent in state universities and one percent (the same proportion Blacks are in the profession) in Black colleges and universities. In terms of institutional affiliation, almost two thirds (61 percent) work in public institutions while the remaining faculty are associated with private non-denominational (27 percent), Catholic (three percent), and Protestant (eight percent) colleges and universities. With respect to institutional size, as might be expected, the majority of political science faculty work in schools having over 10,000 students (59 percent) as opposed to schools under 2,500 students (16 percent), the remainder falling in the 2,500-9,999 student range (24 percent)

Tied in with the dynamic growth and youthful orientation of political science over the 1960s, 54 percent of our nation's political science faculty have taught less than seven years and two thirds less than 10 years. Moreover, 51 percent have taught *at their present institutions* for less than four years and 69 percent less than seven years. Table 12 highlights the increasing movement among political science faculty with advancing age; of the sample, two thirds have taught in two or three institutions, the

TABLE 12
The Mobility of Political Science Faculty

Number of Places Taught	All	Highest Degree Year					
		Before 1949	1949- 1953	1954- 1958	1959- 1963	1964- 1966	1967- 1969
One	12%	13%	5%	10%	10%	14%	16%
Two	39	18	23	23	34	52	59
Three	27	27	29	33	33	23	22
Four	13	18	26	22	15	9	3
Five	5	17	9	8	5	2	0
Six plus	2	6	7	4	2	0	0
	99%	99%	99%	101%	99%	100%	100%
N	(1267)	(136)	(130)	(157)	(252)	(298)	(288)

median lying between two and three. The tendency was for political scientists to move with increasing frequency to a second or third job the later they received their highest degree—from 45 percent before 1949 to 81 percent in the 1967-1969 period. In direct contrast, less than 16 percent in each period remain at their first job. On the other hand, seven percent have taught at as many as five institutions though from 11 to 23 percent of those earning their highest degree in the 1954-1958 to "before 1949" periods had done so.

Another important aspect of the work environment centers on the question of prestige degrees and departments. Writing about the academic profession in general, Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee point out the importance departments place on hiring faculty members from prestige departments and with prestige degrees due to a perpetuation of their own prestige; hence, one's early choice of graduate school determines his entire career as "every discipline can show examples of brilliant men with the wrong credentials whose work somehow fails to obtain normal recognition."²³ This gained credence in political science with Albert Somit and Joseph Tannenhaus' profile of the discipline in which, through questionnaire responses, they rated the top 33 political science departments in the United States. In a later volume, the authors accepted the rating of political science departments done by the American Council on Education since it contained the same group of universities (though in different order) and included MIT which they did not rate.²⁴

Somit and Tanenhaus found that their top ranked eleven departments produced 53 percent of the political science Ph.D.s; and, at the same time, those departments had faculty 89 percent of whom held Ph.D.s from those universities.²⁵ These figures were confirmed when the authors analyzed the Ph.D. production and faculty of the top eighteten departments, which were those rated "distinguished" or "strong" in the Cartter report.²⁶ The situation was changed but slightly by the end of the 1960s as 85 percent of the prestige departments had faculty from prestige departments, and, they still awarded highest degrees to 59 percent of those teaching political science. From Table 13, the trends away from the prestige departments for faculty training is readily discernible—from 72 percent in 1949-1953 to 54 percent in 1967-1969—but not nearly as drastic as indicated by Eulau and March.²⁷ The trend might possibly be retarded by the movement of departments into the "distinguished" and "strong" categories—witness the latest American Council on Education department rating by Roose and Anderson in which Rochester, Iowa (Iowa City), Oregon, and Washington (St. Louis) moved into those categories; but, it will continue until many fledgling Ph.D. granting departments gain recognition in the world of

²³ *The Academic Marketplace* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), pp. 193, 92, 138.

²⁴ *American Political Science* (New York: Atherton Press, 1964), pp. 34-36; *The Development of American Political Science* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967), pp. 164-166; and Allan M. Cartter, *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966), pp. 40-41.

²⁵ *American Political Science*, p. 43.

²⁶ *The Development of American Political Science*, p. 166.

²⁷ *Political Science*, pp. 72-74.

TABLE 13
Trends in the Granting of Prestige Degrees

Department	All	Highest Degree Year					
		Before 1949	1949- 1953	1954- 1958	1959- 1963	1964- 1966	1967- 1969
Prestige ^a	59%	65%	72%	61%	58%	56%	54%
Non-Prestige	38	30	25	34	40	40	44
Foreign/NA	3	5	3	5	2	4	2
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	(1267)	(136)	(130)	(157)	(252)	(298)	(288)

^a Defined as distinguished and strong in Roose and Anderson, *A Rating of Graduate Programs* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1970), pp. 64-65.

political science.²⁸ In addition, the latest department ranking reveals a clear emphasis on the importance attributed to the sub-field of political behavior.

CONCLUSION

The average political scientist today is certainly from a more diversified background; however, he is still a male from a middle to upper class background though as likely to claim no religious affiliation as he is to claim the Protestant religion. Today, he is more likely to be a junior faculty member with his highest degree from a prestige department and teaching at a public college or university, though increasing numbers are being trained in the non-prestige departments. He is likely to work in a university with 10,000 or more students and earn a mean salary of \$12,000 per academic year. From the political point of view he is the colleague of an overwhelming number of "liberal" Democrats who did split, however, over the Democratic presidential candidates standing for war and peace; and, in essence, the further removed from the Great Depression, he is more likely to have a "left" orientation and disaffected with national politics on voting day; and, he is more likely to support a peace presidential candidate.

²⁸ Kenneth D. Roose and Charles J. Anderson, *A Rating of Graduate Programs* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1970), pp. 64-65.