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Some international relations (IR) scholars lament the divide that exists between the academic community and the policy community. Others celebrate it. In this article, we test a core proposition advanced by advocates of bridging the policy-academy divide: that direct engagement in the policy-making 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 difference-in-differences estimation strategy, we evaluate whether and to what extent direct exposure to the policy-making process influences how IR scholars select publication outlets. We define and evaluate policy-making exposure in two ways: periods of public service in which faculty members temporarily vacate their university positions to work for governments or intergovernmental organizations; and instances in which faculty members undertake substantial consulting assignments for government agencies and intergovernmental 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 policy-making 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.
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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 policy-making process. The article sparked a heated debate—in email exchanges, private conversations, weblogs, and professional journals—among members of the discipline. Scholars
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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. 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), cofounder of the Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), argued nearly 20 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, 1996:62).

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, Maliniak, Oakes, and Tierney (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; 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 2011). Walt (2009) speaks of a “cult of [policy] irrelevance” within the professional IR discipline.

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 US foreign policy decisions. He argues that, even in those rare historical cases where the
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2For example, Desai and Vreeland (2009) take issue with Nye’s assertion that IR scholars are out of touch with the needs of policy practitioners, 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 Web site that, “I received more positive responses to this op-ed than almost any I have written.”

3Newsome 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, 1996:62).

4This 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 1% 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.”

5If US IR scholars have had limited influence on US foreign policy, the influence of non-US IR scholars has been even weaker. According to a 2008 TRIP survey, the 10 IR scholars who have had the greatest influence on US foreign policy over the last 20 years are all Americans (Jordan, Maliniak, Oakes, Peterson, and Tierney 2009).
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. 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 US 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).

Despite these obstacles, IR scholars continue to traverse the academy-policy divide in non-trivial numbers. Six 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). Of the 445 scholars who published at least two 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. 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 intergovernmental 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. Forty-nine percent 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). Forty-three percent of respondents reported that they themselves had recently worked in a paid capacity for a government, international organization, non-governmental organization, think tank, interest
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6In 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 US Defense Department would provide substantial new funding for social science research and called upon the US 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 US 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).

7If one broadens the definition of policy-making 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 25 years as Director General and Chief of the International Labor Organization’s Program and Planning Division. However, this period of participation in the policy-making process preceded his entry into the academy.

8For the purposes of this paper, we employ the TRIP definition of the discipline’s “12 leading journals.” See pg. 13 for details.
group or private sector outfit. Maliniak, Oakes, Peterson, and Tierney (2007:2) 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 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 policy-making process, noting that IR scholars can influence or be influenced by the policy-making process in a variety of indirect, but nevertheless significant ways. 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 article 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 policy-making 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 policy-making process can yield significant intellectual benefits for individual scholars and the IR discipline as a whole. Reflecting on his own experience, Nye (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), Lepgold and Nincic (2001), Jentleson (2002), Putnam (2003), Walt (2005), Shapiro (2005), Goldman (2006), Vogel (2006), Wilson (2007), Desch (2009), Mahnken (2010), and Jentleson and Ratner (2011).

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 (2009a, b), Drezner (2009a,b), and Jentleson and Ratner (2011) 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 policy-making 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.11

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 2011).12 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 (Vogel 2006; Nye 2009a,b). 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.13 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).

Given these differences, members of the “mind the gap” school generally believe in a rigor–relevance trade-off and argue that IR scholars who dabble in policymaking should not expect to enjoy great success as practitioners (Krasner 2009). Keohane (2009:126) goes even further, arguing that scholars-cum-policy-makers 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

11Walt (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 policy-making 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 2011, Duke University, George Washington University, and the University of California at Berkeley launched “an International Policy Summer Institute geared to post-docs and junior faculty interested in learning further about major foreign policy issues, the US policy process, policy relevant research methodologies, policy briefing strategies, media training and other skills to enhance engagement with the policy community” (Jentleson and Ratner 2011:9).

12Stanley 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).

13Krasner (2009:115) makes this same point somewhat indelicately, noting that “misanthropes can thrive in a university setting.”
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.14 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 long-standing 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 article 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 policy-making 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.

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 policy-making experience influences scholarship.15 Drezner (2007), who worked in the US 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 policy-making process influenced his theoretical perspective. In particular, he notes that he reentered the academy with a new appreciation for the role that great-power governments play in creating and policing global regulatory regimes.16 Nye (2008) more obliquely suggests that his period
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14Keohane (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.

15For example, 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.”

16Drezner’s period of service at the US 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 US Treasury “fieldwork” in order to explain how powerful states create and enforce global regulatory regimes (Drezner 2007).
of public service led him to focus more on ethical and normative issues.\textsuperscript{17} Therefore, based on individual anecdotes and general intuition, we might expect direct exposure to the policy-making process to affect an IR scholar’s theoretical approach, normative orientation, and/or methodological priorities.\textsuperscript{18}

As we indicated earlier, our goal is to determine whether policy-making 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 (2011:7) 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 journal counts for a lot; an article in \textit{Foreign Affairs} counts for little. New PhD’s are hired entirely on the basis of their scholarly work; policy-related writing or service in government counts for nothing.”

\textbf{Section 3: Methods and Findings}

\textit{Defining and Measuring the Treatment Variable}

In order to assess whether, to what degree, and how policy-making exposure influences IR scholarship, one must first define “policy-making exposure.” Scholars can participate in the policy-making 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.


\textsuperscript{17}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 \textit{The Paradox of American Power}. For better or worse, both works were heavily influenced by my experience in government” (Nye 2008:601).

\textsuperscript{18}In the interest of full disclosure, one of the authors of this paper worked in the Department of Policy and International Relations 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 in theoretical approaches that better account for the outsized agency of individual policymakers, which he witnessed firsthand during his period of public service.

\textsuperscript{19}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 US Vice President from 2003 to 2005; Thomas Christensen, who served as US Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs from 2006 to 2008; and Barry Blechman, who served as Assistant Director of the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency from 1977 to 1980.
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.


We also found that it is not particularly uncommon for IR scholars to accept positions with intergovernmental 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 UN.20 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 (for example, 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.21

If one broadens the definition of exposure to the policy-making 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 US Department of State. Friedrich Kratochwil, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, and Daniel Deudney have all served as consultants to the US 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 sam-
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20Nor is it unusual for IR scholars outside of the United States to assume positions of public service. Ariel Levine, 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).

21If one includes consultants, approximately 12% have “worked” for an IGO.
ple of 445 IR scholars, we found that approximately 34% had worked or consulted for a government or IO.\footnote{This is almost certainly an underestimate, 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 article, we employ two definitions of direct exposure to the policy-making process. Our first treatment variable measures the most \textit{intensive} form of exposure to the policy-making process: full-time employment in a government or intergovernmental organization. These are the “in-and-outers” described by Nye (2009a,b) 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.\footnote{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 #24).} We then recorded the total number of \textit{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.\footnote{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 International, 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.} 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.

\textit{The Model}

In order to estimate the effect of policy-making exposure on IR scholarship, we employ a difference-in-differences (DID) 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 DID 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 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 $Y_{i,0T} - Y_{i,0C}$, where
\[ T = \text{treatment and } C = \text{control. But this will only provide the true causal effect if the assumption of unit homogeneity (no unobserved heterogeneity) holds. With panel data, we can improve on this by using } Y_{i,t,T} - Y_{i,t,C}. \] 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 DID approach:

\[ (Y_{i,t,T} - Y_{i,t,C}) - (Y_{j,t,C} - Y_{j,t,C}). \]

A DID approach involves calculating the mean value of each group’s outcome before and after the treatment is assigned and then calculating the “DID” 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.

Difference-in-differences 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.


Four hundred and forty-five scholars published at least two 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 ten 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 policy-making 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 policy-making process before they became professors or very recently began

---

25The 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.

26We collected curricula vita and publication lists from faculty member Web sites and through direct email correspondence with those scholars who do not publish such information online.
Our research differs from the general DID approach in that not every individual in the treatment group was exposed to the treatment at the same time. The typical DID approach uses a treatment that affects all of the members of the treatment group simultaneously, such as a policy change targeting a subset of the larger population. By contrast, our treatment is not only assigned to the individuals in the treatment group in different years, but also at varying durations from the start point of our analysis. 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).

A common method to determine the cut points for individuals in the control group is the process of optimal matching (OM). This methodology determines the “distance” between two sequences, which is given by the minimum number of insertion, deletion, or substitution operations needed to turn one sequence into the other. This “distance” calculation could be used to match each scholar in the control group with a “statistical twin” in the treatment group. The statistical twin would be the scholar in the treatment group whose pre-policy publication pattern is most similar to the control group scholar, as defined by the OM distance. We would then assign the control group scholar the same cut point as her statistical twin in the treatment group.

However, OM methods are not applicable to our study. OM methods are meaningful for matching sequences in which there are a relatively small number of well-defined events and in which the order of events in the sequence is important to the empirical phenomenon of interest (see Kruskal and Liberman 1983; Abbott and Forrest 1986; Abbott and Hrycak 1990). In our study, each “event” is the scholar’s yearly ratio of articles published in policy journals to total articles published. These “events” are not well-defined and do not conform to meaningful sequences from year to year. The high variability, or “noisiness,” of our data

---

27Our decision to employ a DID estimation strategy necessarily excludes a non-trivial number of IR scholars with significant policy-making experience. 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 PhD. This methodological approach is attractive in that we are using observational data to approximate the conditions of an experiment. However, a disadvantage of this approach is that scholars who participated in the policy-making 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 policy-making treatment if the treatment has already been assigned prior to the pre-treatment period. 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 policy-making 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 policy-making process (that is, scholars excluded from our sample) are potentially influenced by policy-making 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 policy-making exposure has on IR scholars’ publication patterns. We expect that this is indeed the case. Casual empiricism suggests that the scholars who we excluded from our sample because of “contamination” concerns are very similar (in terms of publication patterns) to the individuals in our treatment group after they have received the treatment.

28The start point of our analysis represents 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.

29This methodology was originally developed in the biological sciences by Hamming (1950). It was later extended by Levenshtein (1966 [1965]) through the introduction of the so-called Levenshtein distance method. Unlike Levenshtein distance, Hamming distance only allowed for substitution operations, restricting the applicability of Hamming distance to comparing sequences of equal length (Lesnard 2006).
means that an incredibly large number of insertions, deletions, or substitutions would be needed to match any of the sequences. This renders OM methods unable to produce meaningful “statistical twins” for the scholars in the control group. Additionally, instead of focusing on the order of events in a sequence, our study focuses on the overall trend of events in each sequence: how a scholar’s propensity to publish in policy journals changes over time. Thus, even if our data enabled the use of OM methods, we have no reason to believe that the “statistical twins” identified would represent pairs of scholars with similar pre-treatment publication trends. The stylized graphs provided above illustrate the inapplicability of OM methods to this study (Figure 1).

Using OM methodologies, two substitutions are needed to transform the scholar one sequence into the scholar two sequence (in years 4 and 5), while five substitutions are needed to transform the scholar three sequence into the scholar two sequence (in years 1–5). Thus, the OM “distance” between the publication data for scholars one and two is less than the “distance” between scholars two and three; however, the publication trends of scholars two and three are far more similar than that of scholars one and two. Thus, not only do our data make the identification of a precise match difficult, but also the focus of this study on publication trends renders OM methodologies inapplicable.

In order to overcome the methodological problems that individual OM matching poses, we have selected a methodology that assigns the cut points to the control group scholars based upon the average point in the careers of the treatment group scholars that are exposed to the policy-making process. We assign the cut points to members of the control group by determining the hypothetical point of policy exposure in the careers of these scholars. To define this cut point, we first calculate the number of years between each treatment group scholar receiving his or her doctorate and his or her first year of policy exposure, and then we calculate an average across the treatment group. Once we determine this average interval, the same interval is used to calculate the cut point for every individual in the control group. This method allows us to estimate the point in the publication trajectories of the control group scholars when they hypothetically would have been exposed to the policy-making process. We then assign cut points based on this estimation. We believe this approach is ultimately more precise than the OM methodology, as the noise of the sequential data in our analysis would render OM unable to yield meaningful matches of the scholars in the control and treatment groups.

The DID analysis (see Table 1) reveals that the propensity to publish in policy journals is higher after treatment for scholars in the treatment group relative to the control group and significantly higher for the in-and-outers. The DID between the moonlighters and the control group is 0.0003 between the pre-treatment and post-treatment periods, while the DID between the in-and-outers and the control group is 0.0713. This means that the change in the average propor-

Fig. 1. OM Methods and Publication Data
### Table 1. Variables used to Predict Publication Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable Name</th>
<th>Long Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inout</td>
<td>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 intergovernmental organization directly engaged in the policy-making process. 0 = No, 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonlight</td>
<td>A dummy variable that measures whether an individual ever worked for or advised a governmental organization or intergovernmental 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 (for example, the Iraq Study Group, the Defense Policy Board Advisory Committee to the United States Department of Defense, the CIA’s External Advisory Board, the US Government’s Political Instability Task Force). 0 = No, 1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>This variable measures the timing of initial policy exposure for in-and-outers and moonlighters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterinout</td>
<td>This is the in-and-out treatment variable. It is an interaction effect between inout and after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aftermoon</td>
<td>This is the moonlighting treatment variable. It is an interaction effect between moonlight and after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>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 (for example, “permanency” or appointment in principle until retirement in the UK system). 1 = Individual possesses university tenure, 0 = Individual does not possess tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhDYr</td>
<td>This variable measures the length of time of time a scholar has possessed his/her highest postgraduate degree (for example, PhD, DPhil, JD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolSch</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProfTrain</td>
<td>This variable records whether the author completed his/her highest postgraduate degree in the United States. 0 = All other countries, 1 = United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThinkTank</td>
<td>This variable records whether and when a scholar worked at a policy-oriented think tank. 1 = Yes, 0 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>This variable measures whether and when a scholar served as an advisor to a political candidate running for elected office. 1 = Yes, 0 = No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tion of articles published in policy journals between the pre-treatment and post-treatment periods (or pre- and post-cut point periods for the control group) is 7% higher for the in-and-outers than scholars in the control group.

In order to better isolate the causal effect of policy exposure on publication patterns, we employ a DID model “with regression.” 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 policy-making 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 policy-making 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, in terms of both 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 policy-making 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 article by number of policy journal publications) and less inclined to see a role for themselves in the “practice” of international relations as appropriate.30 By contrast, the post-positivist IR community, which is largely based on universities outside of the US, may perhaps be more inclined to engage in normative and policy debates (Cohen 2007:198–200).31

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 PhD. (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 PhD—have more flexibility to accept policy work and publish in policy journals.32 We expect these variables to

---

30Lee Sigelman, a former editor of the APSR, has documented in some detail the retreat of US 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).

31Farrell 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.”

32Krasner (2008:5) notes that “the standard advice for any younger scholar interested in government service is: get tenure first.”
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 PhDs with and without university jobs. One would expect newly minted PhDs 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 (2011:7) 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 2 provides a summary of our independent variables, including our treatment variables and our control variables, and a brief explanation of how we constructed these measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Difference-in-Differences Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Intervention Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between in-and-outers and control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (n=1251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n=6149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unadjusted mean difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between moonlighters and control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (n=1597)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (n=6149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unadjusted mean difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Findings

Table 3 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. 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 policymakers. 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

---

33In an unreported set of models, we included gender as a control variable to assess whether gender affects the proclivity of scholars to both hold policy positions and publish in policy journals. Gender has been identified as having an impact on one’s area of study, job selection, and advancement in the international relations academy and foreign policymaking (see Sedowski and Brintnall 2007; Maliniak, Oakes, Peterson, and Tierney 2008; Zenko 2011; Drezner 2012). However, this variable had no discernible effect on the dependent variable. These unreported models are available upon request.

34In models 1–3, we exclude moonlighters from the treatment group. In models 4–6, we exclude in-and-outers from the treatment group.

35Krasner’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).
disapproval. Therefore, one might interpret the in-and-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-and-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 policy-making 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” (that is, how their input supports a policymaking outcome). To the extent that moonlighters are exposed to a weaker version of the policy-making 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 policy-making “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-jour-
nal-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 policy-making position (our treatment IV).  

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. This finding raises some questions about the conventional wisdom (for example, Krasner 2008; Jentleson and Ratner 2011). 

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 policy-making 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 their research in policy journals. We find the same basic result for scholars who work for policy schools (for example, Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government). By contrast, the effect of university employment in the capital city (for example, George Washington University, American University) is inconsistent across the in-and-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. 

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 policy-making 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 article, we offer suggestive evidence that direct, sustained engagement in the policy-making process has a substantial impact on IR scholarship. But we also acknowledge the limitations of our study. First, our objective was relatively modest: to assess whether varying levels of policy exposure steer academics toward different types of publication outlets and audiences. Future work might focus on content analysis of IR journal articles in order to assess the impact of policy-making exposure on the epistemological, theoretical, methodological, and normative priorities of IR scholars. 

Second, 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 out-

---

36In this context, control variables are employed to explain not only the outcome variable, but also the 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. 

37We introduced these variables in separate equations because they are highly correlated (.58). 

38In 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. 

39This type of analysis will be greatly facilitated by double-coding and reconciliation of all articles in the TRIP journal database.
lets than their ivory tower peers. This reorientation of intellectual effort is not captured in our model.

Third, the methodological design of this article 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 data set). 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 data set (for example, Robert Cox, Barry Buzan, Andrew Linklater, Brigid Laffan); IR scholars who died before 1980 (when the TRIP journal data set begins); and IR scholars who did not publish much in “leading” IR journals after 1980 (for example, Thomas Schelling).

Our sample also excludes a fair number of individuals whose professional experiences are relevant to the question of how exposure to the policy-making process influences IR scholarship, but who presently are not full-time academics or did not hold university positions during the TRIP journal data set period. Specifically, our methodology excludes a large number of scholar-practitioners who possess a PhD in IR or political science, but never returned to the academy after entering the policy world (for example, David Petraeus, Henry Kissinger, Paul Wolfowitz, Susan Rice, Marin Strmecki); scholar-practitioners who possess a PhD in IR or political science, but never returned to the academy after entering the think tank/public intellectual world (for example, Fareed 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 data set (for example, Ezra Vogel, Jendayi Frazer, Mark Lagon); scholar-practitioners who study both comparative politics and IR and did not publish much in the TRIP journal data set between 1980 and 2008 (for example, Larry Diamond, Jeremy Weinstein); scholar-practitioners who held policy positions prior to the beginning of the TRIP journal data set period of measurement (for example, George Keenan, E.H. Carr); and scholar-practitioners who only recently vacated their university posts to accept positions in the public sector (for example, Peter Cowhey, Anne-Marie Slaughter).

Finally, the policy exposure effect that we have identified in this article begs the deeper question of why participation in the policy-making process leads to changes in publication patterns. There are at least three potential causal mechanisms that might explain this effect. One hypothesis is that sustained exposure to the policymaking process has a direct impact on the values and priorities of IR scholars. Another plausible explanation is that scholar-practitioners who submit manuscripts to policy journals face fewer obstacles during the publication review process. A third possibility is that the professional incentive to suppress or conceal one’s interest in policymaking may be less strong once an IR scholar has directly engaged in the policymaking process. We refer to this last explanation as the “outing” hypothesis. Identifying which of these causal mechanisms is at

---

40We also excluded several IR scholars who passed away after 1980 and never published a detailed curriculum vitae (for example, Ernst Haas).

41We 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, 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 policy-making process. For this point, we are indebted to David Auerswald and Audrey Cronin of the US National War College.
work is a promising avenue for future research. In particular, the use of survey methods may help shed light on this issue.

The goal of this article was to 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 merits continued exploration.

References


