

# Political Theory Today: Results of a National Survey

Matthew J. Moore, *California Polytechnic State University*

**ABSTRACT** This article reports the results of a 2008 national survey of political theorists. The results, based on 1,086 responses from professors at accredited, four-year colleges and universities in the United States, provide information about the demographic characteristics of political theorists, opinion data on the place of political theory within political science, the proportion of political theorists in political science departments, teaching loads, expectations for tenure, the experience of political theorists on the academic job market, and, finally, rankings of theorists, journals, publishers, professional organizations, and Ph.D. programs.

In the fall of 2008, I conducted a survey of political theorists in the United States.<sup>1</sup> The survey asked a wide range of questions about the place of political theory within political science, the experiences of political theorists as teachers and scholars, and about what and how political theorists teach.<sup>2</sup> My goal was to investigate theorists' views on the long-running debate over whether political theory belongs in political science,<sup>3</sup> as well as to get a snapshot view of the practice of political theory as a subfield today. For purposes of the survey, I defined political theory as the study of political philosophy, including both normative and historical approaches, but not including positive political theory or formal modeling.

My research assistants<sup>4</sup> and I visited the webpage of every accredited, four-year college and university in the United States to attempt to identify potential participants. We also included everyone in the American Political Science Association's (APSA) *Directory of Political Science Faculty and Programs, 2007–2008* (2007) who listed an interest in political theory (not including positive political theory). We included everyone who could not be excluded.

Of the 2,073 schools we identified, 59.1% (1,226) include political theory in their curriculums, while 20.3% (420) include political science but not political theory, and 14.8% (306) do not teach political science at all (in any department). We attempted to verify these findings by examining school catalogs. Through this process, we identified 5,144 potential respondents—roughly half people whom we had reason to believe were political theorists, and roughly half people we could not rule out. After deducting bounced emails, undeliverable letters, and respondents who identified themselves as ineligible, 4,351 potential respondents received an invitation to take the online survey. By the time data collection had closed, 1,086 individuals had completed some or all of the survey, pro-

ducing a simple response rate (total responses/total invitations received by potential respondents) of 25% (1,086/4,351). The response rate among scholars we now had reason to believe are political theorists and who received the invitation<sup>5</sup> was 49.3% (1,086/2,203).

One simple, initial question of interest is: who are political theorists? Many of the answers to this question are not surprising, such as that 96.1% (745;  $N=775$ ) of respondents hold a Ph.D. or equivalent, or that 81% (628;  $N=775$ ) of respondents teach in a political science department. (Since not every respondent answered every question, I will indicate the  $N$  for each topic.) However, one finding of note concerns gender. According to the APSA (2001), 23.8% of political scientists are women, whereas 26.6% (205;  $N=771$ ) of survey respondents were women, suggesting that political theory has a slightly higher proportion of women than does the profession generally. (As of February 2010, 31.8% of the APSA's members are women, but, as I report below, not all political scientists are members of the APSA, so that figure may not be representative of the broader population.) Similarly, while it should be no surprise, only 25.3% (270) of respondents were at institutions that grant a Ph.D. in political science, while 74.7% (798;  $N=1,068$ ) were not.

One final demographic question concerns how the respondents, all of whom reported teaching at least some political theory, relate to political theory itself. I have broken the respondents into three categories: (1) Theorists by Necessity, whose primary research or teaching interests are not in political theory (27.3% [211] of respondents); (2) Theorists at Heart, whose primary teaching or research interests are in political theory and who teach at least 25% of the time in political theory (58.9% [456] of respondents); and (3) Would-Be Theorists, whose primary teaching or researching interests are in political theory but who teach theory less than 25% of the time (13.8% [107;  $N=774$ ] of respondents).

Table 1

**Respondents' Views on the Place of Political Theory within Political Science**

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	ROW TOTALS
Political theory is an essential part of political science.	85.0% (668)	12.3% (97)	1.4% (11)	1.0% (8)	0.3% (2)	100% (786)
Political theory articles are given a fair chance at publication in major political science journals.	4.1% (32)	19.5% (152)	37.7% (294)	32.2% (251)	6.5% (51)	100% (780)
The number of political theory articles published in major political science journals properly reflects the importance of political theory to the discipline of political science.	3.3% (26)	11.2% (87)	25.9% (202)	44.9% (350)	14.7% (114)	100% (779)
Political theory books are given a fair chance at publication by major university presses.	6.4% (50)	34.6% (269)	40.0% (311)	16.3% (127)	2.7% (21)	100% (778)
Political theory paper and panel proposals are given a fair chance of being selected at major political science conferences.	8.0% (62)	44.4% (345)	30.6% (238)	14.2% (110)	2.8% (22)	100% (777)
The number of political theory panels at major political science conferences properly reflects the importance of political theory to the discipline of political science.	4.8% (37)	31.1% (241)	34.1% (264)	25.5% (197)	4.5% (35)	100% (774)
Overall, political theory is UNDER-represented in the areas mentioned above.	17.3% (132)	36.8% (281)	29.3% (224)	14.4% (110)	2.2% (17)	100% (764)
Overall, political theory is OVER-represented in the areas mentioned above.	1.2% (9)	2.1% (16)	24.0% (181)	44.6% (336)	28.1% (212)	100% (754)
Political theory is respected in my department.	31.2% (244)	44.2% (346)	9.1% (71)	11.5% (90)	4.0% (31)	100% (782)
Political theory is respected by political scientists generally.	3.2% (25)	20.7% (161)	29.5% (230)	39.4% (307)	7.2% (56)	100% (779)

**THE PLACE OF THEORY IN POLITICAL SCIENCE**

As mentioned above, one main motivation for conducting this survey was the perennial debate over whether theory belongs in political science. Perhaps not surprisingly, of the 781 respondents to a question about whether political science is the right academic “home” for political theory, 92.7% (724) said “yes.” A related series of questions asked about respondents’ views regarding the current status of political theory within the discipline. The results, summarized in Table 1, show both that

political theorists are concerned about their place within political science, and that, in many cases, they are unsure about theory’s current status.

Another question asked about the numbers and proportions of theorists in the respondents’ departments. The mean

Table 2

**Amount of Publication Required for Tenure in Respondents’ Departments**

	%	N
Multiple books	2.2	16
At least one book (and some articles)	37.2	274
Several articles (more than 5)	17.9	132
Some articles (2–5)	25.8	190
At least one peer-reviewed article	2.9	21
Any publications at all	8.7	64
Publications are not required for tenure in my department	5.3	39
<b>Column Totals</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>736</b>

Table 3

**Length of Time Respondents Spent on Tenure-Track Job Market after Receiving Ph.D.**

	%	CUM. %	N
Less than 1 year (includes finding a job before completing the Ph.D.)	46.0	46.0	347
1 year	9.5	55.6	72
2 years	11.1	66.7	84
3 years	7.8	74.5	59
4 years	5.3	79.8	40
5 or more years	9.3	89.1	70
I have never held a tenure-track appointment	7.8	96.9	59
I did not look for a tenure-track position right away	3.1	100	23
<b>Column Totals</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>754</b>

Table 4

## Rank Ordering of Scholars Who Have Had the Greatest Impact on Political Theory in the Past 20 Years

VOTES	NAME	VOTES	NAME	VOTES	NAME
279	Rawls, John	15	Brown, Wendy	6	Shapiro, Ian
148	Habermas, Jürgen	14	Agamben, Giorgio	6	Waldron, Jeremy
122	Foucault, Michel	14	Pocock, J.G.A.	6	West, Cornel
84	Connolly, William	14	Voegelin, Eric	5	Baudrillard, Jean
73	Strauss, Leo	13	Berlin, Isaiah	5	Huntington, Samuel
71	Walzer, Michael	12	Benhabib, Seyla	5	Jaffa, Harry V.
70	Taylor, Charles	12	Oakeshott, Michael	5	Laclau, Ernesto
64	Wolin, Sheldon	11	Dworkin, (Ronald? Andrea?)	5	McWilliams, Wilson Carey
62	Butler, Judith	11	Elshtain, Jean	5	Meier, Heinrich
53	Arendt, Hannah	11	Shklar, Judith	5	Putnam, Robert
45	Skinner, Quentin	10	Deleuze, Gilles	5	Rancière, Jacques
44	Rorty, Richard	10	Sen, Amartya	5	Riker, William
37	Sandel, Michael	10	Wolin, (Sheldon? Richard?)	5	Rogin, Michael
37	Young, Iris Marion	9	Euben, J. Peter	5	Spivak, Gayatri
35	Mansfield, Harvey	9	Fraser, Nancy	5	Žižek, Slavoj
35	Nussbaum, Martha	9	Gutmann, Amy	4	Cohen, G.A.
27	MacIntyre, Alasdair	9	Pettit, Philip	4	Elster, Jon
26	Derrida, Jacques	9	Skinner, (B.F.? Quentin?)	4	Gadamer, Hans-Georg
25	Nozick, Robert	8	Galston, William	4	Gunnell, John
25	Pateman, Carole	8	Kateb, George	4	Hardt (Michael) and Negri (Antonio)
24	Dahl, Robert	8	Schmitt, Carl	4	Lowi, Theodore
21	Bloom, Allan	7	MacKinnon, Catharine	4	McWilliams, (Wilson?) Carey
21	Kymlicka, Will	7	Pitkin, Hanna	4	Nietzsche, Friedrich
21	Okin, Susan Moller	7	Said, Edward	4	Rosenblum, Nancy
19	Dworkin, Ronald	6	Bruell, Christopher	4	Smith, Rogers
17	Barber, Benjamin	6	Manent, Pierre	4	Zuckert, Michael
17	Pangle, Thomas	6	Raz, Joseph		

Note: This list includes only those scholars who received at least four votes.

percentage of tenured or tenure-track faculty teaching political theory in respondents' departments is 16.9%, while the median is 20%. However, a follow-up survey revealed that the median at Ph.D.-granting institutions is lower (see below for details).

A final question in this set asked how many theory classes the respondent's department offers in the average year (counting different sections of the same course separately). The mean answer was 6.5, the median was 5, and the mode was 4 ( $N = 744$ ).

### WHAT IT'S LIKE TO BE A POLITICAL THEORIST

A second motivation for undertaking the survey was to investigate the professional experiences of political theorists. One question in this series asked how many courses the respondent is required to teach per academic year. The mean answer was 5.5, the median answer was 5, and the modal answer was

4. However, 24.4% (182) of respondents said that they teach 6 classes per year, and 17.7% (132;  $N = 747$ ) said they teach 8. A related question asked how much of that teaching is in theory. Just over half of those answering this question (53.2%, or 412 respondents) reported that theory makes up only half or less of their teaching load, while only just over a third (35.4%, or 274 respondents;  $N = 774$ ) reported that theory makes up at least three-quarters of their teaching.

Of respondents who answered a question about whether their school offers tenure, 96.9% (747;  $N = 771$ ) answered affirmatively. Those whose departments do offer tenure saw a follow-up question about the relative importance of teaching, research, and service in tenure decisions at their schools. Of respondents answering these questions, 54.1% (397;  $N = 731$ ) identified teaching, 45.5% (334;  $N = 729$ ) identified research, and only 0.4% (3;  $N = 732$ ) identified service as being the most

Table 5

**Rank Ordering of Scholars Doing Excellent Work Today Whose Work Will Be Influential during the Next 20 Years**

VOTES	NAME	VOTES	NAME	VOTES	NAME
40	Markell, Patchen	8	Gillespie, Michael	5	Rawls, John
39	Brown, Wendy	8	Manent, Pierre	5	Ryn, Claes
37	Connolly, William	8	Pogge, Thomas	5	Skinner, Quentin
29	Honig, Bonnie	8	Rancière, Jacques	5	Thiele, Leslie Paul
19	Mansfield, Harvey	7	Allen, Danielle	5	Waldron, Jeremy
19	Nussbaum, Martha	7	Cesar, James	5	White, Stephen
18	Kymlicka, Will	7	George, Robert	5	Žižek, Slavoj
18	Taylor, Charles	7	Hirschmann, Nancy	4	Appiah, Kwame Anthony
17	Pettit, Philip	7	Lawler, Peter	4	Arnhart, Larry
16	Benhabib, Seyla	7	Zuckert, Catherine	4	Eckersley, Robyn
16	Butler, Judith	6	Dean, Jodi	4	Ellis, Elisabeth
15	Deneen, Patrick	6	Deitz, Mary	4	Flathman, Richard
15	Pangle, Thomas	6	Mansbridge, Jane	4	Goodin, Robert
15	Walzer, Michael	6	Muthu, Sankar	4	Haraway, Donna
14	Euben, Roxanne	6	Nichols, Mary	4	Held, David
14	Zuckert, Michael	6	Smith, Rogers	4	Kohn, Margaret (Peggy)
13	Shapiro, Ian	6	Tully, James	4	Krause, Sharon
12	Dryzek, John	5	Agamben, Giorgio	4	MacIntyre, Alasdair
11	Gutmann, Amy	5	Ball, Terence	4	Mehta, Uday
11	Habermas, Jürgen	5	Bartlett, Robert	4	Meier, Heinrich
10	Bennett, Jane	5	Cohen, Joshua	4	Mills, Charles
10	Sandel, Michael	5	Collins, Susan	4	Mitchell, Joshua
10	Villa, Dana	5	Dienstag, Joshua Foa	4	Nelson, Eric
10	Zerilli, Linda	5	Dumm, Thomas	4	Okin, Susan Moller
9	Barber, Benjamin	5	Farr, James	4	Orwin, Clifford
9	Elshtain, Jean	5	Frank, Jill	4	Rehfeld, Andrew
9	Pitts, Jennifer	5	Galston, William	4	Sandoz, G. Ellis
9	Sen, Amartya	5	Macedo, Stephen	4	Saxonhouse, Arlene
9	Tuck, Richard	5	Mahoney, Daniel	4	Schall, James
8	Bruell, Christopher	5	McCormick, John	4	Smith, Steven
8	Coles, Romand	5	Nederman, Cary	4	Strong, Tracy
8	Fraser, Nancy	5	Rahe, Paul	4	Yack, Bernard

Note: This list includes only those scholars who received at least four votes.

important factor in tenure decisions at their institution.<sup>6</sup> Those who indicated that their school grants tenure were also asked how many and what type of publications, if any, were required for tenure. The results, summarized in Table 2, show that the majority of the respondents—60.6% (446; *N* = 736) —are in departments that do not require a scholar to publish a book to gain tenure.

A final question in this set asked how much time the respondent had spent on the job market before finding a tenure-track position. The responses are summarized in

Table 3. Two noteworthy findings are that 55.6% (419) of respondents who answered this question found a tenure-track job within a year of receiving their Ph.D., and that nearly 90% (672; *N* = 754) of those looking for one found a tenure-track position within five years.

A vast majority 90.6% (696; *N* = 768) of respondents reported that they were political scientists by training, but of those only 66.3% (451; *N* = 680) indicated that political theory was their primary subfield, while 19.7% (113; *N* = 574) indicated that it was their secondary field. That suggests that more than 20% of respondents who are teaching political theory are not specialists in the field (adding together those who are not political scientists with those for whom theory is neither their primary nor secondary field).

Of those who reported being political scientists by training 81.5% (555; *N* = 681) belong to the APSA. Of these, only 44.9% (249; *N* = 554) belong to the Foundations of Political Thought organized section within the APSA. This suggests that a majority of the people teaching political theory in the U.S. today are members of the APSA, but not of the Foundations section.

**RANKINGS**

Several questions asked respondents to rank scholars, presses, journals, and professional associations. The results are presented in Tables 4–8. All of the ranking questions had the same basic format, asking respondents to identify up to five

entries for each category. The rank orderings were determined by the total number of votes received for each response.

**GRADUATE TRAINING IN POLITICAL THEORY**

The survey asked three questions about the training of graduate students. Respondents who indicated that their departments grant the M.A. or Ph.D. were asked whether their department offers theory as a primary or major area of concentration for graduate students; 68.2% (206; *N* = 302) said “yes.” Of those same respondents, only 33.9% (102; *N* = 301) reported

Table 6

### Rank Ordering of Journals Related to Political Theory That Respondents Report Reading

VOTES	JOURNAL	VOTES	JOURNAL	VOTES	JOURNAL
407	<i>Political Theory</i>	22	<i>Perspectives on Politics</i>	7	<i>Politics &amp; Gender</i>
205	<i>American Political Science Review</i>	21	<i>Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society</i>	7	<i>Public Culture</i>
121	<i>Review of Politics</i>	20	<i>Journal of the History of Ideas</i>	7	<i>Review of Metaphysics</i>
90	<i>History of Political Thought</i>	16	<i>Perspectives on Political Science</i>	7	<i>Social Theory and Practice</i>
74	<i>Polity</i>	15	<i>New Political Science</i>	6	<i>Humanitas</i>
73	<i>Journal of Political Philosophy</i>	13	<i>Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy</i>	6	<i>Politics &amp; Religion</i>
67	<i>theory &amp; event</i>	12	<i>Political Studies</i>	5	<i>Journal of Social Philosophy</i>
63	<i>Ethics</i>	11	<i>Critical Inquiry</i>	5	<i>Radical Philosophy</i>
57	<i>Philosophy &amp; Public Affairs</i>	11	<i>Philosophy &amp; Social Criticism</i>	4	<i>differences: a journal of feminist cultural studies</i>
54	<i>Journal of Politics</i>	11	<i>Political Science Reviewer</i>	4	<i>Ethics &amp; International Affairs</i>
47	<i>Contemporary Political Theory</i>	9	<i>Telos</i>	4	<i>Gender and Politics</i>
43	<i>Constellations</i>	7	<i>Modern Age</i>	4	<i>Millennium: Journal of International Studies</i>
41	<i>Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy</i>	7	<i>New Left Review</i>	4	<i>Politics, Philosophy &amp; Economics</i>
29	<i>European Journal of Political Theory</i>	7	<i>Polis</i>	4	<i>PS: Political Science &amp; Politics</i>
23	<i>American Journal of Political Science</i>	7	<i>Political Science Quarterly</i>	4	<i>Rethinking Marxism</i>

Note: This list includes only those journals that received at least four votes.

Table 7

### Rank Ordering of Publishers Related to Political Theory Whose Books Respondents Report Reading

VOTES	PUBLISHER	VOTES	PUBLISHER	VOTES	PUBLISHER
278	Cambridge University Press	22	Hackett Publishing Company	7	I.S.I. Books
251	Princeton University Press	22	Verso Books	7	New York University Press
235	Oxford University Press	18	Blackwell (Wiley)	7	W.W. Norton & Company
187	University of Chicago Press	18	University of California Press	5	Continuum
138	Harvard University Press	17	University of Missouri Press	5	Penguin
92	Routledge	16	Columbia University Press	5	Temple University Press
76	Rowman & Littlefield	16	Johns Hopkins University Press	5	Transaction Publishers
60	Duke University Press	15	Lexington Books	5	University Press of Kentucky
60	Yale University Press	15	Stanford University Press	4	Basic Books
59	University of Minnesota Press	13	Liberty Fund	4	Catholic University of America Press
48	Cornell University Press	11	Pearson	4	Cengage Learning
47	University Press of Kansas	11	University of Notre Dame Press	4	CQ Press
44	Pennsylvania State University Press	9	Macmillan	4	St. Augustine's Press
28	State University of New York Press	9	Sage	4	University of North Carolina Press
23	MIT Press	8	Polity		

Note: This list includes only those publishers that received at least four votes. Votes for subsidiaries were added to the vote totals for the named publishers.

Table 8

### Rank Ordering of Professional Organizations Related to Political Theory to Which Respondents Report Belonging

VOTES	ORGANIZATION
496	American Political Science Association (includes organized sections)
123	Association for Political Theory
95	Western Political Science Association (includes organized sections)
61	Midwest Political Science Association
36	International Conference for the Study of Political Thought
33	American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy
27	International Studies Association
24	Southern Political Science Association
16	Northeastern Political Science Association
14	New England Political Science Association
14	Society for Ancient Greek Philosophy
10	International Political Science Association
9	Law and Society Association
8	American Philosophical Association
7	Association for the Study of Law, Culture and the Humanities
7	Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy
6	Canadian Political Science Association
6	Eric Voegelin Society
6	Southwest Political Science Association
5	American Psychological Association
5	American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies
5	Oakeshott Association
5	Rousseau Association
4	American Historical Association
4	American Society for Public Administration
4	AMINTAPHIL (International Association for Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy)
4	Christians in Political Science
4	Hegel Society of America

Note: This list includes only those associations that received at least four votes.

that their department requires graduate students to take at least one political theory class. Further, all respondents were asked to rank political science Ph.D. programs in terms of the quality of their training in political theory; their responses are summarized in Table 9.

Because the original survey focused on individuals as the unit of analysis, rather than institutions, it was difficult to tell how representative the findings summarized above were of political science Ph.D. programs. To get a more complete picture of the status of political theory in American graduate programs, I conducted a follow-up survey of the graduate directors of the 129 programs identified by the APSA as granting a Ph.D. in political science. I received answers from 95 of the program

directors, and was able to identify 10 other programs that are either currently inactive or offer a Ph.D. only in a coordinate field, such as public administration. For the remaining programs, I visited their websites and gathered as much information as possible.<sup>7</sup> This follow-up survey found that theory is available as a major/primary field in 69.7% (83) and available as a secondary or minor field in 77.3% (92) of the active programs ( $N = 119$ ). Only 27.7% (33) of active programs require their Ph.D. students to take at least one theory class. In terms of the percentage of Ph.D.s granted in theory in an average year, the mean response was 12.4% and the median was 10% ( $N = 91$ ). The mean percentage of theorists on the full-time, tenure-track faculty of the active Ph.D. programs is 16.9% and the median is 11.7% ( $N = 90$ ). Regarding full-time, non-tenure track faculty, the mean percentage of theorists was 14%, while the median was 0% ( $N = 90$ ).

### CONCLUSION

My hope is that the results of these surveys will be the catalyst for a discussion among political theorists and within the discipline more broadly about the role of theory in political science, as well as about whether we are training graduate students appropriately for the jobs that await them. Knowing the actual state of political theory in the discipline is the first step in deciding whether we are happy with the status quo and, if not, how we might go about changing it. ■

### NOTES

*An earlier version of this essay was presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. I would like to thank my fellow panelists, and the members of the audience, for their helpful suggestions on that occasion. That earlier version of the paper has more complete versions of some of the tables included here, and is available through the Social Science Research Network at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1463648>. I would also like to thank Prof. Jeff Sklar of the Statistics Department of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, for his generous assistance as part of the University's Statistical Consulting Service.*

1. My research has turned up only one other national survey of political theorists; Hajjar and Brzezinski's (1978) 1977 survey resulted in 172 responses.
2. Other findings from the survey, primarily concerned with what and how political theorists teach, will be published separately.
3. The debate has been going on for at least 50 years now. For example, see Smith (1957), which contains an excellent short list of earlier related articles. See also Cobban (1953).
4. The following students (and a few former students!) provided invaluable help (much of it as volunteers), and have my profound thanks: Mallory Homewood, Kayvan Chinichian, Alex Finch, Alyson Pietrowski, Jimmy Sotelo, Leah Coleman, Alex Cunny, Christine Stradford, Manuel Reynoso, Maggie Stone, Janelle Little, Rob Binning, Andy Hillier, Doug Johns, Taylor Roschen, Sarah Prince, Lauren Schneider, Danielle Kennedy.
5. These are the scholars we initially identified as theorists, minus those whose invitations were returned as undeliverable or who identified themselves as ineligible, plus the people in the couldn't-rule-them-out category who responded and identified themselves as theorists.

**Table 9**  
**Rank Ordering of Political Science Ph.D. Programs by the Quality of Political Theory Training They Offer**

	WEIGHTED VOTES	SCHOOL	WEIGHTED VOTES	SCHOOL	WEIGHTED VOTES	SCHOOL
1013	23	Princeton University	23	University of Hawaii at Manoa	4	Lancaster University (UK)
921	22	Harvard University	22	Louisiana State University	4	Amherst College
900	22	University of Chicago	22	Michigan State University	4	University of Tennessee, Knoxville
523	20	University of California, Berkeley	20	University of California, San Diego	4	University of Houston
506	19	Yale University	19	London School of Economics	3	Australian National University
402	19	Johns Hopkins University	19	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	3	California Institute of Technology
277	15	Duke University	15	University of Massachusetts, Amherst	3	American University
264	14	University of Notre Dame	14	City University of NY, Graduate Center	3	Free University of Berlin
252	13	Northwestern University	13	Northern Illinois University	3	University of Georgia
178	12	Boston College	12	University of Maryland, College Park	3	Boston University
177	10	University of Texas at Austin	10	McGill University	3	Johns Hopkins University: SAIS
151	9	University of California, Los Angeles	9	University of California, Santa Barbara	3	State University of New York at Albany
139	9	Columbia University	9	University of Colorado at Boulder	3	State University of New York at Stony Brook
133	8	Georgetown University	8	Duquesne University	3	University of Oregon
115	8	University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	8	George Mason University	3	Villanova University
110	7	University of Toronto	7	Emory University	3	Texas A & M University
94	6	Stanford University	6	University of Southern California	3	College of William and Mary
92	6	Cornell University	6	Fordham University	3	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
83	6	Claremont College/Graduate University	6	University of Rochester	2	University of California, Davis
75	6	University of Michigan	6	Ohio State University, Columbus Campus	2	Georgia State University
75	6	University of Virginia	6	University of Essex (UK)	2	Oberlin College
72	5	New School University	5	University of California, Irvine	2	University of Oklahoma
69	5	Oxford University	5	Clark Atlanta University	2	Queen's University (Canada)
57	5	Baylor University	5	University of Iowa	2	Vanderbilt University
54	5	Catholic University of America	5	Tulane University	2	University of Paris (Sorbonne)
50	5	Rutgers, The State University of NJ	5	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1	University of California, Riverside
40	5	New York University	5	University of Missouri, Columbia	1	European Graduate School
36	5	University of Pennsylvania	5	Washington University in St. Louis	1	University of New Orleans
36	5	University of Dallas	5	Syracuse University	1	Smith College
34	5	University of California, Santa Cruz	5	University of North Texas	1	Macquarie University (Australia)
33	5	University of Wisconsin-Madison	5	University of Wales Aberystwyth	1	North Carolina State University
31	4	Cambridge University	4	Arizona State University	1	State University of New York at Buffalo
31	4	University of Washington	4	University of Arizona	1	University of British Columbia
28	4	Brown University	4	Loyola University of Chicago	1	University of Wales Swansea
27	4	Indiana University, Bloomington	4	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	1	Northwest University
25		York University (Canada)				

Note: The question asked respondents to rank order their responses. Schools ranked number 1 received 5 points, number 2 received 4 points, and so on. This list is ranked by the schools' weighted totals. Every school that received at least one vote is included in this list, including schools that do not currently offer the Ph.D. in political science but were named by respondents.

---

## Symposium: *Political Theorists*

---

6. Rothgeb and Burger's (2009) recent survey of department chairs has revealed a great deal of information about tenure in political science generally.
7. A table showing the complete results is available in the version of this paper presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. That paper is available through the Social Science Research Network: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1463648>.

---

### REFERENCES

- APSA. 2001. *APSA Survey of Political Science Departments, 2000–2001*. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.
- . 2007. *Directory of Political Science Faculty & Programs 2007–2008*. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.
- Cobban, Alfred. 1953. "The Decline of Political Theory." *Political Science Quarterly* 68 (3): 321–37.
- Hajjar, Sami G., and Steven Brzezinski. 1978. "Teaching Normative Political Theory: A Nationwide Faculty Survey." *Teaching Political Science* 5 (3): 295–306.
- Rothgeb, John M., Jr., and Betsy Burger. 2009. "Tenure Standards in Political Science Departments: Results from a Survey of Department Chairs." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 42 (3): 513–19.
- Smith, David G. 1957. "Political Theory and Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 51 (3): 734–46.