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Is there a gap between the theory and practice of international relations (IR)? If so, what does the gap look like? Who—scholars or practitioners—is responsible for the gap? Should we seek to bridge that gap? Some scholars “insist on the benefits to be gained from trying to bridge the gap, highlighting the contribution that theoretical inquiry can make to the policy world and the responsibility of academics to contribute towards resolving policy challenges. Others argue for the continued importance of a division of labor, stressing that the logic of theoretical enquiry demands analytical and critical distance from power and politics.” (Hurrell 2011) Finally, who can and should bridge this gap, and what might they do to narrow the gulf between the academic and policy communities of IR? This annotated bibliography examines existing works on the interaction between the theory and practice of international relations that explore these and related questions.

Scholars within many academic fields explore their discipline’s relevance to policy practitioners. This bibliography includes works primarily from the field of international relations, but we also include some works on the policy relevance of political science and the social sciences, more generally. We categorize the academic field in which each work is located, the audience to whom its argument is directed, or the field from which it draws its assumptions, beliefs, or knowledge.

This is an early draft of a living document. As you read the abstracts and use the document, please send us additional citations for works that you feel should be included. Also, as you explore the bibliography and the works it references, please also remember that analysis of the works collected in the snowball sample is not yet complete. We caution, for instance, against using the data to develop or test citation networks.
**Methodology:**

We began our collection of sources to include in this bibliography with a series of keyword searches. We initially identified relevant works using the following terms:

- Theory and practice
- Policy relevance
- The gap
- Scholarship and policymaking
- Practitioners and academics
- Ivory tower
- The academy
- Experts
- Discipline

When necessary, we filtered the initial keyword searches with the following constraining keywords:

- International relations
- IR
- Political science
- Social science

We restricted our keyword searches to the following domains:


- Articles available in the *Social Science Citation Index* via Thomson Reuters Web of Science

- Non-scholarly articles in *Foreign Affairs, Foreign Policy, Wall Street Journal, New York Times, Washington Post, and ForeignPolicy.com*

---

1 Initially, we also included a number of well-known books in our seed dataset. After completing a keyword search of scholarly and non-scholarly articles, we discovered that all the books we had identified had emerged in our snowball sample of journal articles. In the future, we plan to conduct a library database search to systematically check for additional books.

2 These journals are included in the TRIP journal article database. The selection of the top twelve IR journals is based on Garand and Giles’s (2003) impact rankings.

3 We perform an initial keyword search in these sources for three reasons. First, these publications have been sources of seminal articles, op-eds, and critiques in the policy relevance debate. Second, these publications are probably less likely to be cited in peer-reviewed journals and academic books, owing to their non-scholarly nature. Third, these publications are probably less likely to directly cite other sources in
The publications derived from a search of these domains are treated as the primary seed dataset. The seeds include both works that are widely cited and considered foundational and other, less frequently referenced works that were picked up in our keyword searches.

We built a citation network through a snowball sampling technique that begins with the seed articles. Our search methodology first considers works in the citation network moving backward in time (bibliographic coupling). It then considers works in the citation network moving forward in time (co-citations).

Each entry in this bibliography includes bibliographic information on the work, as well as a paragraph summarizing the article according to our key questions:

- Is there a gap between the theory and practice of international relations?
- What is the nature of that gap?
- Who is responsible for it?
- Is the gap a good thing, or should it be bridged?
- Who should bridge it?
- How might it be bridged?

Where available, we also include the published abstract, publisher summary, or relevant excerpt if available and applicable.

constructing their arguments. These final two criteria inhibit articles from these publications from being identified in a snowball sampling technique.

Editor Summary:
The Aall article is an evaluation undertaken by an American expert in managing international education and training of a set of case studies in which scholar-practitioners attempted to apply their knowledge and hunches to conflict management and resolution in the field.

TRIP Summary:
Policymakers tend to dismiss academics and their theories, while academics scoff at the policymaker’s ad-hoc approach to policy formulation. Aall argues that despite the negative views held by academics and policymakers toward one another, the subfield of peacekeeping has been relatively successful in maintaining close ties between the communities. In this subfield, the academy has oriented itself towards nonofficial, or “track two,” approaches to conflict resolution. Unlike game theory and other academic advancements that feed directly into formal policy and strategy structures, track two academic research can contribute most in nonofficial policy environments. The author briefly examines the cases of the Norwegian FAFO, the Workshop on Managing Potential Conflict in the South China Sea, the Inter-Tajik Dialogue, and the High Commissioner for National Minorities of the OSCE. To adequately prepare upcoming generations of peacekeepers, scholars and academic institutions should continue to strengthen institutional ties with the policy community.


Abstract:
While an interactive relationship between scholars and policymakers is generally regarded as mutually beneficial, there is also the risk of “entrapment.” The latter occurs when scholars, once having proven their usefulness to policymakers and thereby earned their trust, become unwilling to offer dissenting opinions for the fear of risking their access and privileges. Using Asian regionalism as an example, this article argues that the development of regional institutions in Asia has benefitted from the ideas and input of the two main channels of such scholar-official interaction: epistemic communities and track two dialogues, especially during the formative stages of Asian regionalism (both economic and security). But after gaining access, scholars engaged with officialdom in developing regional institutions have found it difficult to dissent from the official line, and in challenging the shortcomings and failures of Asian regional institutions. In Asia,
the danger of entrapment has been strong in authoritarian countries. In general, participation by Asian scholars in the policymaking process has suffered from the inability of scholars and think-tankers (especially the latter) to rise above the national interest and question the official position of their own governments, the ubiquitous presence and dominance of government-linked scholars or retired government officials in track two dialogues, the exclusion of social movements from many such dialogues, the presence and influence of non-specialists (in issue areas) in setting their agenda and outcome, and generational gatekeeping (failure to bring in new faces). As a result, the development of a genuine transnational regionalism has been stunted.

**TRIP Summary:**
Epistemic communities and track-two dialogues facilitate scholars’ access to policy communities, to which they can innovate, filter, validate, legitimize, and dissent to ideas and theories. In the case of Asian regionalism, Acharya finds these channels alive and robust, facilitating institution-building and community idea formation. But autocratic governments in Asia limit scholarly autonomy, and in order to preserve close ties to policymakers, academics legitimize state platforms more than they dissent. The gap, then, between policymakers and academics, needs to be widened institutionally: both will benefit when the former allows the latter free flow of ideas and the ability to set an autonomous research agenda.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

**TRIP Summary:**
American IR scholars, communicating their ideas to American policymakers in a domestic epistemic community, were instrumental in the understanding of arms control during the Cold War. The academy is the natural environment in which “scientific” and technical theories can form and be validated before being transmitted to the political system by academics. In turn, those theories shape national understanding of strategic relationships. In contrast with explanations supported by structural realism, scholars shaped leaders’ views and actions in two-level arms control games by contributing to common understandings and practices. Thus the arms control epistemic community in the United States contributed directly to crisis understanding and policy formation, and the strong links between the academic and policy communities in this case was both critical and beneficial for U.S. nuclear policy.

Abstract:
Most conceptualizations of the linkage between science and politics have traditionally been informed by rationalist concepts of science and decision making. The result has been a false dichotomy between (legitimate) rational research utilization and (illegitimate) political research utilization. This dichotomy must be overcome, on normative as well as empirical grounds. Scientifically generated knowledge constitutes an important, but on the whole unquantifiable part of the enormous store of knowledge which participants in the politico-administrative decision making process apply to their practical tasks. To understand the complex interfaces between social science research and the political-administrative decision making process, it is necessary to be aware that research is transferred to, and becomes part of, a discourse of action, in the philosophical as well as the everyday practical sense - a discourse in which (self)reflecting participants deliberate on and debate norms and alternatives with a view to concrete action. This makes the contribution of science to policymaking both less tangible and potentially more influential than is usually assumed.

TRIP Summary:
Most tests of the linkage between social science and policy consider the impacts of rationalist scientific theories on rationalist decision-making and find that theory infrequently shapes policy. But non-rational, non-positivist social science also contributes to the policy decision-making process, which is characterized more by chance (as in a garbage-can perspective) than by predictable and rational choices. The gap between theory and practice, which would seem large if viewed through a strictly rationalist lens, is actually much narrower: science and politics aren’t wholly different entities, as there “is no science without interests, and no politics without analytical reflection.” In order to further strengthen the links, the author recommends both scholars and policymakers recognize the legitimacy of the influences of non-rational science on non-rational policy.


Abstract:
What do the most senior national security policymakers want from international relations scholars? To answer that question, we administered a unique survey to current and former policymakers to gauge when and how they use academic social science to inform national security decision making. We find that policymakers do regularly follow academic social science research and scholarship on national security affairs, hoping to draw upon its substantive expertise. But our results call into question the direct relevance to policymakers of the most scientific approaches to international relations. And they at best seriously qualify the “trickle down” theory that basic social science research eventually
influences policymakers. To be clear, we are not arguing that policymakers never find scholarship based upon the cutting-edge research techniques of social science useful. But policymakers often find contemporary scholarship less-than-helpful when it employs such methods across the board, for their own sake, and without a clear sense of how such scholarship will contribute to policymaking.

TRIP Summary:
In light of the existence of a gap between the worlds of policy and academia, what do policymakers really want from IR scholars? Paul Avey and Michael Desch use data from the TRIP survey and the parallel policymaker survey to argue that the gap is harmful because it is in neither realm’s best interest. Policymakers hope to learn from national security scholarship expertise, but are deterred by jargon, technique, and an unjustified scholarly preference of harder-to-apply quantitative knowledge over more applicable qualitative research. The gap exists largely because of the structure of the academy and the demands of the policy environment: the former doesn’t place emphasis on pursuing policy-relevant research while the latter limits the time and energy policymakers have to digest complex basic science. Policymakers rely significantly on resources like op-eds and newspapers for information rather than the channels, like scholarly journals, that academics regularly publish in. To bridge the gap, scholars should first focus on condensing their findings to make them more palatable in op-eds, policy journals, or blogs. They should also work to generate simple, mid-range theories, which policymakers prefer over parsimonious but methodologically complex theoretical approaches.


Abstract:
This article explores the different approaches to study of conflict resolution from a variety of interdisciplinary perspectives. It argues that CR research is sophisticated and nuanced, addressing both state-level and group-level motivations behind political violence. The article argues that there are two distinct strands within CR scholarship: one that deals with “conflict transformation;” the other which deals with “conflict settlement.” Although these two strands are sometimes seen as offering conflicting interpretations of conflict, we are argue that they are essentially complementary and have much to offer theoretically and practically to policymakers.

TRIP Summary:
This article reviews and espouses the benefits of conflict resolution research in the “conflict transformation” and “conflict settlement” tracks. In a bulleted list, the author explores the extent to which CR research has had a direct impact on policymaking in the US government, intergovernmental, and non-governmental
institutions. The authors blame the theory-policy gap on differences in professional cultures between the scholarly and policy worlds. They then propose that both scholars and policymakers work to strengthen the links: the former, by exposing future generations of policymakers to CR research in their graduate education, and the latter by making an effort to have at least some members of the policy community follow CR research and translate it for their peers. Think tanks, the authors argue, can also bridge the gap by converting CR research into more accessible policy language.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
The policy community dangerously ignores scholars and their research, which threatens informed policy and the utility in the policy world of a scholarly method of thinking. Drawing from personal experience transitioning from academia to the policy community, Barnett argues policymakers miss the nuance found in exhaustive, methodical academic research. Scholars can reach the policymaker’s ear if they present their findings in short, easily digestible “talking points” in media such as Foreign Policy magazine. But policymakers are making decisions without the advice of experts at their peril: their own personal experiences and impressions too often guide foreign policy. The author implies that the responsibility to close the gap lies primarily with policymakers, who need to be more open to turn to academic information sources and who ought to even consider scholars role models.


Abstract:
We review the relevance of the international relations articles published in the first 100 years of the Review for American foreign policy. We define a spectrum of “policy relevance” and give a brief overview of the Review’s changing relationship to American foreign policy as the journal, the profession, and the foreign policy process evolved over the last century. We then look at the Review’s role in key periods in American foreign policy, focusing in particular on the example of the democratic peace literature. We conclude that although the content of the journal has moved away from early aspirations to near-term and direct policy relevance, the journal has evolved toward basic research that influences
American foreign policies by affecting what scholars teach students, publish in policy journals, write in newspaper op-eds, say on the media, advise political leaders, and do when they are themselves in public office.

**TRIP Summary:**
Analyzing articles published by the *American Political Science Review* between 1906 and 2006, Bennett and Ikenberry survey the impact scholarly literature has had on both academia and the US Foreign Policy process. The *Review* saw a sharp decline in articles aspiring to near-term policy relevance in the 1950s as scholars transitioned to building more basic theory. Publication lag times hamper near-term relevance in a frequently-evolving policy context, and thus timing is more of a problem than brevity or accessibility. The impact of the *Review*, as a conduit of knowledge for the scholarly community, is mostly indirect, in that it informs new students and enriches the body of available information from which policymakers can form their conclusions. Links are alive and well between the social sciences and policy, guided primarily by basic research which can trickle down through policy journals to practitioners. In order to continue bridging the gap, journals like the *Review* should not discount the merit of such longer-term policy relevance.

---


**Editor Summary:**
Thomas Biersteker, who was Director of the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University, reflects on his experience of not only analyzing targeted UN sanctions, but also participating in initiatives to promote them. He shows how academic involvement in the policy process can encounter dilemmas, such as how to maintain access and speak critically knowing when principle matters more than continued access.

**TRIP Summary:**
Scholars consulting for governmental or intergovernmental institutions can be afforded extraordinary access to policymakers, but in directly influencing the policymaking process they are “torn between irrelevance and absorption.” Biersteker describes his personal experience researching targeted sanctions as director of the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University, particularly his team’s involvement in drafting a report on UN Security Council sanctions commissioned by Switzerland, Sweden, and Germany. Direct policy exposure can be beneficial for scholars because firsthand knowledge of processes allows them to see exactly how things work. But scholars catering to the policy community face the risk of “absorption” if they choose to self-censor in acquiescing to policymaker opinions and demands. Scholars should take advantage of opportunities to interact with and influence policymakers, but should
remain cognizant of the balance between an important commitment to social science and continued access to decisionmakers.


**Publisher Summary:**
Why do politicians and civil servants commission research, and what use do they make of it in policymaking? The received wisdom is that research contributes to improving government policy. Christina Boswell challenges this view, arguing that policymakers are just as likely to value expert knowledge for two alternative reasons: as a way of lending authority to their preferences; or to signal their capacity to make sound decisions. Boswell develops a compelling new theory of the role of knowledge in policy. She illustrates her argument with an analysis of European immigration policies, charting the ways in which expertise becomes a resource for lending credibility to controversial claims, underpinning high-risk decisions or bolstering the credibility of government agencies. This book will make fascinating reading for those interested in the interface between policymaking, academic research and political legitimacy.

**TRIP Summary:**
Policymakers use expert knowledge not only for instrumental policy improvements, but also to legitimize political figures and lend authority to their preferences. Comparing British and German immigration policies, Boswell argues that political pressures can often overwhelm expert opinion, causing the latter to be underutilized and even misapplied. Academics, for their part, produce research that is often too abstract for policymakers to decode, and is frequently not applicable to issues on the policy agenda. The author emphasizes the need for closer relationships, both individually and collectively, between academics and policymakers. Closer, more sustained interaction can increase understanding of academic advancements, decrease misuse of theories and scholarly knowledge, and refocus the use of research towards policy improvement.


**Abstract:**
What does it take to be an international relations (IR) scholar? IR discourses have tackled this question with focus on very different problems: the role and function of IR scholars for policy; the (ir)relevance and impact of IR knowledge and expertise in world politics; disciplinary history; or in studying IR’s institutions. We argue that all these “disciplinary sociology” debates struggle with the relation between an internal scientific IR world and an external social context (policy,
society). We reject this distinction and argue that science studies can help us to address these problems more adequately by treating IR as a scientific practice that is closely tied to its social environment. The article sets out to explore science studies’ possible contributions. Based on science studies key assumptions, we develop a heuristic by which the relations between IR and its environment can be grasped systematically. From this perspective, IR is pivotally a culture constituted by different domains of practice. Hence, understanding IR scholars in “doing IR” requires taking into account their daily and sometimes trivial practices. For instance, writing an article in IR means much more than only thinking theoretically at a desk. We systematize the different domains of practices as the articulation of knowledge claims, mobilizing the world, autonomy seeking, alliance building, and public representation. “Being an IR scholar” and “producing IR knowledge” depends inevitably on these sets of practices and IR is intrinsically interwoven with its environment through these.

**TRIP Summary:**
International relations, like other science, is a social process and should be studied as such, according to the conceptualizations presented in the sociology of science discourse. Existing literature in international relations has framed the question of “how context and knowledge production speak to each other” in six ways: the question of irrelevance, bridging the gap for knowledge transfer, the role of knowledgeable experts, effects and consequences of scholarly input, the study of disciplinary history, and, from sociology, the threats of the “knowledge society.” Each of these frames examines the internal-external dilemma, between the study of IR and the “outside” world. Science studies can transcend this dilemma by focusing on five interactive domains of practices in the study of IR: the practice of links and knots, the practice of mobilizing the world according to an analytical framework (e.g. the “levels of analysis”), the practice of autonomization, the practice of alliance-building, and the practice of public representation. Research in the theory-practice literature should not solely examine the IR-policy nexus nor the policy relevance of theory, but rather prescribe solutions for managing the relationship between theory and practice.


**Publisher Summary:**
Following World War II, American social science research became increasingly characterized by its adherence to the scientific method. The application of the scientific method and efforts to achieve precision in the social sciences opened the doors to large research programs, particularly in political science and international relations. However, as research became less accessible to the general public, policymakers began to ignore the findings and advice given to them by political scientists. The disconnect between policy and academic debates was exacerbated
by the failure of empirical research to predict important developments, such as the fall of the Soviet Union and the peaceful resolution of the Cold War.

James W. Davis engages with the widespread dissatisfaction within the social sciences applying the scientific method to the study of social outcomes. *Terms of Inquiry* critically examines central claims and assumptions made by proponents of the scientific method in general, as well as the specific problems confronting the social sciences in particular. Davis seeks to develop a middle ground between the uncritical application of the scientific method in pursuit of empirical truths and the postmodernist assertion that there is no foundation upon which to build an edifice of social science.

Although interested in fundamental questions of scientific inquiry, Davis is nonetheless concerned by the increasing irrelevance of the field of political science to the actual practice of politics. In an effort to re-link empirical research to pressing questions of public policy, *Terms of Inquiry* provides a much needed discussion of practical research methods in a critically important discipline.


**Abstract:**
Much of the policy literature holds that rigorous policy analysis as practiced in the defense policymaking community has a much greater influence than analysis performed in the nondefense or “domestic” sectors. This argument is examined by, first, offering several examples of quantitatively driven decisions in the U.S. Department of Defense and, second, inquiring more precisely as to the nature of the actual decision variables. The conclusion is that the defense and domestic modes of policy analysis and decision making are not as disparate as they are usually perceived. In practice, both camps share many of the same problems and could benefit from shared solutions.

**TRIP Summary:**
Quantitative, highly analytic models and analysis in defense research are likely more developed than such research in domestic fields, but this development does not necessarily correlate with higher levels of applicability to or influence on defense policy. Analytic input serves, rather than motivates, defense policymaking, for three reasons: most defense policy decisions are made on qualitative judgments, subjectively “satisfying” resolutions often take precedence over numerically dominated “solutions,” and oversimplified models can’t account for uncertain realities. deLeon concludes that such analysis will be more influential on policy when both policy analysts and policymakers have the same set of clear objectives. To help achieve this goal, the author stresses the importance of defense policy analysts adopting both a multidisciplinary perspective and a normative approach in their work.

Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Joseph Nye’s 2009 Washington Post op-ed unfairly blames academics for their perceived irrelevance and disregards advances in policy-relevant forecasting power. Desai and Vreeland assert that a focus on methodological rigor within the academy has made, or should make, IR scholarship even more policy-relevant, because today’s statistical tools and theoretic models are clearer and more precise than ever. The authors also contest the notion that teaching in International Relations focuses too much on irrelevant theories. Instead, they assert that one purpose of the classroom is to teach students to see connections between such maligned theories and the real world – to bridge the gap themselves. Finally, the authors dispute Nye’s basic premise that the fault for the theory-policy gap lies in academia. Whereas staffers in the country’s economic and monetary agencies are trained to understand the mathematical and statistical models of economists in academia, the political arms of the government do little to either hire individuals with or equip employees with the knowledge necessary to understand and apply political science to improve policy.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Academics can influence the formulation of better national security policy, and have done so many times in recent decades of U.S. history, but today they face the rise in prominence of non-academic intellectuals, a lack of public confidence in academia, and the threat of being ignored when their ideas don’t align with policymakers’ existing opinions. Desch cites the cases of nuclear deterrence theory, political development and nation-building, and the use of systems analysis as evidence of direct social science impacts on past national policy. But today’s academics must compete with think tanks and “beltway bandits” who do less-rigorous but more timely work, and work to convince the anti-intellectual public that sometimes scholars do know best in matters of war and peace. In order to remedy these problems that arose in the policy community, scholars should re-engage with national security policy, policymakers should “be willing to really
listen” to the academy, and the public should look to intellectuals for more accurate information than is often provided by the government.


**Abstract:**
There are few issue areas within international relations in which the policy realm has followed the scholarship quite as quickly or as far as in the area of the environment. After simple identification of the existence and causes of existing environmental problems, both scholarship and policy initially focused on formal institutional approaches for addressing these problems, and both have expanded that focus to include greater consideration of informal approaches, expansion of the environmental issues considered, and concentration on the importance of nonstate actors. Critical scholarship, the one area of scholarship with little connection to policy, calls attention to the interests, power structures, and assumptions that underlie environmental behavior and suggests that small-scale improvements over business-as-usual are misleading and even counterproductive. But most environmental politics scholarship has drawn direct influence from, and contributed to, policy pertaining to the environment. Ultimately, it is likely that both scholarship and policy have been strengthened by this close connection, but at the same time, both have perhaps been narrowed by it as well, so that some important issues or approaches have been understudied. While there are advantages to the close relationship in this subfield between scholarship and policy, there may be some advantages in the future to encouraging some distance between the two, even for those ultimately concerned about the fate of the global environment.

**TRIP Summary:**
Traditional environmental policy research in international relations academia has focused on finding solutions to policy inaction and on the creation of international institutions to mitigate environmental harms, and has thus, either implicitly or explicitly, been policy-interested and often policy-relevant. DeSombre argues that critical environmental scholarship, which examines the causes of inaction and the “problems created by the way human activity is economically and politically organized,” is often ignored and even derided for producing few explicit policy recommendations, but should be considered even more important due to its “disconnect with policy.” International organizations sponsor research on international environmental negotiations, but this support reinforces institutionalist approaches that favor existing structures. Thus, while some
environmental IR scholars have maintained symbiosis with the policy community, critical scholarship is underrepresented in the policy dialogue and should not be ignored.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Political science is hyper-specialized in methodology, theory, and vocabulary, and increasingly irrelevant in a world that demands answers to uncharted international questions such as terrorism. Writing in the wake of the September 11, 2001 terror attacks, Diamond argues political science must renew a commitment to oft-scorned area studies, and has a “moral imperative” to strive to broaden its audience in order to educate opinion leaders and policymakers on issues that “really matter to our national and global security.” The mission of political scientists is to promote debate and reasoned analysis of crucial policy questions, and scholars should also engage in such dialogue outside of edited volumes and rarified peer-reviewed journals. Diamond also recommends tenure decisions place more weight on policy-relevant publication, work oriented towards non-academic audiences, and work in area studies that is too often not considered “real” political science.


Abstract:
This essay reviews the literature and origins of the targeted sanctions framework. The development of smart sanctions has solved many of the political problems that prior efforts at comprehensive trade sanctions had created. In so doing, the idea of smart sanctions served as a useful focal point for policy coordination among key stakeholders. Nevertheless, there is no systematic evidence that smart sanctions will yield better policy results vis-à-vis the targeted country. Indeed, in many ways, the smart sanctions framework has been too successful. It would behoove policymakers and scholars to look beyond the targeted sanctions framework to examine the conditions under which different kinds of economic statecraft should be deployed.

TRIP Summary:
Targeted sanctions represent a “rare success story of fruitful collaboration between scholars, policymakers, and diplomats,” but scholars and policymakers alike should explore alternative frameworks for diplomatic coercion. Following
the controversial comprehensive sanctions against Iraq in the 1990s, track-two conferences brought scholars and policymakers together in shows of unprecedented consensus. Policymakers and scholars alike sought innovation in minimizing negative humanitarian externalities when implementing economic statecraft, and collaborated indirectly and directly towards that end. Drezner cautions scholars, however, against a narrow focus on causal mechanisms and process-tracing, which in “policy naïveté” can overlook substitutable causal processes.


Abstract:
This article discusses how and under what conditions ideas coming from International Relations (IR) scholarship are used in foreign policy. We argue that the focus on policy relevance, which dominates the IR literature on the research-policy interface, is limited. Focusing instead on political utilisation highlights types and mechanisms of political impact, which are overlooked in studies on policy relevance. The fruitfulness of this change in focus is showed in an analysis of how Samuel Huntington’s “clash of civilizations” notion and Joseph Nye’s “soft power” concept have been used in US foreign policy. George W. Bush’s explicit critique and reframing of “the clash” thesis should not be interpreted as absence of impact, but as a significant symbolic utilisation, which has helped legitimate US foreign policy. Likewise, in the few instances in which the notion of “soft power” has been used explicitly, it has played a conceptual and symbolical rather than instrumental role. More generally, this article argues that accessible framing and paradigm compatibility are essential for political utilisation of ideas.

TRIP Summary:
Scholars should conceptualize the research-policy interface in terms of political utilization as opposed to policy relevance, because while the latter perspective treats research as only a tool for “improving” policy, the former distinguishes between instrumental, conceptual, and symbolic utilization of research. Eriksson and Norman examine the Bush administration’s utilization of Huntington's “clash of civilizations” and Nye’s “soft power” ideas instrumentally, conceptually, and symbolically. Bush’s explicit critique and reframing of “the clash” thesis should not be interpreted as absence of impact, but rather as a significant symbolic utilization. Likewise, in the few instances in which the notion of “soft power” has been used explicitly, it has played a conceptual and symbolical rather than instrumental role. They find that scholarly ideas are politically utilized when they are framed in an accessible manner and when they are compatible with existing policy paradigms. Scholars should act as policy entrepreneurs by packaging and marketing their ideas to sympathetic policymakers.

Abstract:
How can policy-relevant ideas be effectively communicated to practitioners? While the existing literature has focused on what kind of theory and research are policy relevant, it does not say much about how this knowledge can be communicated. If you want to make a difference, you must know how to reach your target. We take note of the important, but in this context often overlooked opportunities for knowledge diffusion that are provided by the education of young minds and the training of mid-career officials and officers. This article first discusses three contending perspectives on the relationship between scholars and practitioners. It then makes a conceptual elaboration of conditions for communicating research to practitioners, drawing on a wide body of literature on the power of ideas. We conclude by summarizing pointers for how scholars may reflect and how we can act, if we wish to enrich foreign policy practice with research-based ideas.

TRIP Summary:
In their article, Eriksson and Sundelius review existing literature and perspectives on the gap between International Relations academics and policymakers. The authors attribute the gap to politically unviable scholarly research and lack of communication between the two groups, and contend that scholars should attempt to bridge it. Eriksson and Sundelius prescribe that scholars should work alongside policymakers, open new lines of communication to the policy world as a whole, reach out to policymakers with education, and center their policy recommendations around the conceptualization of problems and policy consequences in order to help mitigate the gap. In addition, the authors caution policymakers to make room for critical reflection.


Abstract:
International Relations (IR) scholarship is directly in the path of two simultaneous tidal waves. The first is the rise of China and India in the traditional IR terms of military and economic power. The second is the expanding nature of what IR scholarship needs to address, as global integration transforms the nature of the issues to be addressed and numerous trends expand the number and types of relevant actors. Neither theory nor practice is yet coping well with the profound implications of these fundamental changes. Investigating what kind of a world order might emerge from these two simultaneous tsunamis will require an enormous research agenda that explores the roles of ideas, structural factors, and path dependencies across regions and issue areas. This article aims to illuminate a
subset focused around the connection between theory and practice as related to two emerging powers. It briefly maps developments in Western IR theory and explores how those connect—or fail to connect—with intellectual and policy currents in the rising Asian giants. It draws on a number of interviews and workshops held in Asia in the past two years that explore how Asian scholars and policymakers are dealing with, and perhaps beginning to shape, the rapidly changing conceptual landscape.

TRIP Summary:
In this article, Ann Florini asserts that traditional IR scholarship is at odds with present realities in the international system, particularly the rise of China and India. She cites an increase in Chinese and Indian scholars studying IR, but points out a problem: the state-centric world view espoused by classical IR theory is not compatible with the present system, in which non-state actors are increasingly influential. As new Asian powers continue to gain global prominence, they produce more classically-educated IR scholars, who then face debates that do not reflect reality.


**Abstract:**
Progress in the study of international politics depends on systematic, rigorous theory and empirical testing. International Relations is most useful when scholars can identify with some confidence the causal forces that drive foreign policy and international interactions, not when they use their detailed empirical knowledge to offer opinions, however intelligent and well informed. Deterrence theory, the democratic peace research program, and the political economy of trade policy demonstrate the importance of both theory and empirical research in enhancing the understanding of international relations. The bargaining theory of war and open economy politics are the current frontiers of research on international relations and promise even greater understanding in the future.

TRIP Summary:
The authors cite examples of the policy community's use of academic literature on deterrence, democratic peace theory, and trade to illustrate the gap between the policy and academic communities of international relations. The authors claim that the gap is beneficial, because IR scholarship is not yet scientific enough to provide sound advice to the policy community. They therefore claim that the IR discipline must become more scientific before the gap can be bridged and that academics are primarily responsible for instigating this change.

Abstract:
Theory has influenced policy in international development but the interaction has been a two-way process. While theories legitimated new policy, appraisal of policy and experience have given rise to theoretical insights. But of the many competing ideas and theories, which ones influence policy? This article analyzes the influence of Sen’s capability and human development approach on the recent evolution of policy agendas in international development, notably the consensus on MDGs and on poverty as the priority concern. It argues that the capability approach played an important role in the contestations over structural adjustment and Washington Consensus policies that led to the new consensus over the MDGs, and help legitimate them, the neoliberal policy approaches of the Washington Consensus remain intact. This illustrates an important distinction between normative and causative ideas. The new consensus has adopted the normative ideas of the capability approach but not the causative ideas. These normative ideas were used to provide a new narrative for international development, not a new policy framework.

TRIP Summary:
Fukuda-Parr argues that despite the close linkages between policy and theory concerning international development, there has been a noted shift in the type of IR scholarship preferred by policymakers in the field of development. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) developed a wider focus on the field of development as a whole and thus required new interpretations from the academic community. Because of the wide variety of issues in the development world, the close relationship between academics and policymakers is better suited to a more theoretical one; creating frameworks within which policymakers can apply multiple cases has become the favored response desired from academia.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Academia too often looks inward and concerns itself with arcane debate, the validity and elegance of models, and complex theoretical constructs more so than important topics relevant to the real world. The academic incentive structure further entrenches such attitudes in hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions. Citing George’s Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy, Gallucci
concurs that IR scholars should seek more interdisciplinary approaches, embrace less parsimonious but more specifically applicable theory, and seek to build a community standard of mutual accountability with policymakers. The author also recommends scholars embrace area studies and privilege policy-relevant work in hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions.


**Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable**

**TRIP Summary:**
The search for policy relevance is excessive and even harmful. Unfortunately, political science is a unique study in that it wants to be “different but engaged,” involved in the policy process like economists but still without “killer apps” such as GDP. Political science can be useful to politics in three ways: expertise in connecting policies to outcomes, lending credibility to policymakers’ actions, and the provision of intellectual discipline and a logical mind to those who enter public service. Academics primarily seek to offer the first, policymakers primarily desire the second, and both communities that the third would be ideal, though unlikely. Gartzke argues that not all scholars should seek to interact with “real world” data or people, and some should look inward to help political science truly become “expert” knowledge.


**Abstract:**
I focus this essay on ways in which political scientists and historians can usefully learn from each other. I offer a number of suggestions for blending history and political science perspectives to produce more and better knowledge for statecraft. These observations derive from personal experience of working at the intersections between these two disciplines (as well as with psychology), and from collaborative work with historians.

**TRIP Summary:**
In this article, Alexander George examines how the combination of history and political science can lead to more informed foreign policy decisions. He believes that a gap currently exists between academia and the policy world because various aspects of scholarly research, especially the favoring of quantitative methods and the focus on generalizable theories, do not appeal to policymakers. To bridge the gap, George claims that historians and political scientists should join forces so that detailed case studies provided by historians can be merged with the theories
provided by political scientists. This hopefully would result in the creation of conditional generalizations for generic problems. He suggests, for example, that the two disciplines could join together to study instances when arms races lead to war, building their evaluation from case studies and theory, rather than claiming that all arms races lead to war.


**Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable**

**TRIP Summary:**
The culture and incentive structure of academia, which promote specialization and the development of “highly theoretical and abstract analyses that produce general propositions,” are at odds with the culture of the policy world, in which policymakers have little free time for reflection and nuanced analysis as they find solutions for immediate problems. Despite the benefits of abstract theory in providing contextual knowledge and diagnostic value to policymaking, scholars are unlikely to simply convince policymakers of their utility. Similarly, despite the value policy-relevant work could add to a scholar’s understanding of the world, the academic hiring and promotion structure will likely continue to ignore such work. Goldman argues both scholars and policymakers ought play roles in bridging the gap. Scholars should teach future policymakers how to apply their theoretical knowledge when they leave academia. Policymakers, for their part, should reach out to academics for assistance in developing near- and long-term policy. Both communities should work to recognize critical periods of uncertainty in which theories can provide new frameworks of understanding the world.


**Editor Summary:**
Natalie Goldring discusses a similar experience working on a UN disarmament and nonproliferation education study and advising a UN Experts Group. She describes the process as unprecedented cooperation with civil society that helped educate the public on disarmament issues and suggests it would not have been possible without academics willing to cross the academy-policy boundary to participate. She also reflects on the academic risks that this participation involved.

**TRIP Summary:**
A scholar working in both the academic and policy worlds has the opportunity to cross-apply lessons learned as well as the access to experts in both communities.
not otherwise afforded to members of just one. But floating between the two worlds can foster monetary instability and professional marginalization. Citing personal experience crossing the gap to consult in the United Nations, Goldring contrasts two cases of scholar-policymaker collaboration. The first case, a UN disarmament and nonproliferation education effort, was a successful example of the importance of incorporating scholarly research into international policy. The second case, a series of small arms and light weapons deliberations, was a failure in which civil society experts such as academics were largely ignored by policymakers. More academics should be willing to cross traditional boundaries to contribute directly to the policymaking process, and policymakers should both make such opportunities available and listen to the scholars who do attempt to participate.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Think tanks bridge the gap “between the worlds of ideas and action,” between academics driven by arcane debates and policymakers focused on tangible day-to-day policy goals. Haass reviews the history of the role of think tanks in US policy: the first wave of think tanks informed the American constituency towards the global community, the second received direct government funding to research deterrence strategy and game theory, and the third focuses “as much on advocacy as research,” in advancing specific ideologically-informed policy options. Scholars at think tanks can be relatively free from the biases and demands of both the academic and policy worlds, allowing them to provide recommendations to policymakers with few repercussions, inform the public, bring professionals together, and mediate sensitive dialogue between polarized policymakers and political entities. Think tank scholars can also quickly and easily cross over to the policy world, and recent presidential administrations have staffed the upper echelons of their foreign policy apparatuses with senior think tank experts.


Abstract:
In recent decades, many who are involved in international relations and foreign policy have bemoaned the increasing divide between what practitioners do and the issues scholars research. Accusations from
both sides have detailed what appear to be entrenched institutional cultures with few possibilities for change. The bridge linking these two communities appears to be broken. Despite myriad attacks, evidence on either side of the divide is desperately lacking. In this report we present a preliminary analysis of original data intended to shed light on the extent and type of gaps between scholars and different types of practitioners. Our examination reveals that the practitioners are, in fact, consuming research and scholarly material. This is consistent for all types of practitioner organizations including non-governmental organizations, intergovernmental organizations, governmental institutions, and business associations. However, a preliminary analysis of scholarly behavior reveals a very different trend whereby scholarly work seems much more isolated to scholarly circles. Thus, we conclude that a one-way bridge is a more accurate characterization of the connection between the practitioner and scholarly communities.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Hill argues that not only is there not a gap between the policy and academic communities of international relations but that one should be established. Because the area in which the two communities meet is very sensitive, IR scholars should maintain a certain amount of distance from the policy world as well as other disciplines. The author details the reactionary, contemporary issues obsessed IR discipline and warns that its usefulness could be diluted by the influence of policymakers. Hill notes that IR scholars need to balance between academic snobbery and maintaining perspective to avoid less useful research. To investigate world problems effectively, multiple approaches are required.


Abstract:
This article takes the example of global governance in order to reflect on the problematic relationship between theory and practice and on the gap that exists between the academic and policy worlds. That there is a gap between the two worlds is clear. Some insist on the benefits to be gained from trying to bridge the gap, highlighting the contribution that theoretical inquiry can make to the policy
world and the responsibility of academics to contribute towards resolving policy challenges. Others argue for the continued importance of a division of labour, stressing that the logic of theoretical enquiry demands analytical and critical distance from power and politics. This article does not examine either of these extreme positions but instead explores the dangers of the middle road. For academics, insufficient awareness of the problematic ways in which theory and practice are inextricably interwoven makes it more likely that they will fall hostage to the politics and parochial prejudices of both time and place. For policymakers and for those who teach public policy, the danger lies in seeking the authority and legitimacy of academic work that purportedly embodies objectivity and detachment but that in fact merely translates the prejudices and preoccupations of the policy world back into a different idiom. An unreflective and uncritical attitude to the relationship between theory and practice can leave the academic study of International Relations in the worst of all possible worlds.

**TRIP Summary:**

In his article, Hurrell uses the example of global governance to examine the problematic gap that exists between the academic and policy worlds. The author attributes the gap to the lack of policy relevance and difficult readability of academic scholarship. While Hurrell acknowledges existing views on whether to close the gap, he focuses his article on the dangers of a 'middle road' stance. He cautions that without an awareness of how theory and practice are interwoven, academics and policymakers will develop an unhealthy co-dependent relationship.


**Abstract:**

It has always been true that foreign policy debates tend to proceed on a weak evidentiary base, with clever quips or stirring oratory regularly trumping sound analysis. According to Thucydides, for example, the Athenian assembly that endorsed the Sicilian expedition during the second Peloponnesian War had only the haziest conception of the adversaries' capabilities. Contemporary politics is distinctive not in the sloganeering quality of political discourse, but in the divergence between the quality of information available to society as a whole and the quality of information used in making decisions. For example, it was clear to any open-minded observer by the time of the Congressional vote in 2002 that implications of collaboration between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda lacked any basis in reliable evidence. By the time the Bush Administration initiated war in 2003, claims about Iraq's nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons capabilities were also partially debunked and increasingly dubious. Still, the war went forward, and many Americans continued to believe the Bush Administration's false claims even after the Administration itself had abandoned them.
TRIP Summary:
In their article, Patrick Jackson and Stuart Kaufman describe how they made an effort to influence policy by organizing an open letter campaign of over 800 scholars. The authors argue that policymakers should draw upon the expertise of scholars to inform their foreign policy decisions, as the quality of information on which policymakers currently base their decisions is inadequate. Using a Weberian method of activism, Jackson and Kaufman explain their process of calling International Relations scholars to action to influence American foreign policy toward Iraq.


Abstract:
Research in international relations has identified a variety of actors who appear to influence U.S. foreign policy, including experts and “epistemic communities,” organized interests (especially business and labor), and ordinary citizens or “public opinion.” This research, however, has often focused on a single factor at a time, rather than systematically testing the relative importance of alternative possible influences. Using extensive survey data gathered over three decades we conduct a comparative test, attempting to account for the expressed foreign policy preferences of policymakers by means of the preferences of the general public and those of several distinct sets of elites. The results of cross-sectional and time-lagged analyses suggest that U.S. foreign policy is most heavily and consistently influenced by internationally oriented business leaders, followed by experts (who, however, may themselves be influenced by business). Labor appears to have significant but smaller impacts. The general public seems to have considerably less effect, except under particular conditions. These results generally hold over several different analytical models (including two-observation time series) and different clusters of issues (economic, military, and diplomatic), with some variations across different institutional settings (the U.S. House, Senate, and executive branch).

TRIP Summary:
Using a variety of statistical models based on extensive survey data, Jacobs and Page attempt to estimate the impact of various groups on the creation of U.S. foreign policy. They determine that internationally-oriented businesses exert the most substantive influence on foreign policy in the United States and that experts are the second most influential group. While the authors believe that the influence of experts is substantial, they also caution that some of the data linking policymakers’ preferences with those of experts may just be the effect of experts and policymakers sharing the same political stances all along.

**Editor Summary:**
Jane Jaquette, who worked as a policy analyst in the Women in Development Office of the US Agency for International Development (USAID), raises rather different practical and ethical issues. Although some of her feminist colleagues questioned her decision to work for an agency that promoted US interests rather than those of people in the developing world, she argues strongly for policy engagement as a moral responsibility.

**TRIP Summary:**
Jaquette recognizes the seemingly conflicting views of her role as a feminist and analyst working for WID. By realizing compatible goals, however, the author was able to set the agenda of WID in such a way that it better promoted certain important areas of women's interests. Although occasionally interests conflicted, her expertise allowed her to overcome many roadblocks within the bureaucracy of USAID.


**Abstract:**
While some gap between the academic and policy worlds is inherent, it is neither necessary nor beneficial for the “Beltway-Ivory Tower” to be as wide as it is. Three principal factors explain the extent of the gap: academia’s dominant organizational culture, which devalues policy relevance; increased role of think tanks as research transmission belts to the policy world; and limited interest of the policy community in academic research. The case for the value of greater policy relevance for the international relations scholarly community is based on the intellectual pluralism of bringing policy relevance in while not driving theory out, intellectual complementarity in the different relative strengths of scholars and policy professionals, and self-interest both in what individual scholars can learn and in being true to the mission of universities. We make three principal bridging the gap recommendations: increase disciplinary incentives for policy relevant scholarship, more programmatic and project-based connectivity, and more policy world experiential opportunities.

**TRIP Summary:**
The authors argue that while a gap between the academic and policy worlds is inherent, it is exacerbated by the dominant organizational culture of academics, the increased role of think tanks in conveying research to the policy world, and
the limited interest of the policy community in academic research. Believing the gap to be negative in nature, the authors prescribe an increase in disciplinary incentives for policy-relevant scholarship, more programmatic and project-based connectivity, and more policy world experimental opportunities in order to try and mitigate the divide. Jentleson and Ratner argue that although there is a gap between policymakers and academics, it is worthwhile to bridge it. The gap is widened by three factors: 1) academic incentive structures that discourage policy relevant work, 2) increased roles of think tanks, and 3) a lack of interest in reaching out to academics not close to the policymaking community. Pursuing more policy relevant work could be useful to both communities. Additionally, embedding more academics in the policy world and more policymakers in the academic world would bring the two communities closer. The authors conclude that bridging this gap is the best way to undertake formidable international challenges.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
In this article, Bruce Jentleson sheds light on the disparity between the IR discipline and the post-9/11 world. He argues that IR scholarship does not adequately address the key problems facing the world today, namely terrorism, and that this lack of information is reducing policymakers’ ability to make the best decisions. Jentleson attributes the gap to the IR discipline favoring theory over policy-relevance, but he claims that the two aspects of IR can exist simultaneously. To bridge the gap, Jentleson claims that the IR discipline needs to create an incentive structure to increase the study of policy-relevant issues, particularly by giving more consideration to policy-relevant research in tenure decisions and by emphasizing the policy applications of theory in the classroom.


Abstract:
Like many other scholars of international relations (IR), Alexander George was concerned with both understanding the world and improving policy. This double focus presents opportunities and difficulties. Among the latter are the influences of our theories and our policy preferences on each other and the possibility that theories can become either self-fulfilling or self-denying prophecies. Less abstractly, following George we then examine prescriptions for better policymaking procedures. This area is plagued by motivated biases because decision makers are responding to powerful political pressures and psychological
needs, which means that there are good reasons for them to reject the procedures that scholars advocate. By contrast, unmotivated biases are at work when decision makers adopt inappropriate short-cuts to rationality, and here scholars’ help may be more welcome. Furthermore, good social science methods can produce better decisions. But the flow of ideas is not simply one way. In the areas of coercion and cooperation, scholars and officials have much to teach each other.

TRIP Summary:
In this article, Robert Jervis examines the gap between the policy community and academia, drawing specifically on various examples relating to US foreign policy. Jervis argues that the gap between theory and practice is negative and exists because scholars and policy-makers approach the same issues in different ways. Jervis asserts that both academics and policymakers can make strides to shrink the gap, but providing the best possible information to policy-makers is the best way to make academia most useful for the policy world.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
In a review of the IR discipline's production of research and utility to policymakers, Lee Jones evaluates Joseph Nye's characterization of the gap between academia and government. Jones attributes the gap to the funding, publishing, and tenure structures within academia. Unlike Nye, however, Jones does not view the gap as negative. The author concludes by stating that though academics have the ability to make their research more palatable to policymakers, all research can be considered relevant given an appropriate audience.


Abstract:
Can unofficial, academically based, third-party approaches contribute to the prevention and resolution of international and intercommunal conflicts? The article focuses on one such approach, interactive problem solving, which the author has applied primarily in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. After describing the central tool of the approach, the problem-solving workshop, the article goes on to address the role of interactive problem solving and related approaches to the larger process of conflict resolution. In this context, it discusses the relationship of
the microprocess of problem-solving workshops to the macroprocess of international conflict resolution; the relationship between official and unofficial diplomacy; the relationship between practice and scholarship in conflict resolution; the role of the university in the process; and the possibilities for institutionalizing this model of conflict resolution.

TRIP Summary:
In this article, Herbert Kelman discusses the important ways in which theory contributes to practice and vice versa in the field of conflict resolution. Although not explicitly acknowledging a disconnect between theory and practice, the author claims that a more interactive model, such as the scholar-practitioner one that has been used in some Israeli-Palestinian peace efforts, should be implemented more. This involves ensuring continual interaction between practice, theory development, and empirical research. Ultimately, Kelman suggests that an institution to prevent, deescalate, and resolve conflict via this method should be created to enrich the conflict resolution process that is currently in use.


Abstract:
In this roundtable, a panel of distinguished scholars reflects on the possibilities, dangers and rewards of academics transgressing the policy-academy divide. Both Krasner and Nye point to the differences in culture between policy and academic realms. Krasner shows how the policymakers are primarily concerned with conceptual framing while academics are more concerned with testing propositions. He describes how the garbage-can model of policymaking accurately suggests that academic ideas may matter, but if they do happenstance and luck are more important than quality. Nye points to how policymaking is heavily influenced by the pressures of time. While he acknowledges the danger of academics compromising truth in the face of power, he notes that scholars can equally lose their objectivity. Stein warns that the powerful 'evolutionary instinct' of social scientists being able to make 'better' policy is a 'conceit' and scholars must ultimately be prepared to leave if they believe that the decision they opposed violates their moral principles and are operationally costly. Keohane concludes the panel by praising scholars who work effectively in policy, but also pointing out some of the risks of scholars venturing into this very different world. Quoting Keynes, he advises academics interested in policymaking to 'beware the bad fairy'. The original discussion took place at the International Studies Association Annual Conference held in San Francisco in 2008. Below are the edited transcripts of the discussion, including further post-panel reflections.

TRIP Summary:
In this roundtable, Robert Koehane addresses scholars who bridge the gap by working directly in the policy world. He attributes the gap to inherent cultural differences between the two groups, and gives an overview of the pros and cons associated with scholars in the policymaking process. While Koehane acknowledges that scholars and policymakers could open mutually beneficial and informative ties, he cautions that academics in policy could both lose their objectivity and lose habits key to critical scholarly analysis.


Abstract:
In the case of the United Nations, scholars have had an impact in fostering ideas and policies, including human development, climate change, global compact, sovereignty as responsibility, and human security. Of the three-headed UN monster—the first UN of member states, the second UN of staff members, scholars constitute a key part of the third UN of those closely associated with the world body but independent from it. Scholars’ roles include research, policy analysis, and idea mongering. They have been able to exert influence as consultants, commissioners, and temporary staffs.

TRIP Summary:
In their article, Kittikhoun and Weiss describe the positive impact scholars have had on fostering ideas and policies within the United Nations. The authors contend that the close ties between academia and policymakers in the UN have allowed experts to exert influence as consultants, commissioners, and temporary staff. Kittikhoun and Weiss conclude their article by recommending that the UN establish an autonomous research entity to advise the secretary-general and revamp its human resources policies to reward exceptional research and analysis.


Abstract:
In this roundtable, a panel of distinguished scholars reflects on the possibilities, dangers and rewards of academics transgressing the policy-academy divide. Both Krasner and Nye point to the differences in culture between policy and academic realms. Krasner shows how the policymakers are primarily concerned with conceptual framing while academics are more concerned with testing propositions. He describes how the garbage-can model of policymaking accurately suggests that academic ideas may matter, but if they do happenstance and luck are more important than quality. Nye points to how policymaking is
heavily influenced by the pressures of time. While he acknowledges the danger of academics compromising truth in the face of power, he notes that scholars can equally lose their objectivity. Stein warns that the powerful “evolutionary instinct” of social scientists being able to make “better” policy is a “conceit” and scholars must ultimately be prepared to leave if they believe that the decision they opposed violates their moral principles and are operationally costly. Keohane concludes the panel by praising scholars who work effectively in policy, but also pointing out some of the risks of scholars venturing into this very different world. Quoting Keynes, he advises academics interested in policymaking to “beware the bad fairy”. The original discussion took place at the International Studies Association Annual Conference held in San Francisco in 2008. Below are the edited transcripts of the discussion, including further post-panel reflections.

TRIP Summary:
In this roundtable, Stephen Krasner relates his experiences in the academic and policy worlds to address the gap that exists between the two institutions. He attributes the gap to inherent differences in the structure and nuances of the two communities. Krasner concludes by stating that the gap cannot be bridged, but academics by happenstance may periodically influence the policy world when new policy problems arise.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Drawing from personal experience as a senior international relations scholar and as director of the Policy Planning Office in the State Department, Krasner asserts that the gap between the academy and policymaking is related less to incentive structures and abstract theory production and more to the garbage can nature of interpreting information for policymaking. Academics can generate policy alternatives, but such alternatives don’t determine policy because policymaking also incorporates personal knowledge, beliefs, chance, bargaining, and compromise. Krasner illustrates the garbage-can nature of policymaking with three personal cases: first, the creation of the Millennium Challenge account, second, challenging China to be a responsible international stakeholder, and third, the creation of the Partnership for Democratic Governance. He concludes that academic work is “only one ingredient in the policy soup,” and that the theory-practice gap may not be worth bridging.

Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Political scientists, like other academics, have marginalized themselves and diminished their real-world relevance by glorifying overly esoteric and quantitative work, discouraging intellectual pursuits in public forums such as blogs and shunning policy prescriptions in their research. Academics don’t “waste their time” writing for public audiences, and this is their primary shortcoming and practical downfall. Kristof calls on scholars to come down from the Ivory Tower and make an effort to contribute to policy and public dialogue because their knowledge could be valuable if applied to real-world problems and translated for non-academics.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Few scholars are questioning, much less studying, the gap between academics and policymakers, despite the widening of this chasm. Academics develop general theory, while policymakers seek immediate solutions. Scholars accept the gap and are “very comfortable” with it because the academic reward structure does not promote policy relevant research, and they believe the policy community simply doesn’t appreciate them enough. Policymakers, with limited time, have few opportunities to digest complex academic work. Scholars have the ability to bridge the gap, but only if they choose to translate their knowledge into accessible language and communication methods such as op-ed, oral exchanges, briefings and workshops, and faxes.


TRIP Summary:
Writing for a popular audience, Kurth reviews the history of the International Relations discipline, particularly the impact and relevance of its two dominant paradigms, realism and liberalism. While some practitioner-academics exist in the field, most academics are only academics and thus lack the experience necessary to understand and care about the realities of international policy. Many scholars
are not only uninterested in the opinions of policymakers, but really only interested in the opinions of “about a dozen other academic specialists in their particular sub-sub-field.” Scholars in the realist and liberal traditions, when they leave rarely leave their paradigmatic shells, often do so only to attack, or at best, debate against, scholars in the other paradigm. Meanwhile, these scholars remain unable to reconcile their theories and works with real-world relevance. The author concludes that an interpretation of international relations based on the union of realism and liberalism, an integration of economic models and analysis, and an understanding of cultural impact will produce the most policy-relevant research.


Abstract:
Many of the competing intellectual traditions and research programs in world politics share a core set of metatheoretical assumptions about the process of strategic interaction in politics. Their differences are anchored in different empirical assumptions about the types of issues, actors, political arenas, and strategic situations that characterize world politics, not in different metatheoretical assumptions about how the process of politics works. Systematically identifying these shared assumptions will help eliminate many false problematics that have entangled the field, create a positive heuristic for research that can link international and domestic politics, and move political scientists toward more general theories of world politics. Building research programs around widely shared metatheoretical principles about how politics works will, moreover, increase the ease with which scholars can communicate their insights to nonacademic audiences.

TRIP Summary:
Lamborn states that the changes in the incentive structure after the Cold War led to a gap between policymakers and academics. To communicate more effectively with policymakers, academics need to provide more theoretical works to frame policymakers’ problems. According to Lamborn, the key to demystifying international relations is moving away from specific policy prescriptions to improving theories.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Lepgold argues that the negative gap between the policymaking community and academics can be easily bridged. By utilizing available frameworks for communication, IR scholars can focus on clarifying their work—whether case study based or theoretical—for policymakers. To improve the use of their work by the policy community, reducing the current esoteric trend in IR scholarship is important yet should not muddle the line between policy applications and theory.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
In this article, Joseph Lepgold discusses the gap between IR academics and policymakers and examines the possibilities for making IR theory more policy-relevant. He argues that the gap between theory and practice in IR has no reason to exist because theory should intuitively be useful to policy; however, he claims that both scholars and policymakers are failing to realize the contributions that each of them can provide the other. Although Lepgold asserts that both sides share responsibility for the existence of the gap—whether that be a result of ignoring the other side's contributions or the naturally differing organizational structures of policy and academia— he primarily tasks scholars with making efforts to bridge it because the main issue causing the division is the nature of IR theories. Too often, Lepgold claims, IR theories focus primarily on forming empirical models and neglect to consider strategic context, which is what would be most useful to policymakers. Because of this, he argues that scholars should focus more on researching the strategic contexts of particular cases to enhance policymaker's ability to evaluate causal processes related to critical issues.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Scholarship can contribute to the policymaking process a rich understanding of context, broad biographical analysis, and better-honed linguistic skills, due primarily to their expertise and selective study, and secondarily to the amount of time they can use to specialize in a specific field of inquiry. Drawing from personal experience as a “long-time academic who had the privilege of serving as Senior Director for Asia on the National Security Council and Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs from 1998 through 2000,” Lieberthal
explains the time constraints and perceptive differences inherent in day-to-day policymaking. Both scholars and the government should make a conscious effort to bridge the gap, because good scholarship can bring value and innovation to the policy table. Academics should communicate via shorter, more easily digestible constructive media such as op-eds, broadcast media, and journals such as *Foreign Affairs* and *Asia Policy*. Political administrations should make efforts to listen to scholars and to include consultations with them in the policymaking process.


**Publisher Summary:**

Scholars, Policymakers, and International Affairs shows how to build mutually beneficial connections between the worlds of ideas and action, analysis and policy. Drawing on contributions from top international scholars with policy experience in the United States, Europe, Asia, Canada, and Latin America, as well as senior policymakers throughout the Americas, Abraham F. Lowenthal and Mariano E. Bertucci make the case that scholars can both strengthen their research and contribute to improved policies while protecting academia from the risks of active participation in the policy process.

Many scholars believe that policymakers are more interested in processes and outcomes than in understanding causality. Many policymakers believe that scholars are absorbed in abstract and self-referential debates and that they are primarily interested in crafting theories (and impressing other scholars) rather than developing solutions to pressing policy issues.

The contributors to this book confront this gap head-on. They do not deny the obstacles to fruitful interaction between scholars and policymakers, but, drawing on their own experience, discuss how these obstacles can be and have been overcome. They present case studies that illustrate how scholars have helped reduce income inequality, promote democratic governance, improve gender equity, target international financial sanctions, manage the Mexico–U.S. border, and enhance inter-American cooperation. These success stories are balanced by studies on why academic analysts have failed to achieve much positive impact on counternarcotics and citizen security policies. The editors’ astute conclusion identifies best practices and provides concrete recommendations to government agencies, international institutions, nongovernmental organizations, and funding sources, as well as to senior university officials, academic departments and centers, think tanks, established scholars, junior faculty, and graduate students.

Clearly written and thoughtfully organized, this innovative book provides analytic insights and practical wisdom for those who want to understand how to build more effective connections between the worlds of thought and action.

**Abstract:**
The World War II experience of public service created a generation of scholars who devoted themselves to policy-relevant research during the early Cold War. The Vietnam War led to a split between the two groups, and scholars and policymakers today inhabit two different worlds. Fortunately, it appears as though the relationship between the world of ideas and the world of action is entering a new phase. Both the academy and the nation would be better off if scholars were more involved in topics of interest to policymakers. However, building a closer relationship between these two worlds faces challenges.

**TRIP Summary:**
The academy should work to make policy-relevant research more worthwhile, and the policymaking community should expand opportunities for scholars to participate in the policymaking process. Mahnken characterizes the three eras of the policy-academy relationship since World War II. The first phase was marked by a generation of scholars highly committed to policy-relevance in the wake of World War II. The second phase, beginning in the late 1960s, was characterized by open tension related to perceptions of the Vietnam War resulting in an inward-looking academy increasingly attracted to the study of methods and highly abstract theories. It was also the era of the third party, the advisors and experts in think tanks and other organizations who filled the ranks of government and inform policy when the academy wouldn’t leave the Ivory Tower. The current academy-policy gap denies the government expertise, produces abstract and detached “impoverished” theory, and inhibits student learning about real-world problems. At the time of publication, the US enters a third phase: scholars today place more emphasis on policy-relevant work and graduate students seek out public service over more lucrative private-sector jobs. The government has begun taking many steps to bridge the gap with academia and should continue to do so, namely through the Minerva Initiative and increased funding and access for researchers. To address remaining structural barriers perpetuating the gap, the academy should give greater weight to policy relevance in hiring, tenure, and promotion decision, give junior faculty members opportunities to participate in policymaking, and increase their departmental diversity with more policymaker hires.


**Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable**

**TRIP Summary:**
Marble, Editor of the new journal Asia Policy, summarizes the articles in this debut issue and presents specific measures the journal should take in order to help bridge the academy-policy divide. The journal will draw from a marketplace of ideas to present select but unbiased information. It will work to overcome disciplinary disincentives by maintaining the high standard of peer-review quality important to the tenure system. The journal will attempt to produce policymaker-accessible research by including one-pagers for all articles, including input from experienced policymakers in the peer review process, and reducing jargon and unclear or overly-complex article structures. Furthermore, Marble hopes to see more formats like roundtables to draw policymakers and academics together to debate research and policy.


Abstract:
In his seminal work Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy, Alexander George (1993) lamented the great divide between academia and the foreign policymaking community, arguing that greater interaction between scholars and policymakers would produce better policy. We share George's belief that scholars and practitioners each have much to offer the other. In fact, a wide spectrum of opportunities exists for scholars in the field of political science to engage in meaningful public service that can enhance every aspect of their careers, as well as contribute to international understanding.

TRIP Summary:
Political scientists should engage the policy community in meaningful dialogue and public service, and they have many opportunities to do so despite many claims of a gap between the two worlds. Scholars can conduct commissioned research, conduct policy analyses, participate in Track II and unofficial dialogues, and even become active policy advocates. Opportunities for academics to participate in the policy process arise when the scholars are experts in a specific field, and when they write for publications that policymakers tend to read, such as Foreign Affairs, the Washington Quarterly, and Foreign Policy. Policy participation provides scholars unique access to the subject of their study, the opportunity to gather data not otherwise accessible, the ability to bring real-world concerns into the classroom, and financial reward. However, scholars should remain cautious of alienating their colleagues with partisan work, and cognizant of the unfortunate reality that participation in policy workshops is often considered public service and publication in policy journals isn’t often considered “real” scholarship.

Murphy, Craig N. 2008. “Learning from UNDP,” in “Risks and Opportunities of Crossing the Academy/Policy Divide,” edited by J. Ann Tickner and Andrei
Editor Summary:
The two forum contributors who were involved with international organizations present a rather different perspective. Craig Murphy, who worked as Historian for the United Nations Human Development Program (UNHDP) for two years, describes it as a “learning organization” with an unusual practice of sponsoring scholars and NGO on whom it relies for generation of the more than 500 Human Development Reports produced since 1989.

TRIP Summary:
The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has helped create a “learning organization” by working with independent scholars and NGOs, but independence of scholarship remains a chief concern. Noting his own experience in the UNDP as a historian, Murphy warns that good scholarship could be negatively affected by the political agendas of bureaucrats. While UNDP’s guarantee of independence was “uniquely strong,” and Murphy was able to publish work quite critical of the organization and various political entities, the author explains that close and continued contact with policymakers can lead to censorship or self-censorship if scholars aren’t careful to protect their freedom.


Editor Summary:
Henry Nau, who served on President Ronald Reagan’s National Security Council staff in the early 1980s, questions the assertion of scholars who stay outside the policy world that their scholarship is likely to be more objective and less driven by power considerations. Lamenting the lack of political diversity in the academy, he makes the unusual argument that partisanship actually facilitates insights and scholarship.

TRIP Summary:
Nau argues that there is a gap between policymakers and academics; however, it is overstated. To close this gap, academics should recognize the innovation that occurs when partnering with politicians. The author concedes that fostering this relationship encourages partisanship within the academy. Nau notes that while partisanship does encourage scholarship, academics should seek political balance when developing relationships with politicians.

**Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable**

**TRIP Summary:**
Newsom argues that the gap is caused by negative perceptions of the insular IR community by the policymaking community. Academics tend to critique foreign policy decisions rather than support them and often obscure their writing behind esoteric, self-referential terms. Policymakers also prefer experience while academics prefer research. Although the gap is bridged in some ways, a large communication gap exists between the two communities. The gap can be further bridged by academics and policymakers encouraging participation from upper-level individuals in both communities in joint activities, such as attending annual research reviews. Newsom notes, however, that both communities will always remain somewhat separate.


**Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable**

**TRIP Summary:**
Nincic examines the makings of good theories and the process of theory-building to analyze the benefits and drawbacks of placing more emphasis on policy-relevant theories within the international relations discipline. He claims that, while policy-relevant theories make up a substantial portion of IR research, that they are still not dominant, despite the benefits they could bring to policymakers. While the author is cautious to promote policy-relevant theory-building because many scholars have expressed concerns about focus on policy-relevance harming the pursuit of empirical knowledge, he claims that the discipline can manage both research trajectories. Specifically, he suggests that scholars can make their research most policy-relevant by creating theories discuss instrumental relations (those that add to knowledge of policy impacts or desired outcomes), contextual relations (those that help policymakers better understand causal processes), and predictive theories (those that anticipate future status of current policies).


**Abstract:**
In this roundtable, a panel of distinguished scholars reflects on the possibilities, dangers and rewards of academics transgressing the policy-academy divide. Both Krasner and Nye point to the differences in culture between policy and academic realms. Krasner shows how the policymakers are primarily concerned with conceptual framing while academics are more concerned with testing propositions. He describes how the garbage-can model of policymaking accurately suggests that academic ideas may matter, but if they do happenstance and luck are more important than quality. Nye points to how policymaking is heavily influenced by the pressures of time. While he acknowledges the danger of academics compromising truth in the face of power, he notes that scholars can equally lose their objectivity. Stein warns that the powerful 'evolutionary instinct' of social scientists being able to make 'better' policy is a 'conceit' and scholars must ultimately be prepared to leave if they believe that the decision they opposed violates their moral principles and are operationally costly. Keohane concludes the panel by praising scholars who work effectively in policy, but also pointing out some of the risks of scholars venturing into this very different world. Quoting Keynes, he advises academics interested in policymaking to 'beware the bad fairy'. The original discussion took place at the International Studies Association Annual Conference held in San Francisco in 2008. Below are the edited transcripts of the discussion, including further post-panel reflections.

TRIP Summary:
In this roundtable, Joseph Nye addresses the growing gap between academia and policy through his personal experiences in both fields. He primarily attributes the gap to differences in the cultures of the two fields. Additionally, he argues that there has been both a decrease in the production of policy-relevant ideas in universities and an increase in new, predominant norms in the realm of academia on the whole which have contributed to the widening of the gap. Nye calls for increased participation in policymaking by academics, but cautions them against developing a career bias that could affect the quality of their work.


Abstract:
Two decades ago, Alexander George observed a growing gap between academic theorists and practitioners in the formulation of foreign policy. The significance of the gap has been debated, but trends in the academy, society, and government suggest it is likely to grow.

TRIP Summary:
In this article, Joseph Nye discusses the nature of the gap between academia and policy and makes suggestions of possible ways to close it, although he believes that it will never be entirely bridged. Nye asserts that the existence of the gap means that the useful policy contributions that scholars could be making are not
reaching the officials making foreign policy decisions. He claims that this is happening because the policy and academic worlds have drifted apart as a result of different cultures (including different research timelines, the use of jargon in academia, and preference for different methods) in these two worlds. To reduce this divide, Nye suggests that academic institutions give more weight to policy-relevant research and that the government more actively seek out scholarly research, largely by increasing the number of grants handed out for those wishing to undertake policy-relevant research.


Publisher Summary:
We begin with some observations by three scholars who have held a variety of positions in the US government. Joseph Nye, who served as deputy to the undersecretary for security assistance, science, and technology in the US Department of State in the Carter administration and later as Assistant Secretary of Defense in the 1990s, offers some general comments on the costs and benefits of government service. He describes two very different cultures—the academy and the policy world—and laments what he sees as a widening of the gap between them. He suggests that this is because of prevailing norms in the academy that reward theoretical over policy-relevant research. He warns of the dangers of leaving policy relevant research to special interest think tanks and, drawing on his own experience, describes ways in which ideas generated in the academy can be useful in making policy changes.

TRIP Summary:
Nye argues that although a certain amount of gap between academia and policymakers is good and natural, allowing that gap to grow more than is necessary is detrimental. The differences between the two cultures, from writing style to the timetables given for providing solution, create this gap. By balancing a university's faculty between purely academic and “in and outers”, individuals with both academic and policy experience, universities can reduce the growth of the gap. Encouraging more in and outers reduces the gap to a healthy level rather than allowing special interest think tanks to fulfill that role.


Abstract:
This article examines the gap between theorists and practitioners in the field of international relations. In recent years, the gap has been widening and bridging
efforts have become more difficult. In response, former ambassador David Newsom (1995–6) advised his colleagues to broaden State Department research grants, to increase scholar-diplomat programs, and to encourage senior officials to participate in scholarly association meetings. The intelligence community, particularly the National Intelligence Council, holds regular unclassified seminars and conferences with academics. Internships and exchanges such as the Foreign Affairs fellowships sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations in the United States have also helped to introduce young American academics to a policy environment. The Internet and blogs also provide new opportunities for scholars to become involved in policy debates on a global basis. On the university side, departments could give greater weight to real-world relevance and impact in hiring and promotion decisions, and journals could place greater weight on relevance in evaluating submissions.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Nye argues that the gap between the policymaking and academic communities is primarily caused by the withdrawal of academics into the Ivory Tower. Academia’s insular reward structure does not promote policy relevance, and trends in IR scholarship have become increasingly esoteric and theoretical. Although think tanks have become a useful asset to the policy community, the withdrawal of the academic community negatively affects the policy process. The onus of the closure of the gap rests on the academic community; promoting policy relevance in the classroom and in the hiring process as well as having a higher tolerance of unpopular policy positions could work to close the gap. However, according to Nye, this seems unlikely, as academia continues to withdraw inwards.


Abstract:
The gap between academic research and policymaking in international relations (IR) is much lamented but poorly understood. Much of what we know about the gap is based on personal anecdotes, untested assumptions, and simplistic conceptions of what counts as policy influence. Using the literature on fragile states as a window into the research-policy interface, this article finds little evidence of scholarship directly influencing policies through specific recommendations and findings. However, academic ideas in this field appear to
have important indirect effects on international policy actors—namely, by helping to define and refine understandings of state fragility as a policy problem and by informing the development of operational frameworks for responding to this problem—even though the actors themselves may not be entirely aware of such conceptual influences.

**TRIP Summary:**
In this article, Roland Paris conducts a study of the influence that scholarly research on fragile states has on policy in order to examine the gap between the two sectors. He seeks to determine why the influence of scholarly research on policy is limited in this area. He finds that there are problems in the mechanisms that transfer scholarly ideas to the policy world, but he claims that these problems need to be better understood before recommendations on how to repair them can be made.


**Abstract:**
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.

**TRIP Summary:**
In their article, Bradley Parks and Alena Stern test whether direct engagement in the policymaking process will make international relations scholars more adept at designing, undertaking, and communicating research in ways that are useful and relevant to policymakers. The authors give an overview of the existing literature
and prevalent arguments regarding the gap, and conduct their experiment using a difference-in-differences approach. Parks and Stern find that direct, sustained engagement in the policymaking process has a substantial impact on IR scholarship, while there is no impact on scholars who simultaneously engage in policy and academia.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
In his article, Robert Putnam calls political scientists to action in bridging the gap between academia and policy. The author primarily attributes this gap to both academics' unwillingness to engage in problems in their communities and the nuances associated with academia. Secondarily, Putnam also acknowledges that the policy and political science worlds have fundamentally different goals and agendas. To bridge the gap, the author asks academics to engage in policy by focusing on relevant problems, discuss these problems with fellow citizens in their community, and generate realistic policy prescriptions to address them.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
In this article, Siverson examines the gap between academia and policy and claims that, while it will always exist because of the different organizational demands of both disciplines, it may be possible to make it smaller. He believes that the gap prevents the dissemination of useful information from the scholarly to policy worlds, but he is optimistic that this situation can be improved because some ideas, notably democratic peace theory, have been incorporated into mainstream policy. To bridge some of the gap, Siverson is adamant that both sides be willing to reach out. This means that policymakers will have to be more willing to accept expert advice, perhaps by relying more on consultants. Furthermore, academics can maximize the policy-relevance of their research by focusing on issues policymakers most need knowledge of: widely-applicable knowledge (like democratic peace theory) and strategic studies. Siverson argues that the gap described previously by Alexander George is negative but primarily caused by the lack of interest of policymakers. However, Siverson underlines the importance of the study of strategic behavior, democratic peace, and other models in the policymaking process. Although the author acknowledges the insular nature
of IR scholars when approaching the policy community, he notes that academic works may be more commonly utilized if policymakers were more receptive to academic works.


**Abstract:**
To paraphrase slightly, I have been asked to focus on the apparent tensions between making genuinely scientific contributions by advancing knowledge in rigorous ways within specialized subfields, on the one hand, and addressing substantive political issues of general interest in accessible fashion, on the other. My view is that, though we should try to do both things, we should give priority to the latter – to helping both disciplinary and general public understandings of important substantive political issues become better informed and reasoned. To adopt this priority is still, I believe, to pursue the main tasks of political science as scientifically as possible; but it is true that this course involves significant tradeoffs.

**TRIP Summary:**
In this article, Rogers Smith delves into the debate within political science of whether studying issues of substantive political importance should take precedence over the general goal of contributing to knowledge. Because political science is a discipline in which findings can directly impact human affairs in ways that harder sciences cannot, Smith argues that scholars have a responsibility to study issues that are of political importance before they pursue those purely based on human aspiration. However, he still emphasizes that both sides of political science can (and should) coexist even if one is weighted more heavily.


**Abstract:**
In this roundtable, a panel of distinguished scholars reflects on the possibilities, dangers and rewards of academics transgressing the policy-academy divide. Both Krasner and Nye point to the differences in culture between policy and academic realms. Krasner shows how the policymakers are primarily concerned with conceptual framing while academics are more concerned with testing propositions. He describes how the garbage-can model of policymaking accurately suggests that academic ideas may matter, but if they do happenstance and luck are more important than quality. Nye points to how policymaking is heavily influenced by the pressures of time. While he acknowledges the danger of
academics compromising truth in the face of power, he notes that scholars can equally lose their objectivity. Stein warns that the powerful ‘evolutionary instinct’ of social scientists being able to make ‘better’ policy is a ‘conceit’ and scholars must ultimately be prepared to leave if they believe that the decision they opposed violates their moral principles and are operationally costly. Keohane concludes the panel by praising scholars who work effectively in policy, but also pointing out some of the risks of scholars venturing into this very different world. Quoting Keynes, he advises academics interested in policymaking to ‘beware the bad fairy’. The original discussion took place at the International Studies Association Annual Conference held in San Francisco in 2008. Below are the edited transcripts of the discussion, including further post-panel reflections.

TRIP Summary:
In this roundtable, Janice Stein addresses the growing gap between social scientists and policymakers caused by inherent differences between the two worlds. She and explains scholars’ recent outcry over the gap as an “evolutionary instinct” of social scientists believing they are qualified to provide expert advice. Stein argues that scholars can make the biggest contributions to policymaking through problem recognition and framing policy issues, but cautions against overconfidence and a loss of objectivity for those scholars who do participate in policy. She concludes by emphasizing that academics working in the policy world ultimately must be prepared to leave if they believe that a decision they oppose violates their moral principals and is operationally costly.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Stein examines the history of international relations and discusses the benefits and drawbacks to making the discipline more policy-relevant, particularly as it pertains to the creation of foreign policy. While he believes that policymakers should be cautious to embrace IR theories in their foreign policy decision making (mostly because the discipline is still young and many theories and scholars have yet to be thoroughly vetted), Stein claims that ideas based on empirical observation and theory are better than hunches alone. To make IR theory more policy-relevant, the author suggests that it focus less on factors that cannot be manipulated in the real world (for example, policymakers can do nothing about the world changing from a bipolar system to a multipolar one) and be more willing to use cross-disciplinary approaches, which more closely give consideration to the vast number of factors that influence decision making in the real world.

**Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable**

**TRIP Summary:**
Steinberg and Gavin examine the pitfalls of policymakers and academics not collaborating as it relates to impending U.S. foreign policy decisions, namely how to react to China's increasing influence and what to do about nuclear proliferation in Iran. They argue that the distance between academia and policy is problematic because uniting the study of IR with the practice of IR can produce benefits for all sides. They attribute the existence of this divide primarily to academia's preoccupation with theory-building, methodology, and paradigmatic debate instead of more directly policy-relevant approaches. The authors emphasize the ways in which the academic discipline of IR needs to change to be more useful to policymakers, but they are emphatic that “cooperation cannot be a one-way street,” indicating the need for policymakers to further embrace scholarly ideas.


**Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable**

**TRIP Summary:**
Sutter describes a closer relationship among legislative and executive officials and academics on policy matters concerning Asia since the Cold War. Officials gain personal support from academics to back policy decisions, and workshops and seminars conducted by academics for officials in both branches have become increasingly common. Additionally, the author notes the importance of journals such as Asia Policy in promoting their academic work in a palatable, commonly read format for policymakers. Sutter therefore describes a symbiotic rather than estranged relationship between academia and the policy community due to collaboration on American foreign policy towards Asia.


**Abstract:**
This research analyzes the role of experts in the European Union’s policy-making process. Focusing on the field of research policy, this study seeks to probe how expert participation in the Open Method of Coordination informs policy decisions. The paper reports on an analysis of the expert group in the European Internationalization Strategy in Science and Technology. Our analysis reveals the dynamics of expert participation at the micro level, as it identifies who these experts are, how they are appointed, and in what ways expert knowledge gets used in policymaking.

**TRIP Summary:**
In their article, Merli Tamtik and Creso Sa analyze the role of experts in the European Union’s policymaking process, particularly in the Open Method of Coordination program. The authors maintain that political organizations need experts to provide legitimacy for their policy decisions, while experts as professionals need to participate in the policy process to build up professional knowledge and networks, as well as increase their authority domestically. Tamtik and Sa therefore prescribe that political institutions should form expert groups in which experts have a high degree of involvement with policymakers in order to mitigate existing gaps between the two groups.

---


**Publisher Summary:**
The intelligence failures surrounding the invasion of Iraq dramatically illustrate the necessity of developing standards for evaluating expert opinion. This book fills that need. Here, Philip E. Tetlock explores what constitutes good judgment in predicting future events, and looks at why experts are often wrong in their forecasts.

Tetlock first discusses arguments about whether the world is too complex for people to find the tools to understand political phenomena, let alone predict the future. He evaluates predictions from experts in different fields, comparing them to predictions by well-informed laity or those based on simple extrapolation from current trends. He goes on to analyze which styles of thinking are more successful in forecasting. Classifying thinking styles using Isaiah Berlin’s prototypes of the fox and the hedgehog, Tetlock contends that the fox--the thinker who knows many little things, draws from an eclectic array of traditions, and is better able to improvise in response to changing events—is more successful in predicting the future than the hedgehog, who knows one big thing, toils devotedly within one tradition, and imposes formulaic solutions on ill-defined problems. He notes a perversely inverse relationship between the best scientific indicators of good judgement and the qualities that the media most prizes in pundits—the single-minded determination required to prevail in ideological combat.
Clearly written and impeccably researched, the book fills a huge void in the literature on evaluating expert opinion. It will appeal across many academic disciplines as well as to corporations seeking to develop standards for judging expert decision making.

**TRIP Summary:**
In his book, Philip Tetlock explores whether or not expert judgment can be trusted to inform policy decisions. The author reviews how a cloud of suspicion currently hangs over political forecasting, as well as the perversely inverse relationship that exists between the best scientific indicators of good judgment and the qualities that the media most prizes in pundits. Tetlock distinguishes between ‘foxes,’ thinkers who know many little things, draw from an eclectic array of traditions, and adeptly improvise in response to changing events; and ‘hedgehogs,’ who know one big thing, work within one tradition, and impose formulaic solutions on ill-defined problems. After reviewing both kinds of thinkers, the author states that skepticism by policymakers and others in trusting the wisdom of experts is warranted, but sometimes excessive. Tetlock finds that overall, foxes are better political forecasters on average than hedgehogs. The forecasts that hedgehogs provide, however, enable the user to see the range of foreseeable outcomes. In constructing policy, therefore, practitioners should listen to both kinds of experts, but in their appropriate contexts.


**Abstract:**
The nuclear arms control regime—centered on the 1968 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT)—faces five challenges: failure of nuclear disarmament by the five NPT-licit nuclear powers (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States); possible cheating by non-nuclear signatories like North Korea and Iran; India, Israel, and Pakistan remaining outside the NPT; terrorists’ interest in acquiring and using nuclear weapons; and the safety, security and proliferation risks of the increased interest in nuclear energy to offset the financial and environmental costs of fossil fuel.

**TRIP Summary:**
In his article, Ramesh Thakur addresses the gap between scholars and policymakers in the area of global governance. The author attributes the gap to differences in structure, information, and vocabulary between the two groups, and promotes a bridging of the gap that would allow scholars to use their expertise to foster better policy. In order to bridge, Thakur stresses that scholars need to present relevant policy advice in a clear and concise format, publish in policy-relevant journals, and engage in new media outlets to publicize their research. In
addition, the author recommends that policymakers attend academic conferences and seminars to build relationships with academics.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Marc Trachtenberg looks into the impact of dominant ideas in international relations on policy decisions. He doesn't address whether influencing policy should be the ultimate goal of the study of social science, but he does mention that the ideas that are considered most important in academia should also be those that have had the greatest influence on policy. Surprisingly, he finds that this is not the case. A theory like balance of power remains enormously popular in the academy, for example, despite its relatively small impact on foreign policy decision making (for example, during World War II, the Allies sought to defeat Germany decisively rather than preserving some of its power in order to balance the USSR). Trachtenberg believes that this lack of influence should be considered a problem for the international relations discipline, but he does not specifically outline a plan for remedying it.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Striking differences of their career objectives and work environments contribute to the gap between policymakers and scholars. Policymakers, while considering the political ramifications for their careers, require clear, succinct solutions to policy problems in short periods of time, while academics have greater freedom in the selection, timeline, and delivery of their research. Academia could benefit from the brevity of the policy community while the policy community could benefit from academic expertise. In order to bridge the gap, academics and policymakers should seek out “go-betweens”, or individuals with experience in both communities, who are best equipped to vet ideas and hone arguments for successful delivery from one community to the other. Though Vogel suggests think tanks could be useful, he takes issue with their issue selection and support of certain political agendas.

Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
In this article, William Wallace discusses what constitutes the ideal distance between the study and practice of international relations. He believes that IR is fundamentally a discipline that is meant to be practically-applied, but he stresses the importance of preserving the academic prestige of the discipline as well. He claims that, in response to pressure from other fields of academia, the study of IR is forced to delegate substantial focus to theory-building and the empirical study of many questions that aren't always of the utmost interest to policymakers. While he is in support of these endeavors, however, he also stresses the practical uses of IR scholarship, citing specifically a series of seminars that connect the Thatcher administration in Britain to experts on the Soviet Union. Wallace hopes to effectively balance the academic side of IR with the policy side by separating universities from the policy world to preserve their “sanctity . . . as a place for contemplation” while still leaving their doors open to maintain relevance and ties to the real world.


Abstract:
Policymakers pay relatively little attention to the vast theoretical literature in IR, and many scholars seem uninterested in doing policy-relevant work. These tendencies are unfortunate because theory is an essential tool of statecraft. Many policy debates ultimately rest on competing theoretical visions, and relying on a false or flawed theory can lead to major foreign policy disasters. Theory remains essential for diagnosing events, explaining their causes, prescribing responses, and evaluating the impact of different policies. Unfortunately, the norms and incentives that currently dominate academia discourage many scholars from doing useful theoretical work in IR. The gap between theory and policy can be narrowed only if the academic community begins to place greater value on policy-relevant theoretical work.

TRIP Summary:
Walt examines the theory-practice gap from an academic perspective, explaining that policymakers are unlikely and/or unable to change or adapt to academia's current knowledge output. IR theory, Walt asserts, is valuable but too general and abstract for policy application, and there is no easy way to synthesize a large
number of theories, as middle-range theory often sacrifices parsimony. Scholars and policymakers have different agendas, and the professionalization of the IR discipline places pressure on academics to produce more abstract theory over policy-relevant work. Academics should strive for policy relevance, Walt argues, with institutional changes, such as greater weight to real-world relevance in hiring, tenure, and promotion, “stop the clock” policies for junior faculty, greater weight on policy relevance in journal publication, and more accessible journals to strengthen the “transmission belt” from rarified theory to current policy.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
The comforts of tenure and the professional incentive structure of the scholarly community foster a “cult of irrelevance” among IR scholars for whom “thinking academics don’t matter” is a self-fulfilling prophesy. The purpose of tenure is not to retreat into the Ivory Tower in esoteric and obscure research, but to encourage and enable academics to take risks in their scholarship and to confront serious real-world issues. The discipline collectively determines its incentive structure, which currently places little value on policy-relevant research. As Nye asserts, departments could give greater weight to policy experience and relevance in hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions, and implement “stop the tenure clock” policies. Furthermore, journal editors can incorporate the evaluation of policy relevance into their editorial process, and professional organizations could make research more accessible to policymakers in new formats.


Abstract / Publisher Summary Unavailable

TRIP Summary:
Wilson asserts that the gap between scholars and practitioners is not nearly as dire as some have claimed, and that the situation may actually have improved. He still, however, considers the gap problematic, and attributes the problems with scholar-practitioner relations to institutional changes to the incentives that influence analysts' work. There has been increased institutional differentiation among the suppliers of knowledge (or scholars), and the demand for policy-relevant research (by practitioners) has also become more institutionally varied. The author advises scholars against homogenization within departments, condescending attitudes towards Ph.D.s “settling” for non-academic jobs, and warns that polarization
between policy schools and “traditional” political science departments could lead to lower levels of knowledge for graduates. That is, students in policy schools may miss the value of nuanced traditional social science research, while graduates of traditional departments may be long on theory and short on real-world understanding.


**Abstract:**
A framework that helps officials and observers appraise the analytical components of public policy is proposed. The framework is centered on policy “engineering,” which is defined as the application of knowledge, principles, and methods to the solution of specific problems in a given political environment. This process of engineering has seven components: national interest, objectives, strategy, design, implementation, maintenance, and review. The framework is prescriptive and is a tool for determining which analytical propositions are truly material to the success of the policy. In addition, the framework might assist policymakers in drawing up a checklist of questions that they may ask themselves or others.

**TRIP Summary:**
Zelikow, building on Alexander George's “Bridging the Gap,” proposes a framework of the components of public policy “engineering” for more informed tailoring of academic expertise to specific policy problems. Zelikow reiterates George's primary contention that the gap between academics and policymakers is problematic for both worlds and explains that both are at fault in the disconnect between them. Scholars, for their part, are often uninterested in studying the questions that are relevant to policymakers, and policymakers are often uninterested in crafting their questions for their academic counterparts and digesting academic work. The author asserts that a more comprehensive picture of the components of foreign policymaking will help both officials and academics ask better questions and receive more useful answers. Academics, however, have the comparative advantage in closing the gap because they have the general knowledge, disciplinary training, and the opportunity to devote time to advanced analysis of policy problems.