

Mapping the Discipline of Political Science ‘Back in Time’

Paper for the IPSA International Conference

‘Political Science in the Digital Age: Mapping Opportunities, Perils and Uncertainties’

Hannover, Germany 4-6 December 2017

Panel Assessing the Structure of Political Science Using Online Tools

By Bob Reinalda

Political Science, Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands

b.reinalda@fm.ru.nl

GSPS: www.rc33IPSA-globalpolitical.science



In Memory of Thierry Dias Coelho (1975-2017)

In 2015 IPSA Research Committee 33 on the Study of Political Science as a Discipline created the **GSPS Project**, *Global Study of the Development of Political Science*, which provides an overview of the discipline’s evolution through lists of publications on the state of the art of political science. The website (www.rc33ipsa-globalpolitical.science), launched in October 2015, was designed and run by Thierry Dias Coelho, who sadly enough passed away recently.¹

The two major Database elements available at the website are the ‘GSPS Bibliographic Dataset’ and the ‘GSPS General Information – Guidelines’. The Bibliographic Dataset allows to find titles on the discipline’s state of the art, arranged by country, continent and region, as well as international political science association, while the Dataset also has a Search Function. By the time enough publications across time will be available (which is the purpose, but this varies per country and region), it enables scholars to map and compare the discipline’s developments over time in several regions of the world. Deeper insights in these developments (e.g., when did behaviouralism pop up where?, or, how is critical theory positioned in the discipline?) will grow if the state-of-the-art publications are combined with key terms, abstracts of publications and data on the profession available from other databases.

Digitalization, according to the organizers of the Hannover IPSA conference, is the integration of digital technologies into all aspects of everyday life, with the Internet and social media multiplying the communications channels and having a substantial impact on the interaction between politicians and citizens as well as all societal actors (see Call for Panels for Research Committees, 9 February 2017). Digitalization in this paper is more restricted, as it focuses on the digitalization process of certain aspects of the discipline and without already including social media. However, the GSPS Project included Twitter and Facebook facilities in

¹ See my ‘In Memoriam Thierry DIAS COELHO (1975-2017)’ at <http://rc33.ipsa.org>.

order to promote communication among political scientists both globally and regionally. The Project, however, came to a standstill due to tragic circumstances.

This paper attempts to revive the Project. One way of extending the Project ‘back in time’ is combining with IPSA’s *International Political Science Abstracts*, which have been published since 1951, and with other international and national databases (e.g., those of political science associations). One way of expanding regionally is exploring possibilities through UNESCO’s networking system. While there are ways to continue this digital mapping of the discipline ‘back in time’, there also is the critical assessment of the discipline’s actual performance (see the next section). Political scientists therefore need to reflect on the digitalization of sources on the origin and the state of the discipline in order to further develop political science as a for society relevant discipline. The GSPS Database may be a tool to support and continue this debate.

The paper elaborates a strategy that clarifies objectives and methods of extending the GSPS Project ‘back in time’, allowing the use of data mining tools in other databases and of digital text analysis of collected texts. It starts with the focus of both IPSA and RC33 on regional developments, then provides a description of the GSPS Project as it exists, followed by some thoughts on how to expand and how to give more content to the GSPS Database through IPSA and UNESCO resources. Given the loss of Thierry with his technical and substantial expertise and the overlap of sub-disciplines, the author hopes that a group of people from several Research Committees with ICT qualities can be set up in order to continue the GSPS Project.

1. RC33 on the Development of the Discipline (2000-2014)

The GSPS Project is in line with, and adds to, the book series, edited by Michael Stein and John Trent, *The World of Political Science: The Development of the Discipline*. At the IPSA world congress in 2000 Michael Stein and John Trent of IPSA Research Committee 33 invited the chairs of the other Research Committees to convene panels on the topic of the development and current state of their respective sub-disciplines within political science, asking the question of ‘why we are where we are in political science?’. They also initiated a book series designed to represent prevailing global professional opinion among political scientists on the historical development and current state of the discipline at the beginning of the millennium. They hoped that by providing sub-disciplinary overviews they would be able to summarize and evaluate current concepts and methodologies that have been developed in the discipline, to provide an overview of findings and trends and to include critical evaluations and suggestions for the discipline’s future. The initiative resulted in a remarkably large number of IPSA panel sessions and papers, as well as 12 book volumes published by Barbara Budrich Publishers between 2006 and 2012. The twelfth and concluding volume, *The World of Political Science: A Critical Overview of the Development of Political Studies around the Globe: 1990-2012*, edited by Trent and Stein (2012), presents the accumulated findings and results they have culled from the previous volumes.

The conclusion by Stein and Trent, based on these findings, is rather critical of the state of international political science. To mention just a few elements (this is not the place to further discuss these outcomes): research output may be characterized as diverse and eclectic; almost all political science research paradigms are severely questioned; political science is still predominantly Western and male; there is an increasing fragmentation of the discipline; and political scientists from many countries recognize that their discipline has little relevance for politics, the media or the public (see Stein 2012, 136-140 for his more detailed description).

These conclusions were discussed at a Special Session during the IPSA world congress in Montreal in 2014, organized by RC33. One of the topics related to the actual strength of political science as a discipline were ‘intercontinental relationships’ and the question of ‘competing political science communities?’. I use the text written for this session on the issue

of intercontinental relations (see Reinalda 2014, 27-29 – as I cannot find anymore the text on the IPSA website).

There has been a steady expansion of political science around the world, with the discipline developing in an incremental manner. It can be argued that the modern discipline we are discussing was founded in the United States (US) in the late nineteenth century. This implies, according to Stein (2012, 67), that the discipline was defined in the underlying values of that country, such as liberal democracy and the pursuit of free academic inquiry, with, after the Second World War, its focus shifting to the objective of scientific truth as defined by modern philosophers of the natural sciences, based on the generation of hypotheses and empirical testing. Stein discloses a debate about the evolution of political science with roughly two positions, based on trends in political science handbooks.

The first position portrays the evolution as ‘essentially following a progressive path or upward trend to a more fully formed, more scientifically advanced and more generally accepted and legitimate academic enterprise’ (Stein 2012, 69). This can be recognized in *A New Handbook of Political Science*, edited by Robert Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann (1996). This is not the place to discuss whether or not their historical analysis is sufficient (Stein mentions the literature dealing with that issue), but rather the claim of Goodin and Klingemann that the discipline is progressively moving in this ‘American’ direction.

Philippe Schmitter (2002) takes the other position, by mentioning the scholarly exchanges between the United States and Europe. Although he also sees an increasing consensus and convergence in concepts, methods and assumptions between the two political science communities, he argues that this synthesis is an unbalanced one that privileges the standards of political inquiry of American disciplinary practitioners. Schmitter, who uses the term ‘American *cum* Transatlantic European perspective’, also refers to a different ‘European’ political science, which is more intellectually, rather than professionally, oriented, more policy-relevant and more contextual in terms of time and space than the American one. Hence, for Schmitter the evolution of the discipline is not as direct as claimed by the first position, but rather a matter of a crisis of identity, which is due in part to the accelerating forces of globalization (Stein 2012, 70-71).

The idea of two large political science communities having a debate based on specific elements raises the question of what is happening in the rest of the world, where political science is also practised. Stein argues that Goodin and Klingemann fail to give sufficient attention to the non-western outlooks and values of important minority communities of professional political scientists. ‘These include a rapidly growing body of Asian political scientists reflecting the interests and orientations of developing global powers such as China and India, a geographically and culturally diverse community of political scientists embracing the religio-cultural values of Islamic countries, or a vocal group of African political scientists focusing on the economic impoverishment and political instability of their sub-continent’ (Stein 2012, 83), as well as forms of political organization and democratization. Stein also criticizes Schmitter for his inclination to define the regional cultural and geographical autonomy of European or Latin American political science communities ‘largely in reactive and negative terms, in response to perceived American cultural imperialism’. Stein prefers to see the outlooks of these communities as independent and expects that much is to be gained from a cooperative and positive perspective on new ideas and approaches that are generated by ‘the large, highly pluralistic, very innovative and energetic, if somewhat ethnocentric American political science community’ (Stein 2012, 84). The chapter in the Trent and Stein volume on Asia, with its focus on Japan, South Korea and China, written by Takashi Inoguchi, is telling in this respect, because it shows the conceptual influence of American political science in these three countries. However, American political science ‘does not care much about what’s going on elsewhere’ (Inoguchi 2012, 33).

Nonetheless, the idea of continents or major regions (Europe, Asia, Africa, Latin America, the Arab world) as identifiable political science communities with regard to the development of the discipline seems promising, because it recognizes the culturally and geographically relevant aspects of these regions and their interaction with dominant American political science. It will also allow the communities to define themselves more precisely vis-à-vis the discipline, which may be a matter to be taken up by the associations at various levels (national, regional, global). This view should not keep the profession from an integratory approach that brings together scientists from all over the world, nor should common features at the regional level reinforce existing stereotypes or weaken the visibility of the common worldwide goal of searching for better ways of promoting political science research and teaching.

The 2014 discussion in Montreal confirmed the necessity of looking beyond national developments. The Stein and Trent project included mostly papers about national developments. Only a few was dealing with developments per continent or major region. The text for this discussion resulted in the proposition (Reinalda 2014, 29):

When discussing the evolution of political science as a discipline, it makes sense to discern the discipline's directions in a number of major regions (continents) with political science communities as locations where American political science has been influential, but where the discipline has also developed its own regional characteristics.

One example of paying attention to the regional history of the discipline, is the symposium organized by the Grupo de Investigación: Historia de la Ciencia Política en América Latina at the 9th congress of the Asociación Latinoamericana de Ciencia Política (ALACIP) in 2017, stimulated by Paulo Ravecca, with four panels, some 18 papers and a book plan.

2. The GSPS Bibliographic Database (2015)

The origin of the GSPS Bibliographic Database is rather simple. While the IPSA began looking for ways to bring regional political scientists more closely together, RC33 wondered whether it could contribute to this effort, in addition to its ideas about intercontinental relations, by providing titles of publications about the development of the discipline in several regions in a digital form. Thierry Dias Coelho and I decided to set up a digital bibliography, which would be publicly available through the website of RC33 and also provide others with the possibility to add more publications as well as corrections (through the Editors). It also included social media facilities in order to promote communication among political scientists in this respect (we did so without proper ideas of what to expect).

When setting up the bibliography, Thierry and I looked for *publications on the state of the art of political science* both in countries and on continents (or parts of them), whether these were journal articles, book sections, books, conference papers, academic dissertations or other relevant texts. With regard to the rules applying to the selection of references, we decided that publications should focus on the state of the art of the discipline of political science or political studies, or whatever name the discipline holds locally, with attention being paid to the development of the discipline (including crucial parts of it, such as international relations, methodology, national political systems, comparative political science, political theory, public administration, etc.) and its institutes (departments, international and national political science associations, institutions, political scientists and researchers), research projects and teaching of the discipline, as well as influential political scientists.

The publications should help to understand *the advance of the discipline* in a country, group of countries, region, continent or worldwide. The terms 'development' and

‘advancement’ of the discipline may be very wide, but if we as Editors have strong doubts about the information provided in a publication, or if we as outsiders are unable to learn much about the advance of the discipline, we will not include such publications.

Publications are *ordered by country name* (in the English alphabetical order), then in alphabetical order by author name. If publications cover more than one country or continent, they are mentioned under all country/continent names. Germany was divided into four periods: ‘Germany (1850-1945)’, ‘Germany (Former German Democratic Republic)’, ‘Germany (Former West Germany)’ and ‘Germany (since 1990)’ and in the case of Russia two periods were considered: ‘USSR’ and ‘Russia (since 1991)’. The dataset includes seven *continents’ labels*: ‘Global’ (for global analysis), ‘Africa’, ‘Asia’, ‘Australia/Oceania’, ‘Europe’, ‘North America’ and ‘South America’. In what concerns *regions*, the dataset includes fourteen labels: ‘Arab World’, ‘Balkans’, ‘Central America’, ‘Central Europe’, ‘Eastern Europe’, ‘Latin America’, ‘Middle East’, ‘Northern Africa’, ‘Northern America’, ‘Northern Europe’, ‘Southern Europe’, ‘Sub-Saharan Africa’, ‘Western Europe’ and ‘Other’. An additional label entitled ‘The Discipline’ has also been created (covering topics related to the longitudinal analysis of political science expansion, independently of the country), together with labels referring to international and national political science associations, such as APSA, ECPR, EPSA, IPSA, etc.

There is *no time limit* with regard to the discipline’s development, as the discipline often is older than generally assumed, while older developments, for instance within law or economics, may still be relevant for understanding the present situation.

The *languages* published are some main languages in the Latin alphabet: English, French, German, Spanish, Italian and Portuguese. Other languages in the Latin alphabet can be included, but (apart from a description in the original language) need a translation of the title into one of the main languages, preferably English. Languages in another alphabet will be included in a transcription plus a translation of the title into one of the main languages in Latin, preferably English, as well as a reference to the original language.

For the *description* of publications in GSPS, we use the so-called APSA style (see www.apsanet.org/Portals/54/APSA%20Files/publications/APSAStyleManual2006.pdf).

We began in a very simple way by setting up lists of titles of articles and books, which we were aware of, but soon the *collection of publications* to be listed in the Database was based on a three-stage comprehensive research:

- 1) Search with keywords (see below) on platforms such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, Web of Science and b-on;
- 2) Continued search of papers presented at relevant academic conferences (APSA, ECPR, EPSA, IPSA, etc. as well as national political science associations);
- 3) Exhaustive search in the bibliographies of the publications listed in 1) and 2).

Keywords used for GSPS are: “political science in”, “comparative politics in”, “political studies in”, “international relations in”, “the discipline” and “political science”, “political science”, “international relations”, “the study of political science”, “mapping political science”, “mapping political research”, “political scientists”, “the profession” and “political science”, “political science” and “history”, “what do we know” and “political science”, “state of” and “political science”, “teaching of” and “political science”, “students” and “political science”, “universities” and “political science”, “conferences” and “political science”, “publishing in” and “political science”.

The *digital search for publications* and *the construction of the website* were done by Thierry, who had excellent ICT skills and strong ideas about technical questions and the quality of a website and he had an assistant available for both the search in web platforms and the testing of the website’s robustness. We fed our lists into the system he was developing at his university, while he also began a thorough search in several web platforms, such as Web of Science, JSTOR and Google Scholar, by using keywords, with over 8,000 references as a first

result. Thierry called this ‘frightening’, but we managed to ‘clean’ the list by refining our keywords. We then ended up with 750 references, a number we could handle and discuss. After we had launched the website, Thierry became seriously ill and eventually passed away, which meant that stages 2) and 3), mentioned above, came to a standstill. New references have not been added (although we received several responses) and our plan to provide the Database not only in PDF format, but also in SPSS, Excel and CSV format was not implemented. The situation is even more complicated, since I have no more access to the website and my passwords are no longer valid. Hence, there is not much I can do to continue the website and Database in its present form. The website, however, is still available.

Let me provide some results with regard to the Bibliographic Database, which is based on what we found a few years ago. The alphabetically ordered countries with the number of publications on the discipline’s state of the art in those countries included in GSPS can be found in Appendix 1. Table 1 shows the countries with the numbers of publications in a declining order with the greatest number of publications for the United States (lonely at the top), France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Italy and Spain (all over 30 publications). Table 2 shows the continents and regions with the numbers of publications and Table 3 shows the international political science organizations and what we called ‘the discipline’ with the numbers of publication.

Table 1: Countries & Declining Numbers of Publications on the Discipline in GSPS

United States	123
France	65
Germany (total)	58
United Kingdom	42
Germany since 1990	39
Italy	34
Spain	31
Mexico	26
Canada	25
China	19
Austria	18
Germany 1850-1950	15
Argentina / Russia (total) / Sweden	14
Portugal	12
Brazil / Switzerland	11
Finland	10
Chile / Japan	9
Australia / Belgium / Netherlands / Norway / Poland	8
Czech Republic / Romania / Russia (former USSR) / Russia (since 1991)	7
India / South Africa / Uruguay	6
Colombia / Greece / Hungary / Ireland / New Zealand / Philippines / Turkey	5
Denmark / Korea, South / Latvia / Lithuania / Slovakia	4
Bulgaria / Croatia / Iceland	3
Cyprus / Estonia / Former GDR 1950-1990 / Former West Germany 1950-1990 / Hong Kong / Lebanon / Malaysia / Moldova / Nigeria / Slovenia	2
Albania / Armenia / Azerbaijan / Bangladesh / Belarus / Cuba / Egypt / Ethiopia / Georgia / Indonesia / Israel / Luxemburg / Macedonia / Mozambique / Nepal / Pakistan / Peru / Serbia / Singapore / Taiwan / Tanzania / Thailand / Ukraine / Uzbekistan / Venezuela / (Former) Yugoslavia / Zimbabwe	1

Table 2: Continents and Regions & Number of Publications on the Discipline in GSPS

Africa	6
Arab World	1
Asia	1
Europe	54
Europe, Central	9
Europe, Eastern	11
Europe, Northern	12
Europe, Western	3
Global	13
Latin America	19
Middle East	1

Table 3: Organizations and the Discipline & Number of Publications on the Discipline in GSPS

APSA	14
ECPR	4
IPSA	6
The Discipline	155

GSPS also allows to look at countries per continent and major regions (Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe (i.e. Eastern and Central, and Western), Latin (i.e. South and Central) America and the Middle East). Northern America is quite simple, given only two countries: the United States and Canada, with 123 and 25 publications, respectively. The general conclusion already is that we know far less about the discipline's development in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East than about the discipline in northern America and Europe. Table 4 shows the African countries included in GSPS, Table 5 the Asian and Pacific countries, Table 6 the Latin American countries and Table 8 the Middle Eastern countries. On 7 African countries we have 13 publications, on 17 Asian and Pacific countries we have 68 publications, on 9 Latin American countries we have 74 publications and on 3 Middle Eastern countries we have 8 publications.

Table 4: African Countries in GSPS and the Number of Publications on the Discipline

Egypt	1
Ethiopia	1
Mozambique	1
Nigeria	2
South Africa	6
Tanzania	1
Zimbabwe	1
<i>Total: 7 countries</i>	<i>13 publications</i>

Table 5: Asian and Pacific Countries in GSPS and the Number of Publications on the Discipline

Australia	8
Bangladesh	1
China	19
Hong Kong	2
India	6
Indonesia	1
Japan	9
Korea, South	4
Malaysia	2
Nepal	1
New Zealand	5

Pakistan	1
Philippines	5
Singapore	1
Taiwan	1
Uzbekistan	1
Thailand	1
<i>Total: 17 countries</i>	<i>68 publications</i>

Table 6: Latin (South and Central) American Countries in GSPS and the Number of Publications on the Discipline

Argentina	14
Brazil	11
Chile	9
Colombia	5
Cuba	1
Mexico	26
Peru	1
Uruguay	6
Venezuela	1
<i>Total: 9 countries</i>	<i>74 publications</i>

Table 7: Middle Eastern Countries in GSPS and the Number of Publications on the Discipline

Israel	1
Lebanon	2
Turkey	5
<i>Total: 3 countries</i>	<i>8 publications</i>

Tables 8 and 9 discern between Eastern and Central Europe on the one hand and Western Europe on the other, with 76 publications on Eastern and Central Europe versus 337 on Western Europe.

Table 8: Eastern and Central European Countries in GSPS and the Number of Publications on the Discipline

Albania	1
Armenia	1
Azerbaijan	1
Belarus	1
Bulgaria	3
Croatia	3
Czech Republic	7
Estonia	2
Georgia	1
Former GDR 1950-1990	2
Hungary	5
Latvia	4
Lithuania	4
Macedonia	1
Moldova	2
Poland	8
Romania	7

Russia (former USSR)	7
Russia (since 1991)	7
Serbia	1
Slovakia	4
Slovenia	2
Ukraine	1
(Former) Yugoslavia	1
<i>Total: 23 countries (USSR and Russia counted as one)</i>	<i>76 publications</i>

Table 9: Western European Countries in GSPS and the Number of Publications on the Discipline

Austria	18
Belgium	8
Cyprus	2
Denmark	4
Finland	10
France	65
Germany 1850-1950	15
Former West Germany 1950-1990	2
Germany since 1990	39
Greece	5
Iceland	3
Ireland	5
Italy	34
Luxemburg	1
Netherlands	8
Norway	8
Portugal	12
Spain	31
Sweden	14
Switzerland	11
United Kingdom	42
<i>Total: 19 countries (several Germanies counted as one)</i>	<i>337 publications</i>

3. How to Extend and Enhance the GSPS Database?

One way of extending and enhancing the GSPS Database ‘back in time’ is combining the bibliographic titles we have found with the abstracts made by the IPSA in its *International Political Science Abstracts*. The *IPSA* abstracts were created in 1951 and have been published regularly, bimonthly today. By the end of 2016, the *IPSA* Database contained over 320,000 abstracts (according to IPSA; nearly 400,000, according to EBSCOhost). The Abstracts have been published by Sage since 2007 and are also published online by EBSCO (with data since its inception in 1951) and by Ovid Technologies (with data since 1989; some 300,000 abstracts since then, according to Ovid Technologies) in English (numbers found on websites in September 2017). Both publishers require a subscription, with discounts to subscribers in developing countries and Eastern Europe. Subscriptions may also be available through university libraries, but it depends on the subscription type. My university library allows access to the *IPSA* abstracts as an e-journal since it was published by Sage in 2007. For this paper, I have not been able to access any older volume or to access the old-fashioned paper version, which we once had in our department library. I still remember exactly where, because I could just walk to the book shelves (but the departmental library does not exist anymore and the paper abstracts were removed, probably/hopefully to a central depot). Every effort to reach the paper

version through the button ‘check available paper version’ leads to the online version, with 2007 as the oldest year, while it is also mentioned: ‘No other editions or formats’. What an interesting experience in a time where we move from paper to digital formats! I just hope that the *IPSA* abstracts do not repeat a previous experience, where I needed to go through several older editions of the *Yearbook of International Organizations* and had to find out that the library did not keep previous versions any longer.

Articles in the *IPSA* abstracts are classified in six chapters: 1) political science: method and theory; 2) political thinkers and ideas; 3) governmental and administrative institutions (both central and state, regional and local); 4) political process: public opinion, attitudes, parties, forces, groups and elections; 5) international relations (both international law, organizations and administration and foreign policy and IR) and 6) national and area studies. Each issue has a detailed index, which may be helpful by checking individual countries, but the keywords or references in the index are not particularly helpful to finding elements of the disciplinary history, as they mostly refer to abstract terminology and concrete elements of political processes and institutions, rather than to elements of the discipline’s development (see the GSPS keywords discussed above). The same goes for ‘Political science’ as a keyword in the index, which has several indented keywords underneath. For the first three issues of 2017 the word ‘mapping [Political science]’ was the only exception in the index, while also three countries were mentioned under the keyword ‘Political science’. This means that a decent set of keywords is relevant for mining the *IPSA* abstracts database in order to find articles not yet included in GSPS. Entering the keyword ‘discipline’ was most successful under chapter 5) international relations as well as chapter 1) political science: method and theory. Chapter 6) national and area studies will be helpful for national and regional developments of the discipline.

I have not yet discussed the combination of the GSPS references (just title descriptions) with the *IPSA* abstracts (as far as covered in journals) with the Editors of the *IPSA* abstracts, because I first want to have an overview of the possibilities of continuing the GSPS Project but I will approach them at the Hannover conference. However, it may be expected that the combination of bibliographic entries in GSPS with their abstracts will be very helpful. The same goes for (information about) links to digitized publications, which also has to be mapped. Both abstracts and full texts are relevant if it comes to digital text analysis of the references and added texts in GSPS.

Since UNESCO played an important role in distributing ideas about the relevance of political science and in bringing together political scientists from the United States and Europe in the years following the end of the Second World War (*IPSA* was founded in 1949 under the aegis of UNESCO), it makes sense to consult the bibliographic databases of UNESCO. UNESDOC/UNESBIB contains bibliographic records and in many cases full text access to UNESCO documents and publications, also with regard to political science (see www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/resources/online-materials/publications/unesdoc-database/). Typing in ‘political science’ into UNESDOC shows 1,454 records. The text of, for example, the survey *Contemporary Political Science*, published by UNESCO in 1950, is available online, like quite a few other UNESCO texts (see www.unesco.org/ulis/cgi-bin/ulis.pl?catno=72539&set=0059D2551C_3_302&gp=1&lin=1&ll=1). Thierry and I have profited from what we found in UNESDOC. Typing in ‘political science’ into the library section ‘Social and Human Sciences – Publications’ shows 699 records, several of them available online. Such availability should be added to the GSPS Database.

UNESCO may also be helpful in further exploring the possibilities of approaching political scientists in various parts of the world. This can also be done through national political science associations, but these are rather weak in their transnational relations, as we found out. A list of *IPSA* collective members can be found at www.ipsa.org/membership/collective, but the numbers remain restricted: 3 in Africa, 6 in Latin America, 3 in North America (here Mexico

is not seen as part of Central America), 9 in Asia, 32 in Europe and 2 in Oceania. In 1992 UNESCO established UNITWIN, the University Twinning and Networking Programme, which has the objective to advance research and training by UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN Networks in institutions of higher education. The list of UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN Networks in the field of political science contains Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Italy, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Sudan and the United Kingdom (www.unesco.org/en/university-twinning-and-networking/access-by-domain/social-and-human-sciences/political-sciences/).

4. Concluding Remarks

The substantial background of the GSPS Project is found in the activities of RC33 on the development of the discipline between 2000 and 2014. The extensive panel and book projects set up by Michael Stein and John Trent resulted in a rather critical conclusion about the discipline's actual performance. The book project also questioned differences between regional/continental political science communities, that should be investigated further. Both IPSA and RC33 is interested in bringing regional political scientists more closely together, as is done by Paulo Ravecca in Latin America. Some South African colleagues are also active in this respect.

The launch of the GSPS Project was well received, but tragic circumstances prevented its elaboration. This paper is an attempt to revive the GSPS Project. It shows ways to continue by extending and enhancing the GSPS Database 'back in time' and it hopes to find new collaborators, preferably from several RCs and with both substantial and ICT expertise.

References

- Goodin, Robert E. and Hans-Dieter Klingemann (Eds) (1996), *A New Handbook of Political Science*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2012), 'Political Science in Three Democracies. Disaffected (Japan), Third-Wave (Korea) and Probably Fledgling (China)' in: John Trent and Michael Stein (Eds), *The World of Political Science. A Critical Overview of the Development of Political Studies Around the Globe: 1990-2012*, Opladen, Berlin and Toronto: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 11-39
- Reinalda, Bob (2014), 'Current Performance and Future Strength of Political Science' in: *Analele Universitatii Bucuresti, Stiinte Politice*, 16/1, 2014, 25-38
- Schmitter, Philippe C. (2002), *Seven (Disputable) Theses Concerning the Future of 'Transatlanticized' or 'Globalized' Political Science*. Paper presented to the IPSA, October 2001
- Stein, Michael B. (2012), 'Is There a Genuinely International Political Science Discipline? An Overview and Assessment of Recent Views on Disciplinary Historical Trends, in: John Trent and Michael Stein (Eds), *The World of Political Science. A Critical Overview of the Development of Political Studies Around the Globe: 1990-2012*, Opladen, Berlin and Toronto: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 67-89
- Trent, John and Michael Stein (Eds), *The World of Political Science. A Critical Overview of the Development of Political Studies Around the Globe: 1990-2012*, Opladen, Berlin and Toronto: Barbara Budrich Publishers

Appendix 1: Countries (Alphabetically) & Number of Publications on the Discipline in GSPS

Albania	1
Argentina	14
Armenia	1
Australia	8
Austria	18
Azerbaijan	1
Bangladesh	1
Belarus	1
Belgium	8
Brazil	11
Bulgaria	3
Canada	25
Chile	9
China	19
Colombia	5
Croatia	3
Cuba	1
Cyprus	2
Czech Republic	7
Denmark	4
Egypt	1
Estonia	2
Ethiopia	1
Finland	10
France	65
Georgia	1
Germany 1850-1950	15
Former GDR 1950-1990	2
Former West Germany 1950-1990	2
Germany since 1990	39
Greece	5
Hong Kong	2
Hungary	5
Iceland	3
India	6
Indonesia	1
Ireland	5
Israel	1
Italy	34
Japan	9
Korea, South	4
Latvia	4
Lebanon	2
Lithuania	4
Luxemburg	1
Macedonia	1
Malaysia	2

Mexico	26
Moldova	2
Mozambique	1
Nepal	1
Netherlands	8
New Zealand	5
Nigeria	2
Norway	8
Pakistan	1
Peru	1
Philippines	5
Poland	8
Portugal	12
Romania	7
Russia (former USSR)	7
Russia (since 1991)	7
Serbia	1
Singapore	1
Slovakia	4
Slovenia	2
South Africa	6
Spain	31
Sweden	14
Switzerland	11
Taiwan	1
Tanzania	1
Thailand	1
Turkey	5
Ukraine	1
United Kingdom	42
United States	123
Uruguay	6
Uzbekistan	1
Venezuela	1
(Former) Yugoslavia	1
Zimbabwe	1