

# POLITICAL SCIENCE AND/ OR POLICY SCIENCE?: PREMISES OF POLARITY IN PERSPECTIVE.

— A. V. MANIVASAGAR

The two terms — ‘ Political Science ’ and ‘ Policy Science ’<sup>1</sup> — are often used interchangeably in common Parlance. A brief look at the literature shows that there are scholars who write about policy issues, and there are scholars who call themselves Policy Scientist; in order to be indentified as a Policy Scientist; one should deal with the policy issues; but not all those who deal with policy issues want to be recognised as Policy Scientists.<sup>2</sup> Some prefer to be called, Economists, Socialogists, System Analysts or Political Advisors — like Kissinger, Moynihan, Lindblom, Etizioni and many others. In recent decades, physical and natural Sciences as well as cultural sciences have also produced Policy Scientists. Despite their diversity of origins, Policy Scientist tend to converge on a common outlook. Ideally, a Policy Scientists perceives himself as an integrator of knowledge and action.<sup>3</sup>

The growth and evolution of Social Science in its purpose of studying various policy issues since the late eighteenth century has reached its culmination in the policy analysis research in recent decades. The term Policy analysis rese-arch in recent decades. The term Policy Science was coined by Learner and Lass-well in 1950s;<sup>4</sup> and now Policy Science is considered the most comprehensive and scientific study of applied social science: Learner outlines the evolution of Social Science towards Policy Science in a tabular form:

APPROX. PERIOD	SOCIAL SCIENCE	POLICY ISSUE
1700 — 1750	Demography	Human mobility
1750 — 1800	Economics	Industry & Commerce
1800 — 1850	Sociology	Urban Poverty
1850 — 1900	Anthropology	Imperialism
1900 — 1925	Psychology	Human Resources
1925 — 1950	Political Science	Democratic Planning
1950 — 1975	Communication	Globalism
From — 1975	Policy Science	Public Policy

SOURCE: See foot note 3 (emphasis added)

Though Policy Science fast developing within the broad gamut of Political Science, Policy Scientists, in the aggregate have only begun to develop a distinctive professional identity and an understanding of the roles they may play in social development. However, there is now a complete shift in Political Science towards public policy - to the description and explanation of the causes and consequences of government activity.

At the very beginning, Policy Science was attached more to Political Science than to other Social Sciences. One can understand the emergence of Policy Science by reviewing the approaches of the scholars of Political Science such as Merriam and his Student Lasswell and the development of the behavioural approach inside Political Science.<sup>5</sup>

Political Science can be considered to be the origin of Policy Science. It is very difficult to determine the contribution of Political Science, since Political Science itself has been very closely connected with Law, Economics and Sociology; especially during the development of behavioural era; Political Science borrowed concepts, tools and methodologies from other disciplines.<sup>6</sup> To say that Policy Science is an interdiscipline is not to say that everything common to Political Science and Policy Science is a contribution from the former to the latter. The claim that certain things borrowed by Political Science from other disciplines created the conditions for the emergence of Policy Science is an interesting argument, but does not define the contribution of Political Science to Policy Science.

It is too early to see Policy Science in a sufficient Perspective for analysing the influence of Political Science on it. Instead, this article deals with their converging and diverging elements in order to explain the existing polarity.

## II

Many definitions of Political Science are scattered in the enormous volume of literature. For the purpose of this attempt, Political Science is defined here as the subject dealt with the academia under the title of Political Science. Although this definition is not very precise, a brief glance at what is being offered in Department of Political Science shows that most of them are dealing with the same topics.<sup>7</sup> These often fall into four major areas: (1) Political ideology (2) Theory of Government (3) Public Administration and (4) International relations.<sup>8</sup> Each of these element is a product, an application or an aspect of another. In this way, we can say that theory of Government is the product of political Ideology, Public Administration is the application of Theory of Government and International Relation is one aspect of the Public Administration.<sup>9</sup> Although this rank order is important,

the relationships are neither one way nor one - dimensional. For example, problems in International Relations caused changes in Political ideology, and, consequently caused shifts in the study of politics. Thus, the emergence of developing states changed not only the World politics but also the Academic World of politics but also the Academic World of research and teaching.

There is at least one dimension that combines all the elements of Political Science - the policy dimension of political activity research. However, the policy dimension has the static character in one group of elements, and a dynamic character in the other. The static dimension results from the rule of values.

'Policy' is concerned with the discovery of values by using the criteria of political ideology without any pretension of directly influencing political ideologies (or to lesser extent, theories of Government). Hence, there is a very dynamic connection between policy and public administration and between policy and international relations. This kind of grouping indicates that the suggested hierarchy among these elements of Political Science is no longer accurate. Recent developments in the U. S. A., China and Russia (among other countries) give us impression that theories of Government and political ideologies are influenced by public administration (which regulates more and more areas) and international relations more than they influence these elements. This change can be explained by the fact that public administration and international relations have changed and now have a dynamic character, while the elements in the other group keep a rather static approach.

This difference partially explains why public administration and international relations tend to seek an independent status outside Political Science; since public administration and international relations have been exposed more to behavioural approaches, they tend to be independent (institutionally at least) from those areas that still prefer the normative approach.

Policy Science with its normative instrumental approach is a break-through in Political Science for at least two reasons:

- (1) Recognition of the critical nature of the connection between 'Science' and 'Government'<sup>10</sup>.
- (2) The narrow approach of Political Science and its concentration around traditional areas of interest.<sup>11</sup>

Much of the reason for emergence of Policy Science outside Political Science is due to the fact that Political Science was not able to assimilate rapidly and effectively what Somit calls "the key behavioralist articles of faith"<sup>12</sup> or, to use the words of Kirkpatrick: "From the advocates of the behavioural approach (in Political Science) there was often more promise than performance".<sup>13</sup>

### III

In Publications by scholars who identify themselves as Political Scientists, we can find views such as:

- “Political Science is a kind of central clearing house on the making, analysis and interpretation of Public policy”<sup>14</sup>.
- “From the very beginning, Political Scientists saw Scholarly inquiry and systematic accumulation of knowledge as a major objective. From the beginning, though many of them regarded two other activities as also falling within their sphere first education... second, personal involvement in Public policy. Both were accepted as correlative responsibilities. Both ... have since absorbed much of the profession’s attention”<sup>15</sup>.
- “...Political Scientists will - and should be called upon to advise policy makers to the degree that they are perceived to have special professional knowledge and skill”<sup>16</sup>.
- “Political Scientists also ask more detailed questions about policy making; for example, most Political Scientists are intensely concerned with policy making from the perspective of what Harold Lasswell termed ‘who gets what, when, how?...’”<sup>17</sup>

These opinions indicate that although something has been changed, there are people who are trying to stop the process or to deny the fact that Policy Science does not exist. The Political Science Panel of Behavioural and Social Science Survey, for example, stated (1969) that “A Science of public policy does not yet exist... objective study of public policy and policy process is high on agenda of Political Science”<sup>18</sup>

Some scholars recognized it, and they have a kind of an ambivalent approach to it. Thus, we can read:

- “Political Scientists do not have any particular claim to professional authority in substantive policy areas because, policies concern all facets of human behaviour”<sup>19</sup>.
- “But even those who believe that matters of public policy are legitimate objects of attention are not altogether sure that Political Scientists have been dealing with the right questions”<sup>20</sup>.
- “If Political Science were the science of determining public policies, it would need to be at least as comprehensive. But, political Science, like Economics, has a less ambitious purpose”<sup>21</sup>.

An ambivalent approach towards new developments is not something new. A comparison of the attitude of Political Science towards behaviourism with its attitude toward Policy Science will reveal some common features, but also an interesting insight into Political Science as a discipline.<sup>22</sup>

The next question is whether Policy Science is an independent entity or simply another approach inside Political Science. In order to answer this question it is useful to use Charlesworth's differentiation between "approach as a method and an approach as an objective".<sup>23</sup>

#### IV

Policy Science can be considered to be an approach only in the second meaning. Thus, Policy Science is different from Political Science. This claim is supported by the following arguments:

- (1) Policy Sciences claim to be an interdisciplinary approach<sup>24</sup> (i. e., a kind of overarching theory of social systems).

Political Science is only one component of Policy Science - which according to some Political Scientists "should keep its identity and integrity against interdisciplinary approach".<sup>25</sup> Therefore, according to set theory, even if Political Science is the most important component of Political Science, Policy Science cannot be part of Political Science.

- (2) There is nothing that enables us to classify Policy Science as another approach among other recognised schools or approaches in Political Science.<sup>26</sup>
- (3) The main approaches inside Political Science are those which deal with institutions and those which deal with the process. Policy Sciences uses both institutions and process, and is not able to separate them.<sup>27</sup>
- (4) Political Science deals mainly with political systems; only recently has attention been paid to the role of individuals. Policy Science is trying to deal with social systems, including the political system, through the use of group dynamics, social psychology, etc.<sup>28</sup>
- (5) Political Science deals with the political aspect of economic decisions; Policy Science inquires into the economic meaning of political decisions. Thus, Policy Science is interested in the economic meaning of economic feasibility - since it sees economic measures as an important tool in the policy process (designing, approval, implementation, and continuation).<sup>29</sup>

- (6) Policy science tries to find out how to define and achieve objective goals through innovations and the manipulation of antagonistic political interests; Political Science is interested in the differences themselves between interest groups, and how each group is organized to achieve its subjective goals.<sup>30</sup>
- (7) Political Science focuses on the origin of power. Policy Science is interested mainly in the use of power to solve the policy issues or to achieve goals.<sup>31</sup>
- (8) Political Scientists are interested in political survival; Policy Scientists are also interested in objective survival. This means (among other things) that Political Scientists are in short-run considerations like the immediate influence of an action on the behaviour of political voters - while Policy scientists try to discover not only the immediate political consequences, but also the social and economic effects with will be political factors in the long run. Thus, we can say that Policy Science is interested equally in the process and content of the policy making process, While Political Science puts more emphasis on the political aspects of this process.<sup>32</sup>
- (9) Political Science is involved with the creation and definition of values for the society; Policy Science looks for them in the society or in the politicians themselves.<sup>33</sup>
- (10) Policy Science tries to find alternate solutions by discovering and defining political and other constraints. Political Science deals mainly with the nature of political constraints.
- (11) Political Science is interested in gathering knowledge in order to educate, and thus, to improve the policy. Policy Science is also interested in the use of existing knowledge in the policy making process,<sup>34</sup> even if the goal of education is not achieved.
- (12) As a product of the above, Policy Science is an applied Science. Political Science is oriented mainly towards basic research. Policy Science in Social Sciences is like engineering in natural science, and Political Science is like Chemistry in Physics.<sup>35</sup>

## V

Up to a certain point, Policy Science was part of Political Science. When it emerged as a separate entity, it took it much knowledge that had been gathered in Political Science.<sup>36</sup> From that time on, Political Science has been contributing to Policy Science in the same way as have other Social Sciences. Therefore,

going back to the original question of the contributions of Political Science to Policy Science. It may be more meaningful to speak of the heritage that Policy Science received from Political Science.

The heritage is mainly an organized knowledge about the meaning and the operational mechanisms of Government. This knowledge is essential in order to understand explicit political issues such as political ideology, democracy, norms and legislation.

Political Science gave Policy Science the context in which economic and social problems should be dealt with as well as a definition of some of these problems, the problems and ideas of the welfare state can be counted as one of the important contributions.

Although Policy Science inherited something from the very branch of Political Science, the most significant heritage was from the field of Public Administration - which is the branch related most closely to Political Science. Actually, Policy Science is an expansion of Public Administration, because Government activities have expanded to the point where there is no real difference between Business Management and Public Management. The only difference which still exists in democratic countries is the idea that Public Administration act inside a framework set by law, whereas private enterprise is permitted to do everything that is not prohibited by law. As a result, Public Administration was forced to accept rational methods and to use them to the degree that it was able. The abandonment of the old rule that you cannot measure Public Administration the way you measure Business Administration made people realize that resources are limited not only for the firm, but that they are scarce and critical for the whole system as well.

Therefore, it seems valid to relate the development of Management Science in general to the development of Policy Science, and the former's contribution to Public Administration.

## Notes and References:

1. Policy Science is also called Policy Sciences since it tends to integrate different disciplines of knowledge.
2. Policy analysis involves systematic identification of the course and consequences of public policy, the use of the scientific standards of inference and the search for reliability and generality of knowledge. (R. Thomas., *Policy Analysis*, The University of Alabama Press, Alabama, 1978, p. 3). The focus attention of policy analysis while with public policy, have been on particular decisions consisting the policy. As decisions are primarily problems - solving', five intellectual tasks are performed - (1) clarification of goals (2) description of trends (3) Analysis of conditions (4) projection of future development and (5) invention, evaluation and selection of alternatives. (*International Encyclopedia of Social Science*, Vol. 12, Macmillan and Free Press, London, 1970, p. 181.)
3. It is envisaged that "Policy Science is the comprehensive conception of the present as a movement from past to the future with a central tendency and a determinate direction". (D. Learner, "An Introductory note to Policy Studies", S. Nagel, (ed.), *Social Science, to Policy Science* Lexington Books, London, 1974, p. 7.)
4. Learner, D. and Lasswell, H. D., (eds.), *The Policy Science; Recent Developments in Scope and methods* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957). Among the early publications in that area, we can mention Apple by, P. H., *Policy and Administration* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1949). It is interesting to compare C. J. Friederich., *Foreign Policy in the making* N. Y.: W. W. Norton, 1938) with the changes from one edition to the other in K. London., *The making of Foreign Policy*, first published in 1949, (3rd ed. N. Y.: J. B. Lippincott, 1965.)
5. Kirkpatrick, E. M., "The Impact of Behavioral Approach on Traditional Political Science" in Ranney, A., (ed), *Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967; Somit A., and Tanenhaus, J., *The Development of American Political Science from Burgess to Behaviorism*. (Boston: Allen and Bacon, Inc., 1967) pp. 109 f; Truman, D. B., "The Impact of Revolution in Behavioral Sciences on Political Science" in Bailey, S. K., et. al., *Research Frontiers in Politics and Government* (Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute, 1955) p. 215.
6. Easton, D., "The Current Meaning of Behavioralism", J. C., (ed.), *Contemporary Political Analysis* (N. Y.: The Free Press, 1967), pp. 11 f.



7. C. F. Mac. Donald, N. A., "Political Theory as an Academic Field and Intellectual Activity" in Irish, M. D., (ed.), *Political Science; Advance of the Discipline* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice - Hall, 1968), pp. 33 f.
8. C.F. Eulau, H., and March, J. C., (eds.), *Political Science* (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice - Hall, 1969), p. 7.
9. This hierarchy of relationships was clearly demonstrated by totalitarian regimes. This also true in democratic regimes, although it is not always easy to see it immediately.
10. E. F. Dror, Y., *Public Policymaking Re-exemined* (San Fransisco: Chandler, 1968) pp. 3 f ( Chap. 1 ).
11. C. F. Hyneman, C. S., *The Study of Politics: The Present State of American Political Science* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959 ), pp. 23. 23 f; Truman, D. B., N. 5, P. 215: Key, V. O., " Issues and Problems of Political Science Research " in *The Status and Prospects of Political Science as a Discipline* ( Michigan: University of Michigan, 1960 ) pp. 32 — 39; de Huszar, G. B. and Satisvinson ( Paterson, N. J.: Littlefield Adams & Co., 1963 ) p. 3.
12. Somit, A. and Tanenhaus, J., ( 1967 ) n. 5, pp. 177 — 183.
13. Kirkpatrick, E. M. in Ranney, A., n. 5, p. 11.
14. Eulau, H., and March J. C., n. 8, p. 9.
15. Somit, A and Tanenhaus, J., n. 5, p. 42.
16. Ranney, A. (ed.), *Political Science and Public Policy* ( Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1968 ), p. 17.
17. Mitchell, J. M. and Mitchell, W. C., *Political Analysis and Public Policy: An Introduction to Political Science* ( Chicago: McNally & Co., 1969 ), p. 5; 6f Roseman, C. et. al ( eds.), *Dimensions of Political Analysis* ( Englewood Cliffs N. J.: Prentice — Hall, 1966 ), pp. 9 — 10.
18. Eulau, H and March, J. C., N. 8, pp. 18 — 19.
19. Mitchell, J. M. and Mitchell, W. C., n. 17, p. 393.
20. Somit, A and Tanenhaus, J., (1967), n. 5, p. 200.
21. Watkins, F., cited by Ranney, A., n. 5, p. 12.
22. Cf. Somit A and T Anenhaus, J., n. 5, pp. 176f; Easton, D., " The Current Meaning of Behavioralism " in Charesworth J. V., ( ed. ), n. 6,

- pp. 11 f.; An important example of this ambivalent approach is Lasswell's discussion of public policy under the title, *The Future of Political Science* ( N. Y: Prentice — Hall, 1963 ) pp. 1 f.
23. Somit, A and Tanenhaus, J., (1967), n. 5, p 1.
  24. Cf. Dror, Y., " Policy Analysis: A Theoretical Frame work and some Basic Concepts ", ( Rand, p. 4156, July 1969 ), p. 5.
  25. Somit, A and Tenenhaus, J., ( 1967 ), n. 5, p. 181 Cf. de Huszar, G. B. and Stivinson, J. J., n. 11, p. 3; Mitchell, J. M. and Mitchell, W. C., n. 17, p. 393; and Ranney, A (1968) n. 16, p. 12.
  26. For a classification of schools or approaches in Political Science, Cf. Charlesworth, J. D. n. 6, pp. 1 f; Gettle R. G., *Political Science*, rev. ed. ( Boston: Ginn & Co., 1949 ), pp. 3f.; de Huszar, G. B. and Stevinson, T. J., n. 11, p. 2; Jacobsen, G. A. and Lipman, M. H., *Political Science* ( N. Y. Barnes & Noble Inc. reprinted 1967 ), pp. 1—2.
  27. Cf. Truman, D. B., n. 5, p. 215; Gettle R. G, *Ibid.*, pp. 3 f. The system approach in Political Science was demonstrated in the classical works of Easton, D., *The Political System* ( N. Y.: Knopf, 1953 ) and *A System Analysis of Political Life* ( N. Y.: Wiley, 1965).
  28. Cf. Eulau, H., n. 8, p. 6; Kirkpatric, E. M., in Ranney, A. (ed.), (1962), n. 4; Hyneman, C. S.; n. 10, p. 23.
  29. Cf. Eulau, H., n. 8, pp. 20 f.
  30. Cf. Springer, M., " Social Indicators, Reports and Accounts ", *The Annals of the American Academy*, March, 1970, p. 4.
  31. Eulau, H , n. 8, p. 14; de Huszar, G. B., n. 10, p. 1; Mitchel, J. M. and Mitchel, W. C., n. 17, p. 3; an early and classical work in this direction is Laswell's, *Who Gets What, When, How*, 1936.
  32. Ranney, A (ed.), n. 15, p. 3.
  33. Cf. Dror, Y., (p. 4156) n. 24, p. 5; Jacobsen, G. A. and Lipman, M. A., n. 26, p. 1—2.
  34. Cf. A. P. S. A., *Goals of Political Sciences: Report of the Committee for Advancement of Teaching* (N. Y.: William Sloan Association, Inc., 1951); Salisbury, R. H., in Ranney, A., (ed.), n. 16, p. 151 f.
  35. Cf. Truman, D., in Ranney, n. 16, p. 283. It may be that an analogy to the ' life sciences ' is more accurate, but not as familier.
  36. Mitchel, J. M. and Mitchel, W. C., n. 17, p. 393.