

Finding Jobs in Political Science: 1996 Placement Candidates Report on Their Employment Search and Outcomes

Sheilah Mann, *American Political Science Association*

The American Political Science has been participating in a project funded by the National Science Foundation that examines the employment of recent Ph.D.s. The project, "Supply and Demand for New Science and Engineering Doctorates," coordinated by the Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology (CPST), was initiated with a grant from the Sloane Foundation and examined the placement of doctoral graduates in science and engineering professions. NSF has supported the expansion of the project to include additional scientific and technical associations including the American Psychological Association, the American Sociological Association, and APSA. Information about the project and data from the other participating professional associations can be found on the CPST web site (www.nextwave.org/survey13.htm).

The major APSA activity for this collaborative project was a survey of the doctoral graduates in political science who were looking for jobs in 1996. This essay discusses data collected from respondents to the survey. These data provide the first direct account by political science placement candidates of their job search experiences and their evaluation of the resources they used in seeking employment. Their experiences, augmented by comments on what was and would be useful in the job search should encourage and inform graduate departments and APSA, along with other political science associations, Organized Sections, and caucuses on how to better assist graduate students in planning

their careers and getting jobs in political science. Appendix 1 describes how this survey was conducted.

An examination of the profile of the 1996 placement candidates who responded to the survey begins this discussion of placement in political science. Specific aspects of their employment search and its outcome, along with their employment and career satisfaction, are explored next, followed by information on the job search experiences and outcomes of the placement candidates in dual-career situations (i.e., candidates with a spouse or partner who is also looking for employment) as compared with that of their cohorts without dual-career needs. A summary of what the respondents now regard as useful in preparing them to find jobs and would recommend to future graduates as they prepare for their job search precedes recommendations for how departments and professional organizations might better assist doctoral students preparing for political science careers. This article has six of the sixteen tables that elaborate on the respondents' experiences and assessments of their search for employment. Collectively, these tables display data on all questions in the survey. Appendix 2 lists the other ten tables that draw upon these same questions and whose findings are summarized in the essay. These ten tables can be found on the APSA website (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement).¹

Placement Candidates: Their Job Search and Its Outcomes

The attributes of the doctoral graduates on the job market in 1996 are summarized in Table 1. The composition of respondents is similar to the profile of the 1996 placement class drawn from the data submitted by Ph.D. departments (Mann 1996).² A slightly smaller percentage of respondents are not U.S. citizens, most likely attributable to their return their home countries for employment. Twenty-seven percent of the survey respondents are women, and women were 29% of the job candidates in the 1996 departmental placement survey. African-American and Latino graduates were each 2% of the respondents to this survey in comparison with 2.8% and 1.6% of the earlier departmental survey. Table 1 also displays information about the personal attributes of 1996 political science doctoral graduates. Their median age is 32; close to two-thirds are married or in domestic partnerships: 32% have children, and over half are in dual-career situations. Nine percent of the placement candidates have spouses or partners needing placement in political science and another 11% have spouses or partners needing placement in another academic field.

There are some notable differences between the respondents and the placement candidates studied earlier: a greater percentage of these respondents have their degrees (80% compared to 57%) and a greater percentage have jobs (87% to 65%). But, these differences may be attributable to the later administration in

TABLE 1
Profile of Respondents to the Survey of 1996 Placement Candidates

ALL RESPONDENTS, N = 417

	Personal attributes	
Citizenship	U.S. Citizens: 373 (90%)	Non U.S. Citizens*: 42 (10%)
	White: 326 (78%)	permanent resident: 21 (5%)
	African-American: 9 (2%)	temporary visa: 21 (5%)
	Latino: 9 (2%)	
	Asian-American: 8 (2%)	
	Native American: 3 (1%)	
	Other: 18 (4%)	
Gender	Women: 13 (27%)	Men: 302 (73%)
Age	Median: 32	Mean: 35
Family Status	Married/Domestic: 133 (32%)	without child(ren): 138 (33%)
	Partnership: with child(ren): 12 (3%)	without child(ren): 132 (32%)
	Unmarried: with child(ren): 36 (9%)	Academic: 44 (11%)
Dual Career Status	Yes: 1 Political Science	Other Career: 135 (33%)
	No: 190 (47%)	
Degree Status	Ph.D.: 331 (80%)	ABD: 84 (20%)
Years to Degree	Median: 7	Mean: 7
Date Ph.D. Received/Expected	Before May 1996: 117 (29%)	May-December 1996: 157 (38%)
	Jan-June 1997: (13%)	July-December 1997: (16%)
Undergraduate Institution	Public: 233 (56%)	Private: 182 (44%)
	Ph.D.: 266 (64%)	M.A.: 64 (16%)
		B.A.: 84 (20%)
		Range: 3-55
		After 1998: 14 (4%)
		B.A.: 84 (20%)
Employed	Yes: 359 (86%)	No: 57 (14%)
Placement Success	All: 359 (86%)	U.S. Citizens: 324 (87%)
	U.S. Men: 236 (86%)	U.S. Women: 87 (88%)
Placed in Academic Position	African-American: 9 (100%)	Latino: 8 (89%)
	U.S. Citizens: 264 (71%)	Non U.S. Citizens: 29 (69%)
	U.S. Men: 192 (70%)	U.S. Women: 71 (72%)
Placed in Full Time Permanent Position	U.S. Citizens: 183 (49%)	Non U.S. Citizens: 17 (40%)
	Men: 139 (46%)	Women: 60 (53%)
Satisfaction with Career Choice of a Political Science Ph.D.		
Recommend Career to Others	71 (17%)	

*Country of origin of non-U.S. citizens: Britain (6); Korea (4); China, India, South Africa (3 each country); Canada, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Philippines, Poland (2 each country); Guyana, Malaysia, Mexico, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Taiwan, Turkey (1 each country).

TABLE 1 — continued

EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS, N = 359

	Median:	9	Mean: Tenure Track:	12	Range: Non-Tenure Track:	0-60 138 (38%)
Months in Job Search Academically Employed		294 (82%)		154 (43%)		
Academic Placement	Ph.D. Department: Tenure Track: MA Department: Tenure Track: Undergraduate Department: Tenure Track: Two-Year College:	115 (32%) 64 (18%) 37 (10%) 19 (5%) 121 (34%) 62 (17%) 3 (1%)	Non-Tenure Track: Non-Tenure Track: Non-Tenure Track:	48 (13%) 18 (5%) 57 (16%)		
Non Academic Placement Current Position	Full Time Permanent: Part Time Permanent:	42 (12%) 201 (56%)	Other: Full Time Temporary: Part Time Temporary:	30 (8%) 93 (26%) 54 (15%)		
Field of Employment	American Gov't/Public Law: International Relations: Public Administration: Methodology: Northeast: Northwest:	132 (37%) 79 (22%) 27 (8%) 23 (6%) 127 (35%) 22 (6%)	Comparative Politics: Political Theory: Public Policy: Other: Southeast: Southwest:	80 (22%) 45 (13%) 26 (7%) 42 (12%) 56 (16%) 55 (15%)		
Job Location					Central: Non-U.S.:	70 (20%) 27 (7%)
Underemployed in Current Position Actively Looking for Another Position Job Search More Difficult than Expected		147 (41%) 180 (50%) 227 (63%)				

the 1996-97 academic year of the direct survey of job candidates. Twenty-nine percent of these respondents received their degrees in 1997 after departments completed and returned their placement questionnaires. Also, placement candidates continued to receive and accept job offers in the winter and spring of 1997.

The higher overall proportion of placed job candidates should not lead to much optimism about the job market or the job search. Seventy-one percent of these candidates had academic positions, but only 37% had tenure-track appointments; and less than half of all of the respondents (48%) had full-time permanent positions. A higher percentage of U.S. citizens (49%) than non-citizens (40%) had full-time permanent jobs. A slightly higher percentage of women (53%) were appointed to full-time permanent positions than men (46%). Almost three-fifths of the placement candidates (58%) said that they are satisfied with their pursuit of a Ph.D. and a career in political science and only 14% are not satisfied. In contrast with satisfaction with their own career choice, only 17% of them would recommend the career to others, with the remaining 83% evenly divided between uncertainty and not recommending a political science career. Their assessments likely reflect the immediacy and difficulty of their own job search, and are associated with the length of time of their job search. Seventy-one percent of the respondents who spent six months or less looking for a job expressed satisfaction with choosing a political science, career and 26% would recommend the career to others. In sharp contrast, 37% of the respondents who searched for employment for over two years before being hired affirmed that they are satisfied with their career choice, and only 7% of these political scientists would recommend the career to others. It is worth pointing out that 97% of the graduates with this lengthy job search received their doctorate.

Table 1 also profiles the employed respondents. Eighty-two percent of the employed respondents received

academic appointments, with only 43% appointed to tenure track positions. Fully one-half reported that they are actively looking for another job, 41% considered themselves underemployed, and nearly two-thirds considered their job search was more difficult than expected. Among the respondents who held academic positions, comparable percentages have tenure- and nontenure-track positions. Only 32% of these newly employed doctoral graduates were placed in Ph.D. departments, whereas two thirds of them began their careers working in institutions with differing missions from that of their graduate institutions. As 64% of the respondents earned their undergraduate degrees from Ph.D. departments, many new political science faculty have had no direct prior experience with the kind of institutions in which they were placed. Since comprehensive universities, public and private colleges, and community colleges now constitute the majority of hiring institutions in higher education, doctoral students would be well advised to learn about and have contact with non-Ph.D. institutions (Gaff and Lambert 1996).

Table 2 has more data on the placement outcomes for the employed respondents, by citizenship, gender, and minority status. A higher percentage of U.S. women (66%) than men (53%) held full-time permanent positions and tenure-track positions (66% of the women and 47% of the men). A slightly higher percentage of women (39%) than men (34%) were employed in undergraduate departments. While all of the African-American respondents were employed, fewer were in permanent positions than were Latino and Asian-American respondents and women. But, a higher proportion of the employed African Americans had appointments in Ph.D. departments than did any other group of respondents. The few African-American respondents spent the least time in the job search of any group—a median time of 5 months. Women, typically, spent 8 months looking for a job, and male, Latino, and Asian-

American respondents typically spent 9 months. The small number of minority candidates make generalizations based on these differences unreliable and make it unwise to separate them for analysis in the tables. Most of these respondents gave positive answers to broad questions about satisfaction with their current position. Sixty-seven percent of the African Americans, 63% of the Latinos, and 83% of the Asian Americans said that they are not underemployed in their current positions, and 67% of the African-American, 78% of the Latino and 75% of the Asian-American respondents are satisfied with their career choice. More of the minority political science doctoral graduates expressed satisfaction with their positions and career choices than did other American and international graduates.

Among non-U.S. citizens, the association between gender and having a full-time permanent position is reversed. Fifty-eight percent of the men and 33% of the women held these positions, and a higher proportion of these men (62%) than women (43%) were on a tenure track. The median job search for non-U.S. citizens was longer for men (10 months) and the same for women as for American women, but a higher percentage of the non-U.S. women were in part-time jobs.

Placement outcomes reported by respondents according to major fields in the discipline were similar to those reported in the 1996 departmental placement survey for the broader fields of American government/public law, comparative politics, and international relations. But larger percentages of these survey respondents, albeit still relatively small proportions of those placed, were in the fields of public administration, public policy, and methodology.

Tables 3A and 3B distinguish between the Ph.D. and ABD placement candidates. Table 3A explores the association between degree status and employment. As the report on the 1996 departmental placement data revealed, a higher proportion of Ph.D.s (9 of 10) than ABDs (7 of 10) are employed, and this is true

for men and women. And higher percentages of Ph.D.s than ABDs had tenure-track appointments, although there is less of a difference here for women than for men. There is little difference between Ph.D. and ABD respondents employed as faculty with respect to the type of department that hired them: Comparable proportions of Ph.D. and ABD men and women were in Ph.D. and M.A. departments. A higher proportion of ABD women than men were employed by undergraduate departments.

As would be expected, those ABD respondents who were employed did spend less time looking for a job. Also, a lower percentage considered the search more difficult than expected and a higher percentage said that their current job was their first choice. Women ABDs are the group reporting the highest level of satisfaction with their current positions and the lowest proportion actively looking for another job or finding the job search more difficult than expected, and being underemployed in their current position. Placement candidates who succeed in their first forays into the job market are understandably more likely to be satisfied with the outcome.

Table 3B introduces responses to questions asking candidates to evaluate specific methods of assistance in the job search as most useful or least useful. There are no striking differences associated with degree status in the responses to these questions.

Responses to the questions about career satisfaction, on the other hand, do differ slightly by degree status, with a higher percentage of Ph.D.s and, within each degree category, of women reporting satisfaction with their decision to pursue a political science career. The former difference may reflect satisfaction with the acquisition of the degree and the latter with having progressed further in the profession than expected.

Salary figures were reported by the employed respondents (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable1.html).³ Predictably, the salaries for the academically employed graduates holding full-time permanent positions are higher than for those holding temporary positions. Among the academically employed, salaries are highest for graduates with such positions in Ph.D. departments. Nine-ten month salaries of men with full-time permanent positions in Ph.D. departments are higher than the salaries of women in equivalent

TABLE 2

Type of Position, Primary Job, and Major Field of Employment for 1996 Placement Candidates Who Are Employed*

	N = 359								
	U.S. Citizens						Non U.S. Citizens		
	All N = 324	Men N = 236	Women N = 87	African American N = 9	Latino N = 8	Asian American N = 6	All N = 34	Men N = 25	Women N = 9
Type of Position									
Full Time Permanent	57%	53%	66%	44%	63%	67%	52%	58%	33%
Full Time Temporary	26	28	22	33	12	17	27	29	22
Part Time Permanent	2	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	11
Part Time Temporary	15	17	11	22	25	17	18	13	33
Total	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	101%	100%	100%	99%
Academically Employed									
Yes	83%	83%	82%	100%	75%	83%	85%	84%	89%
No	17	17	18	0	25	17	15	16	11
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Tenure Track									
Yes	52%	47%	66%	44%	67%	60%	57%	62%	43%
No	48	53	34	56	33	40	43	38	57
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Type of Primary Job									
Ph.D. Department	33%	34%	32%	67%	29%	50%	32%	29%	43%
MA Department	10	10	10	22	14	0	19	21	14
Undergrad Department	35	34	39	11	43	33	26	25	29
Two-Year College	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Academic Position	12	12	12	0	14	17	13	13	14
Other	9	9	7	0	0	0	10	12	0
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Months Spent Looking for Job									
Median	9	9	8	5	9	9	10	10	8
Mean	12	13	11	8	10	9	12	12	11
Field of Employment**									
American Gov't/Public Law	33%	37%	41%	44%	50%	17%	21%	16%	33%
Public Policy	8	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Comparative Politics	21	23	17	11	38	33	32	28	44
International Relations	20	23	14	0	13	0	41	48	22
Public Administration	8	6	14	44	0	0	3	4	0
Political Theory	14	15	9	0	0	17	3	4	0
Methodology	7	7	6	0	0	0	6	8	0
Other	11	11	10	22	0	17	18	20	11
Field in Which Sought Employment**									
American Gov't/Public Law	35%	34%	36%	44%	50%	17%	9%	8%	11%
Public Policy	8	8	8	22	25	0	6	0	22
Comparative Politics	23	24	21	22	50	33	56	48	78
International Relations	20	22	14	11	25	0	47	52	33
Public Administration	7	6	10	33	0	0	3	4	0
Political Theory	14	15	10	11	13	17	3	4	0
Methodology	4	6	1	0	0	0	9	12	0
Other	9	9	11	0	0	0	15	20	0

*All valid responses.

**Respondents could select all fields that apply in this table and in all the tables reporting on field of employment or field in which sought employment.

TABLE 3A
1996 Placement Candidates: Degree Status and Employment*

	All Candidates			Ph.D.			ABD		
	All N = 417	Men N = 302	Women N = 113	All N = 331	Men N = 244	Women N = 86	All N = 84	Men N = 58	Women N = 26
<u>Employed</u>									
Yes	86%	86%	86%	90%	90%	91%	70%	71%	69%
No	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>31</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<u>Academically Employed</u>									
Yes	83%	83%	83%	82%	83%	80%	85%	80%	94%
No	<u>17</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<u>Tenure Track</u>									
Yes	53%	48%	64%	55%	52%	65%	40%	30%	59%
No	<u>47</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>41</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<u>Type of Position</u>									
Full Time Permanent	57%	54%	63%	58%	56%	64%	49%	44%	61%
Full Time Temporary	26	28	22	28	30	22	19	17	22
Part Time Permanent	2	2	2	1	1	3	7	10	0
Part Time Temporary	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%	101%	100%	100%	100%
<u>Type of Primary Job</u>									
Ph.D. Department	33%	33%	33%	33%	34%	32%	32%	32%	33%
MA Department	11	11	10	10	11	10	12	12	11
Undergrad Department	35	33	39	35	34	37	34	27	50
Two-Year College	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	0
Non-Academic Position	12	12	12	12	11	14	14	17	6
Other	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100%	99%	101%	99%	100%	101%	100%	100%	100%
<u>Field of Employment**</u>									
American Gov't/Public Law	37%	35%	41%	35%	33%	40%	48%	46%	50%
Public Policy	7	8	5	7	8	5	7	7	6
Comparative Politics	22	23	20	24	26	19	10	7	17
International Relations	22	25	14	24	27	15	12	12	11
Public Administration	8	6	12	7	6	10	9	2	22
Political Theory	13	14	8	13	15	8	10	10	11
Methodology	6	7	5	6	6	5	9	10	6
Other	12	12	10	11	11	10	17	20	11

*All valid responses.

**Respondents could select all fields that apply in this table and in all the tables reporting on field of employment or field in which sought employment.

positions. Respondents who have non-academic positions reported median salaries comparable to the highest academic salaries.

Table 4 records responses to questions on the availability and usefulness of specific sources of information and assistance in finding employment for all respondents and according to their employment status and type of primary job. The sources of information are organized broadly under three categories: Ph.D. de-

partment and institution, professional networks, and the APSA. Respondents could check all sources of assistance that were available and that they found useful. The two sources of job information and assistance available to both employed and unemployed placement candidates, and to around 9 out of 10 respondents, were their dissertation advisors and the *Personnel Service Newsletter (PSN)*. Other sources of employment information and assis-

tance available to 50% to 60% of these placement candidates included the department's graduate director and placement director, APSA's Annual Meeting Placement Service, regional political science association meetings and placement services, and peers and colleagues at their own university. Nearly as many respondents, but more of the men than women, indicated that peers and colleagues at other universities were available to assist them in their

TABLE 3B
1996 Placement Candidates: Job Search and Satisfaction*

	All Candidates			Ph.D.			ABD		
	All N = 417	Men N = 302	Women N = 113	All N = 331	Men N = 244	Women N = 86	All N = 84	Men N = 58	Women N = 26
<u>Months Spent Looking for Job</u>									
Median	9	10	8	10	11	9	7	7	8
Mean	12	13	11	13	13	12	8	8	9
<u>Job Search More Difficult Than Expected?</u>									
Yes	64%	67%	54%	65%	68%	56%	55%	62%	39%
No	12	10	18	12	10	18	14	10	22
About as Expected	24	23	28	23	22	26	31	28	39
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<u>Actively Looking for Another Job?</u>									
Yes	51%	53%	45%	51%	52%	48%	49%	56%	33%
No	49	47	55	49	48	52	51	44	67
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<u>Choice of Current Position</u>									
Yes, First Choice	47%	44%	53%	42%	41%	44%	58%	54%	67%
No, preferred same type of position in a different organization	36	37	32	32	34	28	22	22	22
No, preferred a position as/in:									
Faculty	14	15	10	22	22	21	18	22	11
Government	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Research/Consulting	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
Non-profit Association	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0
Other	2	2	5	2	1	5	0	0	0
Total	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	101%	100%
<u>Evaluation of Current Position</u>									
Not Underemployed in Position	63%	57%	65%	60%	59%	64%	52%	44%	71%
Underemployed	37	43	35	40	41	36	48	56	29
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<u>Reasons for Underemployment</u>									
Not in field	25%	26%	21%	25%	27%	19%	25%	22%	44%
Not commensurate with experience	46	44	52	49	46	56	39	39	40
Prefer more challenging position	50	47	61	54	53	59	36	26	80
Looking for more commensurate position	69	68	73	68	66	74	71	74	60
Prefer to remain for personal reasons	12	10	18	10	9	15	18	13	40
<u>Evaluation of Job Search Methods*</u>									
<u>Faculty Advisor</u>									
Most Useful	36%	37%	32%	37%	40%	28%	30%	24%	42%
Least Useful	30	29	32	30	29	34	27	28	27
<u>Informal: friend, colleague</u>									
Most Useful	35%	36%	31%	35%	36%	33%	35%	40%	23%
Least Useful	15	14	19	14	14	16	19	16	27
<u>Newspaper</u>									
Most Useful	7%	7%	5%	8%	8%	7%	4%	5%	0%
Least Useful	23	24	19	24	25	20	19	21	15
<u>Newsletter/Magazine</u>									
Most Useful	60%	58%	64%	60%	59%	64%	58%	55%	65%
Least Useful	18	20	13	17	19	11	21	21	23
<u>Placement Service</u>									
Most Useful	9%	9%	10%	9%	9%	12%	7%	9%	4%
Least Useful	26	29	20	27	30	19	23	22	23

*Respondents could select two sources in each category—most useful and least useful—to evaluate job search methods in this table and in all tables reporting on their evaluation of job search methods.

TABLE 3B 1996 Placement Candidates: Job Search and Satisfaction
(continued)

	All Candidates			Ph.D.			ABD		
	All N = 417	Men N = 302	Women N = 113	All N = 331	Men N = 244	Women N = 86	All N = 84	Men N = 58	Women N = 26
Employment Agency									
Most Useful	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%
Least Useful	6	8	3	7	9	2	2	3	0
Through Former Job									
Most Useful	8%	8%	9%	9%	8%	9%	8%	9%	8%
Least Useful	4	6	0	5	7	0	1	2	0
Sent Unsolicited Vita									
Most Useful	6%	6%	7%	7%	6%	8%	5%	5%	4%
Least Useful	15	17	11	14	15	9	20	22	15
Received Unsolicited Offer									
Most Useful	4%	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%	6%	7%	4%
Least Useful	5	7	1	6	9	0	0	0	0
Electronic									
Most Useful	16%	18%	10%	15%	17%	8%	20%	22%	15%
Least Useful	13	13	12	12	12	9	16	16	15
<u>Satisfaction with Career Choice</u>									
Yes	58%	57%	60%	60%	59%	62%	49%	47%	54%
No	14	14	14	14	14	15	14	15	11
Uncertain	<u>28</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>35</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<u>Would Recommend to Others</u>									
Yes	17%	16%	19%	17%	17%	19%	16%	14%	19%
No	41	42	39	42	44	37	38	34	46
Uncertain	<u>42</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>35</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

job search, and over one-third said that articles in *PS: Political Science and Politics* were available to them. Very few placement candidates selected their university's placement center, state political science association meetings, Organized Sections, caucuses, or APSA's Annual Meeting events for graduate students as available sources of assistance in their search for employment.

With regard to which sources of employment information and assistance were available to them, there is little difference according to where the academically employed respondents work. Fewer of the respondents in positions outside of academia indicated that departmental advisors, APSA resources, regional PSA meetings, or peers and colleagues were available sources of employment assistance.

The percentage of respondents who found a source of employment assistance useful is always lower than

the percentage who said that it was available. The closest correspondence between availability and usefulness for any single source of information and assistance is for APSA's *Personnel Service Newsletter*, which was used by 75% of the employed women and 80% of the employed men. Fewer respondents overall, but still a majority of those employed academically, rated departmental advisors "useful" to their job search efforts than said that their advisers were available to assist them. But the closest correspondence between the availability and usefulness of the dissertation advisor was reported by women who held positions in Ph.D. departments (83%). A notable proportion of the 1996 job candidates identified their peers and colleagues as providing useful information and assistance for their employment search. Networking was a significant source of assistance to political science graduates,

and particularly to those not placed quickly in Ph.D. departments.

The survey yielded information about the respondents' experiences searching for employment and their satisfaction with the outcomes of the search according to their primary job, type of position, and field of employment. The indicators for evaluating employment assistance are the graduates responses to questions used in Table 3B. The "newsletter," meaning *PSN*, was rated as most useful by the highest percentages of respondents in all academic positions and all fields. Faculty advisors received the next highest percentage of ratings as "most useful," but the advisors also were rated as "least useful," often by similar percentages of respondents. Informal contacts with friends and colleagues were again one of the most useful job search methods regardless of type of job or position.

An examination of the respon-

dents' employment search according to their primary jobs, categorized in terms of type of academic department and non-academic employment finds that those in academic positions spent less time looking for employment (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable2.html). Women placed in Ph.D. department took longer to get their jobs than did men placed in Ph.D. departments, but the reverse is the case for the respondents employed in masters and undergraduate departments. More of the women than men placed in academic positions said that their search for employment was as difficult as expected: more of the men said that it was more difficult. The overall finding that higher percentages of the women in faculty positions than men in similar positions have full-time permanent positions is manifest for academically employed graduates in all types of departments but is reversed among those in non-academic jobs.

As expected, the doctoral graduates' assessments of the difficulty of the job search, the usefulness of faculty advisors, satisfaction with their current position, and with a career in political science are all associated positively with the permanence of their positions and with having full-time rather than part-time positions (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable3.html). Women took into account personal objectives as well as professional objectives and possibly were more likely to compromise in accepting a position than men, as a slightly higher percentage of women than men reported taking a job outside of their major field and 16% more women than men who considered themselves underemployed selected "personal reasons" for choosing to stay in their current position.

The employment search experiences of the 1996 doctoral graduates were related to their academic field as well (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable4.html). Higher percentages of those in the smaller-sized fields of public administration (70%), public policy (64%), and methodology (64%) were in tenure-

track positions than were respondents in comparative politics (51%), international relations (42%), and political theory (39%). As could be anticipated, there is a similar association between the respondents' major fields and their job and career satisfaction, with those in comparative politics, international relations, and political theory, overall, somewhat less satisfied with their jobs and their career choice. With respect to their search for jobs, higher percentages of the doctoral graduates who specialized in the smaller-sized subfields selected their faculty advisors as one of two of the most useful methods of employment assistance. Placement candidates in the smaller-sized fields may be better positioned to get the attention of advisors and mentors. Friends and colleagues were considered most useful in the job search particularly by men in the field of political theory (54%).

In addition to evaluating employment and career satisfaction broadly, the employed graduates indicated their levels of satisfaction with such specific aspects of their current positions as salary and benefits, opportunities for promotion, personal development and recognition, their relationships with supervisors and colleagues, and working conditions (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable5.html). Most employed graduates are satisfied with many aspects of their current positions. Salary is the target of lesser satisfaction relative to other aspects of employment. In contrast, majorities of the employed graduates were satisfied with their relationships with colleagues and supervisors (department chairs) and working conditions. While political science graduates placed in all temporary positions are understandably not satisfied with their opportunities for promotion and, to a lesser degree, with their opportunities for personal development and recognition, there is little difference in overall satisfaction with the other personal and professional aspects of their jobs between these graduates and those in full-time permanent positions and those in non-academic positions. This finding is evidence that there

are supportive professional departmental climates for faculty who get temporary appointments.

There are no sharp distinctions to be made among those who hold academic position in terms of their primary job by type of department, particularly when the responses are divided broadly in terms of satisfied and dissatisfied. Comparing levels of job satisfaction for women and men placed in the same type of academic departments, slightly higher percentages of women than men in Ph.D. departments indicated satisfaction with opportunities for promotion and recognition. Women and men placed in undergraduate departments have comparable levels of satisfaction with all aspects of their current positions, with slightly higher percentages of women than men satisfied with their opportunities for personal development. Since a higher proportion of women than men indicated a preference for placement in an undergraduate department, this difference may be influenced by such preference.

An indicator of job satisfaction, as well as stability, is whether the employed graduates were seeking another job (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable7.html). Not surprisingly, fewer of the academically employed doctoral graduates who held a permanent position, which coincides for the most part with a tenure-track position, reported not seeking another position. Among all employed respondents, 27% in full-time positions and 85% in full-time temporary positions reported that they were actively seeking another job. Among those who were academically employed, 17% of the respondents in a tenure-track position and 84% of those in a non-tenure-track position said that they are actively seeking another job. Other factors associated with not seeking another position were the respondents' preferences for their current position and evaluations as to whether their jobs match their skills, fields, and experience. Some three times more of the graduates whose current positions were their first choice than those for whom they were not are not seeking

TABLE 4
Availability and Usefulness to 1966 Placement Candidates of Specific Sources of Information and Assistance in Their Job Search and Their Employment Status and Type of Job*

	Employment Status								
	All Placement Candidates			Employed			Not Employed		
	All	Men	Women	All	Men	Women	All	Men	Women
N = 417	N = 302	N = 113	N = 359	N = 261	N = 97	N = 57	N = 41	N = 16	
Sources of Information and Assistance*									
<i>Ph.D. Department and Institution</i>									
Dissertation Advisor									
Available	91%	92%	89%	91%	93%	88%	93%	90%	100%
Useful	61	60	63	64	64	63	46	39	63
Graduate Director									
Available	59%	60%	57%	59%	61%	56%	60%	59%	63%
Useful	21	20	22	20	20	20	26	22	38
Placement Director									
Available	53%	55%	46%	54%	56%	45%	49%	49%	50%
Useful	22	24	17	20	24	17	26	27	25
University Placement Center									
Available	27%	29%	24%	27%	30%	21%	30%	24%	44%
Useful	6	6	6	6	7	4	7	2	19
<i>Professional Networks</i>									
Regional PSA Meetings & Placement Service									
Available	59%	61%	54%	60%	61%	59%	53%	63%	25%
Useful	13	12	17	14	12	20	11	15	0
State PSA Meetings									
Available	13%	14%	10%	13%	13%	10%	12%	15%	6%
Useful	1	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
Organized Sections									
Available	19%	20%	17%	18%	19%	16%	26%	27%	25%
Useful	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	5	0
Caucus/Organized Group									
Available	7%	5%	12%	7%	5%	12%	4%	2%	6%
Useful	1	1	2	1	0	2	2	2	0
Peers/colleagues at Own University									
Available	57%	60%	51%	59%	60%	56%	49%	59%	25%
Useful	32	33	30	34	34	32	23	24	19
Peers/colleagues at Other Institutions									
Available	48%	51%	41%	49%	51%	42%	44%	49%	31%
Useful	31	32	27	32	33	27	23	22	25
<i>American Political Science Association</i>									
<i>Personnel Service Newsletter</i>									
Available	91%	92%	89%	91%	91%	89%	95%	95%	94%
Useful	78	80	75	79	79	76	79	83	69
Annual Meeting Placement Service									
Available	60%	59%	62%	61%	60%	63%	60%	61%	56%
Useful	12	10	18	12	10	18	14	12	19
Reports, Articles in <i>PS</i>									
Available	37%	37%	37%	37%	37%	37%	40%	42%	38%
Useful	18	16	20	17	15	20	23	22	25
Annual Meeting Events for Graduate Students									
Available	13%	14%	12%	13%	13%	12%	19%	24%	6%
Useful	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Respondents could select all sources that apply in this table.

TABLE 4 – (continued)

Type of Primary Job											
Ph.D. Department			MA Department			Undergraduate Department			Non-Academic		
All N = 115	Men N = 85	Women N = 30	All N = 37	Men N = 28	Women N = 9	All N = 121	Men N = 84	Women N = 36	All N = 42	Men N = 31	Women N = 11
93%	93%	93%	97%	100%	89%	93%	93%	92%	83%	87%	73%
70	65	83	62	68	44	68	71	58	43	42	46
64%	65%	63%	62%	61%	67%	60%	58%	64%	48%	52%	36%
28	28	27	16	14	22	21	20	22	5	7	0
57%	61%	47%	51%	61%	22%	59%	57%	61%	38%	45%	18%
29	33	17	22	25	11	23	24	22	12	16	0
24%	28%	13%	32%	29%	44%	26%	27%	25%	33%	39%	18%
7	7	7	8	11	0	5	6	3	5	3	9
64%	59%	77%	60%	64%	44%	61%	63%	58%	48%	45%	55%
17	12	30	11	11	11	14	12	19	7	7	9
10%	11%	7%	11%	11%	11%	13%	16%	8%	12%	7%	27%
2	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0
22%	26%	10%	19%	21%	11%	17%	13%	25%	17%	16%	18%
4	5	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	0	0	0
5%	2%	13%	5%	0%	22%	8%	6%	14%	7%	7%	9%
1	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0
63%	62%	63%	60%	64%	44%	60%	61%	56%	38%	36%	46%
38	38	40	27	36	0	36	33	39	24	23	27
59%	60%	57%	51%	61%	22%	45%	48%	36%	33%	26%	55%
42	42	40	38	50	0	25	26	19	24	16	46
93%	93%	93%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	94%	74%	74%	73%
82	85	73	89	93	78	88	85	94	52	52	55
64%	60%	73%	70%	68%	78%	63%	62%	64%	45%	52%	27%
10	9	13	11	11	11	17	11	31	12	13	9
37%	34%	47%	57%	57%	56%	40%	41%	36%	17%	19%	9%
15	14	17	30	25	44	20	18	22	2	3	0
10%	9%	13%	30%	36%	11%	9%	7%	14%	10%	13%	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

another position. Nearly four times more of the respondents who consider themselves underemployed as those who do not are actively searching for another job. Differences between the employed graduates seeking another job and those not seeking another job are manifest, but not as large with respect to satisfaction with specific attributes of their current positions. While 35% more of those not seeking another job said that they were satisfied with their choice of a career in political science than did those actively seeking another job, there is little difference between the two groups as to whether they would recommend the career to others.

What about the plans of the 1996 doctoral graduates who did not get jobs? (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable8.html). Nearly one-half remained unemployed and one-fifth (but 38% of the women and 15% of the men) said that they would remain in school with a part-time job. A position in a Ph.D. department was preferred by more of the men than any other position. Equal percentages of the women selected a position in a Ph.D. department and in an undergraduate department (31%). A higher percentage of the men than women said that they were considering a non-academic position. More of the women were uncertain about any non-academic position. Relatively few of the unemployed placement candidates were definitely considering employment in non-academic positions. Among possible non-academic positions, those in government received the most mentions.

Dual Careers and Employment in Political Science

Over one-half of the 1996 doctoral graduates who participated in this study had to consider the career needs of a spouse or partner (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable9.html). The graduates were asked about their dual-career status, and those with dual careers were asked whether their spouse or part-

ner needed a job in political science, in another academic field, or in another profession. There were small numbers of respondents, particularly of women, in the dual-career categories. Nonetheless, this survey can provide some insight into the impact of dual careers upon political science placement candidates. Both men and women who were not in a dual-career situation reported a median time of 6 years to get their Ph.D., one year less than the median for dual-career couples. And, looking for a job also took longer for placement candidates who are in some dual-career situation. The candidates with dual careers in academia reported the lengthiest job search experiences—one-and-one-half years for men and one year for women. Dual-career couples in political science reported a less lengthy job search than other dual-career couples, perhaps attributable to their focusing on a specified and shared job market. The placement process may be more complicated when more than one academic department or professional network is involved. Another possibility is that the graduates with dual careers in political science were quicker to accept employment or compromise in doing so because their placement outcomes were less positive if gauged by whether they were seeking another job. A somewhat higher percentage of the respondents with dual careers in political science said they were actively looking for another position.

Men in a dual-career situation reported taking longer to find jobs than did women, and 78% of them found the job search more difficult than expected. But a higher percentage of men (90%) than women (69%) with dual careers in political science were employed. Higher percentages of women (86% to 100%) in the other categories of dual careers, or not in any dual-career situation, were employed.

A higher percentage of the graduates with political science and academic dual careers were placed in Ph.D. departments, suggesting that departmental and institutional size facilitate accommodating dual-career needs. There is little difference at-

tributable to dual-career status distinctions with respect to holding a tenure-track position and to whether the position was the candidate's first choice. With respect to career choice, the highest percentages of respondents who affirmed satisfaction with pursuing a Ph.D. and a career in political science were men whose spouse/partner is a political scientist (70%) and women who did not have to consider the career needs of a spouse or partner (74%). In contrast, only 38% of the women with dual careers in political science expressed satisfaction with their career choice, the lowest percentage for any category of respondents. Also, only 56% percent of the women with dual-career status in political science have their degree in hand, compared to 85% of the men in this situation and 83% of the women who did not have to consider the career of a spouse or partner. The experiences of the 1996 political science graduates with a need for dual-career placement in political science indicate that the difficulties of this situation are experienced more by women political scientists than by men and that faculty advisors be more attentive to the particular needs of this group of graduate students.

What Doctoral Students Consider Important to Employers and in Securing Employment

The political science Ph.D.s and ABDs seeking employment in 1996 who responded to this survey answered questions about what prospective employers consider important and identified the types of graduate training and placement assistance beneficial to the search for employment. Their answers, in Table 5, confirm the primacy of scholarship, although this varies by type of primary job, and the need for further information and assistance to prepare for the job search.

Most of the academically employed respondents indicated they believed scholarly accomplishment and teaching skills were important to

TABLE 5
Academic Jobs of Employed 1996 Placement Candidates and Their Assessment of Attributes Employers Consider Important

	Ph.D. Department			MA Department			Undergraduate Department		
	All N = 115	Men N = 85	Women N = 30	All N = 37	Men N = 28	Women N = 9	All N = 121	Men N = 84	Women N = 36
<u>Attributes Important to Employers</u>									
All Attributes Important to Employers									
Scholarly Accomplishment and Promise	94%	92%	100%	89%	89%	89%	94%	96%	89%
Teaching Skills and Promise	84	79	97	89	93	78	93	94	92
Quality of Graduate Training	80	81	77	65	68	56	72	73	69
Contribution to Faculty Diversity	40	38	47	51	50	56	43	37	56
<u>Attributes Considered to be Most Important to Potential Employers</u>									
Scholarly Accomplishment and Promise	61%	61%	60%	40%	39%	44%	39%	41%	33%
Teaching Skills and Promise	8	7	10	11	11	11	35	32	42
Quality of Graduate Training	7	7	7	5	4	11	3	2	3
Contribution to Faculty Diversity	4	5	0	8	7	11	3	4	0
Other	3	5	0	8	11	0	4	5	3
N/A	17	15	23	27	29	22	17	17	19
Total	100%	100%	100%	99%	101%	99%	101%	101%	100%

employers. The quality of graduate training also was credited as being important. More women than men selected teaching skills and contribution to diversity as important considerations for employers. Lesser percentages of all of the respondents employed in non-academic or other types of jobs selected any of the possible attributes offered as important. Political science doctoral graduates' regard for the singular importance of scholarly accomplishments and promise to employers was demonstrated by their selection of this attribute as the one most important to potential employers by a margin of nearly 3 to 1 overall, regardless of employment status. But the ratio is a little more than 2 to 1 among the academically employed women, nearly one-quarter of whom identified teaching skills and promise as the most important attribute to employers.

Table 5 displays the academically employed respondents' assessments of what attributes employers consider important according to the type of department that hired them. The responses affirm the differences in institutional and departmental missions in higher education. By a ratio of at least 6 to 1, the newly

employed Ph.D. faculty identify scholarly promise and accomplishment as the most important attribute; among the faculty employed by M.A. institutions, the ratio is less, but still considerable at 4 to 1. Nearly comparable percentages of the newly employed undergraduate faculty identified teaching and scholarship as important attributes. Among undergraduate faculty, higher percentages of men (41%) than women (33%) said scholarship was the most important attribute and higher percentages of women (42%) than men said teaching was the most important attribute (32%).

The 1996 Placement Candidates were asked three open-ended questions calling for reflection on the relationship between graduate training and getting hired. Their responses to each question are summarized in Table 6. First, these political science graduates identified the aspects of their Ph.D. training that they now consider to have been most useful in preparing them for employment as political scientists. Twenty-eight percent of their responses cited training in research, getting published and giving papers. This category in-

cluded distinct references to research skills (9%), publishing opportunities (9%), conference presentations (7%), and writing and defending a dissertation (3%). Teacher training, experience and teaching skills received 26% of the responses, nearly as many as scholarship, signifying that preparation for undergraduate teaching in graduate school proved useful in the job search. One respondent expressed the relationship as "Publish to get noticed, teach to get hired." Fifteen percent of the responses cited assistance from graduate advisers and the department as useful. Another 15% of the responses referred to their graduate courses, with the most mentions given to training in specific skills, notably in methodology (6%). Other aspects of graduate education, personal attributes, and experiences received 10% of the responses. Graduate school was dismissed as being of no value in finding a job by 6% of the responses to this question.

A second question invited comments on what these placement candidates did not have in graduate school that they now think would have been helpful in finding employment. Twenty-seven percent of the

TABLE 6

1996 Placement Candidates' Comments on Graduate Training and the Job Search

Aspects of Graduate Training and Experiences Now Considered Most Useful in Finding Employment No. of responses = 436	Training and Experiences Useful in Finding Employment but Missing in Graduate School No. of responses = 323	Information or Assistance Recommended to Help Graduate Students be Better Prepared to Look for Professional Employment No. of responses = 319
Training in Scholarship, Research, and Publishing 28% Research/scholarly skills, training 9% Publishing, opportunities to publish, co-author 9% Presenting conference papers 7% Dissertation and its defense 3%	Publishing Papers 27% Publishing conference papers, encouragement and assistance in publishing 20% Faculty co-author a publication 7%	Publishing 23% Publications 18% Conference and meeting papers 5%
Teaching Training, Experience, and Abilities 26%	Teaching Training, Experience 11%	Teaching Experience 7% Department, Faculty Assistance 15% Advisors' mentoring, assistance 3% Be at top ranked department 4% Active assistance in the job search 2% Practical training for professional roles 3% Have fewer students on the job market 3%
Assistance from Graduate Department and Advisors other than Research and Teaching Training 15% Active advisor/mentor 5% Practice job talks 4% Prestigious department faculty 3% Faculty contacts, interaction 2% Socialization into academic life 1%	Faculty Assistance in the Placement Process 25% Mentoring relationship 7% Placement director's assistance in job search 7% Faculty advisor's guidance in the job search 4% Better preparation for the job talk 4% More professional development 3%	Specific Training 6% Quantitative training/methodology 4% Mentions of fields 2% More Information/preparation for Job Search and Market 7%
Types of Training, Fields 15% Quantitative analysis/methodology 6% Broad training 5% Other specified fields 4%	Specific Skills, Courses 14% Quantitative training 10% Broader training 2% Specified other course titles, skills, computer, proposal writing 2%	Recommend Against Graduate School, Academic Career 11%
Other Useful Attributes, Activities 10% Personal skills, attitudes, outlook 2% Networking 2% Peer support 1% Attending conferences 1% Degree completed 1% Additional degree 1% Internships 1%	More Prestigious Degree 4%	Advice to Graduate Students 33% Network with recent Ph.D.s 5% Pay attention to non academic jobs 4% Be prepared for a long and even unsuccessful job search 3% Get work experience, internships 2% Get the Ph.D. 2% Belong to an affirmative action group 2% Personal qualities: persistence, aggressiveness, patience, flexibility, entrepreneurship, and personality 10% Attend job talks 1% Choose faculty, fields, dissertation topic carefully 1% Understand different types of colleges and universities 1% Use advertisements in <i>Chronicle</i> , <i>PSN</i> 1%
Little or Nothing At All Useful 6%	More, Better Introduction to Job Market, Hiring Institutions, and Careers 18%	

responses specified faculty assistance, encouragement, or partnerships in publishing. Faculty assistance in professional development and in securing employment accounted for 25% of the responses, and included mentoring (7%), guidance in the job search from the placement director (7%) and from their advisor (4%), better preparation for the job talk (4%) and more attention to professional develop-

ment in their graduate program (3%). More and better information about the job market, careers, and what different hiring institutions seek in a new employee received 18% of the responses. Only 11% of the respondents said that teaching preparation was missing in graduate school—suggesting that a larger proportion of the graduate students had some teaching experience than had advice and assistance in producing

publications and giving presentations at professional conferences and/or on how to get started in a political science career. The desire for more quantitative training expressed by 10% of these graduates responses should be noted also by Ph.D. departments.

The last open-ended question invited the 1996 graduates to recommend what information or assistance would better prepare graduate stu-

dents to search for employment. Once again, having publications and making presentations at conference received the most mentions (23%). Over one-fifth of the recommendations called for various types of assistance from their advisors, 15% called for more help from their departments, and 7% asked for more information and better preparation in order to understand the job market and how to conduct the job search. Preparation for undergraduate teaching received another 7% of the responses. One-third of the responses to this questions recommend an array of specific activities and personal qualities, with networking among peers being the most prominent and reflecting the reliance on this activity by many of the 1996 graduates. Finally, and another expression of the difficulties experienced by a contingent of doctoral graduates, one in ten of the recommendations was that students be advised against pursuing a graduate degree and an academic career.

To sum up, the comments made by these members of the 1996 political science placement class are realistic assessments of the skills and experiences that employers, particularly academic employers, consider to be important and forthright statements about useful professional training. These graduates recommend that Ph.D. faculty and departments give doctoral students more information and assistance, especially in publishing and presenting research, and along with professional organizations, do more to prepare doctoral graduates for the realities of the job market and for the process and, frequently, less-than-optimal, outcome of the job search.

Addressing the Placement Concerns and Recommendations of Political Science Graduates

The difficulties that so many political science placement candidates encounter in finding employment are widely acknowledged. The survey of members of the 1996 placement class confirm the impact of these difficulties and the disappointments

Appendix 1 Survey Design and Procedures

The survey of members of the 1996 placement class was accomplished with the assistance of 60% of all Ph.D. departments, including 76% of the 25 departments having the largest placement classes. In fall 1996 and winter 1997, these departments sent the Association the names and mailing addresses of their graduates who were seeking jobs in 1996. A total of 865 names and addresses were submitted; 829 questionnaires were delivered, of which 417 were completed and returned for a response rate of 50.3%. The four-page questionnaire was designed to comport with the objectives of CPST's collaborative project and be compatible with the aggregate placement data that the APSA has been collecting annually since 1972 by surveying Ph.D. departments. Questions posed to the placement candidates asking for evaluations of job search methods and job satisfaction were adapted from those used by the American Psychological Association in its annual survey of Ph.D.s in psychology. The introduction to the survey promised departments and individual recipients anonymity. To further guarantee confidentiality, APSA contracted with Questar, a research firm working with other professional associations in the project, to prepare, distribute, and collect the questionnaires, code responses to the closed ended questions, and provide printouts summarizing responses to open ended question.

The survey was distributed in spring 1997, with follow up mailings in the summer. The 50.3% response rate is comparable to the response rate for the surveys conducted by other scientific societies participating in this project and considered to be quite good for a new survey of doctoral students. It is possible that the respondents were tied more closely to the profession than the nonrespondents: 75% of the respondents said they are APSA members. However, the high rate of affiliation with the Association can be attributed also to the requirement that subscribers to the *Personnel Service Newsletter*, which lists academic positions in political science, be APSA members.

experienced by a significant proportion of political science graduates in getting hired and in having to plan immediately to search for another job. These difficulties are being experienced by doctoral graduates in other academic disciplines and this phenomenon was an important factor in establishing the collaborative study of doctoral graduates of which the special survey of members of the 1996 placement class is one component. The findings of this survey should prompt political scientists to address and ameliorate the difficulties graduates are encountering as they seek professional employment. To initiate a discussion of how the profession might respond, a list of possible initiatives follows.

Consider the Number of Ph.D.s

While very few survey respondents said that there were too many political science doctoral graduates competing for jobs, the numbers deserve

attention. According to the National Science Foundation's summary of science and engineering doctorates awarded from 1987-96, 928 doctorates were awarded in all fields of political science in 1996, an increase of 30% from 647 doctorates in 1987, with the most rapid annual increases occurring in the last five years. These figures include degrees in international relations, public administration, and public policy along with degrees in political science/government. But the growth in the number of doctorates cannot be attributed to the inclusion of the three specialized fields. In 1996, 621 doctorates were awarded in political science/government compared with 404 doctorates awarded in 1987, an increase of 54% in the discipline's doctorates in the past decade (Hill 1997, 10).

An increase in the numbers of doctoral graduates once seemed appropriate because of projections of a growth in academic positions from 1987-2012 (Bowen and Sousa 1989).

Even though undergraduate student enrollment has increased, colleges and universities have not responded by expanding the numbers of tenure-track positions and are not likely to do so. Tenure-track positions are declining and part-time faculty positions are increasing. One report estimates that only two-fifths of recent faculty appointments are to full-time tenure-track positions (Schuster 1998). In addition, there will not be a growth in academic positions due to retirements because very few faculty are planning to retire in the coming years (National Center for Educational Statistics 1998).

A good case can be made for expanding the number of doctoral graduates on the reasoning that all educational institutions, the economy, and society are well served by having greater numbers of highly trained professionals. But, if graduate departments and the profession take this position, attention should be given to the next possible initiative.

Consider Professional Socialization

Political science doctoral students anticipate pursuing—and, for the most part, are expected to pursue—academic careers in four-year colleges and universities. An academic career is the goal of graduate students in nearly all of the humanities disciplines and in most of the social sciences. With the number of new doctorates in political science exceeding the number of full-time tenure-track positions, and the Association's placement studies showing a small but increasing percentage of placement candidates taking jobs outside academia, shouldn't graduate departments and the profession train students for alternate careers and help place students in such careers? If so, the professional culture needs to be changed to one more supportive of political scientists pursuing non-faculty careers. In reality, this will be as difficult to accomplish as any cultural change; the singular primacy of academic careers has characterized political science since the 1950s. Nonetheless, in recognition of the realities of the job market, suggestions

for facilitating doctoral students' pursuit of careers other than as college or university faculty are presented next.⁴

Increase Employment Information and Networks

The recommendations as to what would have helped them and would help future placement classes made by the 1996 doctoral graduates call for more information about the various roles and responsibilities of college faculty, the differing missions and contexts of higher education institutions and how these affect faculty roles, preparing for interviews and job talks in accord with these institutional differences, and moving

into non-academic careers. Resources on institutional missions and the preparation of graduate students to be effective faculty are available from the American Association for Higher Education's Forum on Faculty Roles and Responsibilities and through other projects devoted to preparing future faculty of the American Association of Colleges and Universities and the Council of Graduate Schools. APSA could feature digests or annotated guides to these resources in the professional section of *PS: Political Science and Politics* and on its web site. Also, APSA's Departmental Services Committee could review recent publications from the Modern Language Association on the academic job

Appendix 2 Additional Tables Appearing on the APSA Website

Salaries, 1996 Placement Candidates Employed in the U.S. by Gender and Type of Position (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable1.html)

Type of Primary Job—Academic by Department and Non-Academic—of Employed 1996 Placement Candidates (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable2.html)

Type of Position of Employed 1996 Placement Candidates—Full Time Permanent, Full-Time Temporary, Part-Time Permanent, Part-Time Temporary— and Their Employment Search, Status, Satisfaction and Degree Status (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable3.html)

Field of Academic Employment of 1996 Placement Candidates and Their Employment Search, Status, Satisfaction, and Degree Status (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable4.html)

Satisfaction with Specific Current Position of Employed 1996 Placement Candidates (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable5.html)

Type of Primary Job and Tenure Status(Combined) of Academically Employed 1996 Placement Candidates (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable6.html)

Newly Employed Political Scientists Who Are and Who Are Not Seeking Another Job: Degree and Employment Status, Employment and Career Satisfaction (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable7.html)

Employment Preferences, Plans, and Status of Unemployed 1996 Placement Candidates (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable8.html)

Dual-Career Status Among 1996 Placement Candidates, Their Employment Search, Status, Satisfaction, and Selected Attributes (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable9.html)

Employment Status of 1996 Placement Candidates and Their Assessment of Attributes Employers Consider Important (www.apsanet.org/professional/placement/webtable10.html)

market and job search designed for graduate departments and for graduate students in order to determine whether APSA should produce comparable guides for political science programs and graduates (Gilbert 1997; MLA Committee on Professional Employment 1997; Showalter et al. 1996).

Departments could develop a collection of references on career options for their graduate students around which to organize meetings on professional development. Many Ph.D.-granting universities have faculty development centers on campus that can assist departments in the preparation of future faculty. All such preparation should continue to feature training and experience in teaching undergraduate students, as this was acknowledged by the survey respondents to be an important contributing factor to getting a faculty position.

The respondents' own use of networking among colleagues and peers could be extended by graduate departments establishing continuing contacts with faculty in neighboring colleges and universities and with rosters of doctoral alumni. These contacts can be a useful source of information about careers in non-Ph.D. institutions and the work of non-Ph.D.-granting universities and colleges. Alumni Ph.D.s might be asked to advise graduate students about different careers and types of employers.

APSA's Annual Meeting programs and those of the regional and state political science associations often include a session on finding employment and pursuing careers in political science. These sessions could become more institutionalized by being scheduled each year at the same time and widely publicized to serve as occasions to pull together and distribute current information about the job market and

practical guidance about identifying career objectives and strategies. Presentations at these sessions might be summarized for wider distribution.

Facilitate Presentations and Publications

The increased competition for faculty jobs has increased pressure on graduate students to publish and to give presentations. Ph.D. programs and graduate advisors are in the best position to respond to requests by many of the 1996 doctoral graduates that more be done. Organized sections might consider advising graduate student members about strategies and opportunities for conference presentations and publishing articles in specialized journals. The APSA could augment its *Guide to Getting Published in Political Science Journals* with information about the scholarly review process. Also, the APSA and the regional associations might consider hosting workshops for graduate students on how to prepare papers and give presentations at professional conferences.

Electronic Communications

A small percentage of the respondents to this survey (16%) said that electronic sources of information about jobs proved useful. It is very likely that increasing use will be made of electronic references and communications. APSA's widely used *Personnel Service Newsletter* is now online (www.apsanet.org/PSN/), and the Association's web site will expand to include references on the profession and professional development. Although relatively few respondents said that Organized Sections and caucuses provided useful job search information, these groups might use their discussion

lists to address the needs of doctoral graduates and newly employed faculty. Departmental web sites can also be used to facilitate networking among a department's doctoral alumni and graduate students.

Conclusion

The findings of the survey of 1996 political science doctoral graduates who were seeking employment confirm the difficulties of the job search and that a considerable proportion of graduates (over half of the respondents to the survey) continued to look for a position or for another position in the coming year. Their evaluations of the employment search and of what would assist in this search should lead to initiatives to inform and prepare political science Ph.D.s on how to establish their careers.

While this report has disclosed the disappointments and critical evaluations of many placement candidates, it is important to acknowledge that a considerable group of political science doctoral graduates do succeed in getting the positions they want, are pleased with the outcomes of their job search and choice of a profession, and satisfied with the information and assistance that they received from their faculty advisors and graduate departments. In addition, newly employed political scientists, whether they are in temporary or permanent positions, receive collegial support from colleagues and department chairs. The growth in Organized Sections, specialized journals, newsletters, and discussion lists and the vitality of the professional meetings of the national, regional, and state political science associations complement and augment departmental and collegial connections.

Notes

1. Jun Yin created the SPSS files for data analysis and prepared the tables for this report. Jun Yin and Polly Leonard coordinated the questionnaire preparation and survey with Questar Data Systems of Eagan, Minnesota. Catherine E. Rudder and Robert J.-P. Hauck made constructive comments on earlier drafts of this report.

2. APSA's Placement Surveys are based on aggregate data on placement candidates reported by Ph.D. departments. The report on the 1997 survey will appear in the December 1998 issue of *PS: Political Science and Politics*.

3. Several tables appear only in the online version of this report. A complete list of these tables

is given in Appendix 2. The URLs for the online tables are included in the text and the Appendix.

4. This is an objective of the APSA's 1999 publication on "Career Choices in Political Science," a successor to *Alternative Careers in Political Science* (1984).

References

- Bowen, William G., and Julie Ann Sosa. 1989. *Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gaff, Jerry G., and Leo M. Lambert. 1996. "Socializing Future Faculty to the Values of Undergraduate Education." *Change*(July-August): 38.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. 1997. *MLA Committee on Professional Employment: Final Report*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- Hill, Susan T. 1997. *Science and Engineering Doctoral Awards 1996*. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.
- Mann, Sheilah. 1997. "Placement of Political Science Doctoral Students in 1996: Degrees Matter." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30(3): 602-10.
- MLA Committee on Professional Employment. 1997. *Evaluating the Mission, Size and Composition of Your Doctoral Programs*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- National Center for Education Statistics. 1997. *Retirement and Other Departmental Plans of Instructional Faculty and Staff in Higher Education*. Washington, DC: NCES.
- Schuster, Jack. 1998. "Reconfiguring the Professoriate: An Overview" *Academe* 84:49-53.
- Showalter, English et al. 1996. *The MLA Guide to the Job Search*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

COUNTING ON THE LATINO VOTE

Latinos as a New Electorate

Louis DeSipio

The book "illuminates an array of important issues and does so thoughtfully. Its findings will be a benchmark in understanding Latino voting, its effect, and its development."—*AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW*

To understand American racial and ethnic minority group politics, social scientists have largely relied on a black-white paradigm. Louis DeSipio gives a more complex picture by drawing both on the histories of other ethnic groups and on up-to-date but underutilized studies of Hispanics' political attitudes, values, and behaviors.

Race, Ethnicity, and Politics
\$14.50 paper



THE MODERATES' DILEMMA

Massive Resistance to School Desegregation in Virginia

Edited by Matthew D. Lassiter and Andrew B. Lewis
Foreword by Paul M. Gaston

"Lassiter and Lewis and their colleagues have restored the sense of conflict over civil rights by depicting opposition to the movement in its full complexity and strength. Their picture is at once more interesting and more realistic than the one that now prevails in textbooks and academic conferences."—David L. Chapell, author of *Inside Agitators: White Southerners in the Civil Rights Movement*

\$49.50 cloth, \$18.50 paper



THE MARTINSVILLE SEVEN

Race, Rape, and Capital Punishment

Eric W. Rise

"This is a valuable and memorable contribution to constitutional and civil rights history; it is well-written and thoroughly researched, and the study demonstrates how due process and equal protection arguments failed when placed against subtle, but very real, racial expectations within the southern legal system."—*HISTORIAN*

Constitutionalism and Democracy
\$14.50 paper

UNIVERSITY PRESS OF VIRGINIA

Box 3608
University Station
Charlottesville, VA 22903
TEL 804-924-3469

