Incentives for Sharing Knowledge: A Survey of Scholarly Practices in Public Affairs and Administration

Stephen R. Neely, *University of South Florida*
Jerrell D. Coggburn, *North Carolina State University*

ABSTRACT This study examines the scholarly practice of "knowledge sharing" and the extent to which it is rewarded by prevailing faculty-incentive structures. Following recent calls for greater connectivity between the academic and practitioner communities in both political science and public administration, there is a need for greater empirical evidence regarding the extent to which these practices are being employed across the discipline and how their use varies across institutional settings. Focusing on "knowledge sharing" as a specific dimension of "engaged scholarship," this article reports the findings from a recent survey of public affairs and administration program leaders regarding current standards for earning tenure and promotion. Relevant scholarly practices are discussed and the reported value of these practices for earning tenure and promotion is presented. Institutional types are compared and recommendations are made for improving the dissemination of scholarly knowledge to the public administration practitioner community.

Since Ernest Boyer's initial publication of *Scholarship Reconsidered* in 1990, "engaged scholarship" has become a recurring theme in higher education. The discussions extend beyond institutional models and disciplinary boundaries, leading to critical reexaminations of academic incentive structures, institutional missions, and the broader role of higher education in a democratic society. Although increasingly common across the academy at large, echoes of Boyer's call for an expanded approach to scholarship are especially prominent among applied disciplines such as public administration (PA), in which scholars have long wrestled with the challenges of connecting the academic and practitioner communities (Buick et al. 2015; Bushouse et al. 2011; Newland 2000).

Building on Boyer's framework, scholars in both political science and PA recently attempted to address these concerns by proposing specific solutions for bridging the "theory–practice gap" (Boudreau 2015; Bushouse et al. 2011; Jentleson 2015; McDonald and Mooney 2011; Posner 2009). Although various approaches have been suggested, these articles consistently emphasize the importance of *knowledge sharing*—that is, the dissemination of

academic research to practitioner audiences and the broader public. However, despite these increasingly frequent calls for greater connectivity, little is known empirically about whether or to what extent this discourse impacts standards for earning tenure and promotion.

This article focuses specifically on the scholarship of knowledge sharing and the extent to which it is currently rewarded by prevailing faculty-incentive structures. We report results from a recent survey of program leaders at member departments and schools of the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA). Comparisons are also made across relevant institutional types (i.e., doctoral-granting, land-grant, and Carnegie Community Engaged Campuses) to determine whether stated institutional priorities influence incentives for scholarly knowledge sharing. Our hope is that the results of this survey will enrich ongoing discussions about engagement in the PA community by providing empirical context for department leaders, tenure-seeking faculty, and concerned practitioners.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The dissemination of disciplinary knowledge to practitioner communities has long been regarded as a central function of American higher education. In his seminal work on engaged scholarship, Boyer (1990) noted the long and storied history of engagement and synergy between American industry and the

Stephen R. Neely *is assistant professor of public administration at the University of South Florida's School of Public Affairs. He can be reached at srneely@usf.edu.*
Jerrell D. Coggburn *is professor and chair of the public administration department at North Carolina State University's School of Public and International Affairs. He can be reached at jcoggburn@ncsu.edu.*

doi:10.1017/S1049096516003036

nation's leading institutions of higher education. This tradition was not only affirmed in the stated missions of many academic institutions; it also was codified in legislation at the federal level. Most notably, the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 and the Hatch Act of 1887 provided substantial federal resources in an effort to promote linkages between the production of academic knowledge and the practice of industrial and agricultural professions. In the post-Depression era, similar linkages emerged between institutions of higher education and governmental agencies in an effort to address the nation's most pressing policy concerns, such as achieving victory in World War II and winning the "space race" (Boyer 1990).

However, by the 1990s, historical and environmental forces had led to a significant shift in institutional priorities among most colleges and universities, including in the PA field (Boyer 1990; Coggburn and Neely 2015). The traditional focus on knowledge sharing through the scholarly functions of teaching and service had been largely displaced by a heightened focus on knowledge production in the form of "basic research."[1] According to Boyer (1990), the "priorities of the professoriate" were heavily influenced by these trends as guidelines for tenure and promotion increasingly reflected institutional desires for greater research productivity and "prestige-enhancing publications" (Backes-Gellner and Schlinghoff 2010, 27). Moreover, public confidence in the enterprise of higher education suffered as colleges and universities appeared to become increasingly detached from the nation's most immediate needs and concerns (Boyer 1990; Holland 2005).

arguing that "teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but *transforming* and *extending* it as well."

In a later formulation of his framework, Boyer (1996) rebranded the scholarship of teaching as the scholarship of sharing knowledge. However, the idea of knowledge sharing was central to both the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of application because each focused on the dissemination of knowledge to practitioner audiences. This overlap was made more explicit in a recent application of engaged scholarship to the PA field. In their follow-up article to the Minnowbrook III conference, Bushouse et al. (2011, 104) extended the idea of knowledge sharing beyond the classroom to include the practitioner community at large, arguing that regarding knowledge sharing, "we need to consider the methods and means we utilize to disseminate our research to the larger PA community." Specifically, Bushouse et al. (2011) recommended the development of succinct research summaries for practitioner audiences; publication of research in more accessible journals (e.g., electronic and open-access outlets); greater emphasis on publication in practitioner-oriented outlets; and development of learning communities to bridge the academic–practitioner divide.

Although classroom instruction is invaluable in disseminating knowledge to both current and future practitioners, this article focuses exclusively on the dissemination of knowledge to practitioners *outside* of the academy. We believe that this distinction is significant because the scholarly functions involved in these different modes of knowledge sharing tend to fall under separate categories in the faculty-review process.

Moreover, public confidence in the enterprise of higher education suffered as colleges and universities appeared to become increasingly detached from the nation's most immediate needs and concerns (Boyer 1990; Holland 2005).

Boudreau (2015) recently discussed the impact of these trends on the field of political science, arguing that prevailing tenure and promotion norms create disincentives for junior scholars to disseminate their research to nonacademic audiences. As one of political science's most applied disciplines, these trends also raise significant concerns for PA, in which the dissemination of knowledge is an essential step toward achieving improved governance. How do PA scholars ensure that new and emerging knowledge makes its way into the world of practice? Which scholarly mechanisms are employed? To what degree do guidelines for tenure and promotion incentivize or discourage these efforts on the part of faculty members? These questions are the focus of this article.

DEFINING KNOWLEDGE SHARING

Boyer's (1990, 24) initial approach to engaged scholarship included four dimensions. The scholarship of discovery focused on basic research designed to produce new knowledge. The scholarship of integration called for an interdisciplinary approach to integrating research across disciplines in an effort to situate basic research findings in their broader context. The scholarship of application focused on the application of knowledge to practical problems, as well as to the establishment of basic research agendas around the pressing societal concerns of the day. Finally, the scholarship of teaching focused on classroom instruction as a scholarly activity,

Whereas classroom instruction is traditionally identified as a teaching function, the external dissemination of research and knowledge to practitioners is more likely to be classified as either research or service under most tenure and promotion guidelines. Therefore, *knowledge sharing* is defined in this study as "the dissemination of research findings and emerging knowledge to practitioner audiences through accessible, practitioner-oriented mediums." The scholarly practices examined in this analysis were deliberately identified based on recent suggestions for bridging the theory–practice gap in PA scholarship (Bushouse et al. 2011; Posner 2009).

DATA AND METHODS

The data reported in this article are from a recent survey of PA academic program leaders (i.e., chairs, deans, and department heads). The survey was administered via a web-based platform using Dillman's (2007) tailored-design survey method. The initial sample included 273 NASPAA member institutions, from which 144 usable responses were obtained, for a total response rate of 53%. Whereas the survey addressed various topics associated with PA research, the data presented in this article focus solely on the value ascribed to specific scholarly outcomes in tenure and promotion decisions, with particular emphasis on the scholarship of knowledge sharing. To place the responses in context, we contrast

these knowledge-sharing activities with more traditional scholarly products, such as peer-reviewed journal articles and scholarly books. We also compare responses across several institutional types. Table 1 summarizes survey respondents by institutional type.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Table 2 reports survey responses to questions concerning the importance of several scholarly products in tenure and promotion decisions. As a whole, the results suggest that substantially more weight is given to traditional scholarly work than to knowledge-sharing efforts. For example, 56% of respondents indicated that publications in peer-reviewed PA journals were "very important" for positive tenure and promotion decisions, as opposed to less than 3% for PA-related articles published in the popular press (i.e., articles in magazines, newspapers, and other nonacademic outlets for general and practitioner audiences). Likewise, 36% of respondents stated that books published by university presses were "very important" as opposed to only 5.5% for books published in the popular (i.e., nonacademic and non-university) press. In addition to these disparities, less than 1% of respondents stated that scholarly efforts to disseminate new knowledge to practitioner communities in the form of web-based videos, succinct research summaries, and the development of innovative PA-related technologies designed for adoption by practitioners were "very important."

the fact that these newer forms of dissemination are afforded *any* measure of importance suggests that there may be a growing recognition of scholarly products directed to practitioner audiences. Prospectively, the results provide a baseline for assessing practitioner-oriented knowledge sharing vis-à-vis traditional scholarship.

To more clearly highlight the differences in value ascribed to these scholarly practices, we created an index of scores for each outcome. Each response was assigned a numeric value ranging from 0 through 4, with 4 indicating a response of "very important" and 0 indicating a response of "very unimportant." The responses were summed for each scholarly outcome, which ranked them in order of overall importance for tenure and promotion decisions. To ensure a consistent scale, responses were removed for any institution that did not provide an answer for every scholarly outcome. This created a sample size of n = 127 for the purposes of this comparison, resulting in a possible "importance" scale ranging from 0 through 508. Table 3 presents the results, with each scholarly product ranked in order of importance.

As noted previously, the data show that prevailing tenure and promotion norms apply significantly more weight to scholarly outcomes published in peer-reviewed journals and university presses than those produced for practitioner audiences. It is noteworthy that the second ranked item "an article reporting findings of an applied research design directly focused on the needs of PA

Although they trail in importance when compared to traditional scholarly activities, the fact that these newer forms of dissemination are afforded any *measure of importance suggests that there may be a growing recognition of scholarly products directed to practitioner audiences.*

To advocates of knowledge sharing, the results for these newer forms of scholarship may appear disappointing, but that picture changes when the "important" response category is included: 48% ascribe some degree of importance to the development of innovative PA-related technologies, 25.2% to written research summaries, and 22% to web-based videos. Although they trail in importance when compared to traditional scholarly activities,

Table 1
Survey Respondents by Institutional Characteristics (n = 144)

Institutional Characteristics	Number	Percentage
Carnegie Community Engaged Campus	15	10.4
Doctoral-Granting/Research-Intensive University	42	29.2
Land-Grant University	18	12.5
Private University	24	16.7
Public University	113	78.5
Urban Campus	40	27.8

Institutional characteristic categories are not mutually exclusive; therefore, the percentages do not total 100%.

practitioners," indicates a level of commitment to practitioner relevance, which may be viewed positively by those who advocate greater commitment to practitioner-oriented research. However, the focus in this case is still on publication in peer-reviewed academic outlets, which suggests that the transmission of this knowledge to practitioner audiences remains an obstacle. Although this focus on peer-reviewed publications is to be expected given the prevailing trends in higher education discussed previously, it has been documented that practitioner audiences are unlikely to read or access these outlets for various reasons (Boudreau 2015; Bushouse et al. 2011; Posner 2009). The four lowest-ranking items—web-based videos reporting research findings, succinct research summaries targeted to practitioner audiences, development of an innovative technology for practitioner application, and PA-related articles published in the popular press—represent some of the most commonly proposed methods for bridging the theory–practice gap (Bushouse et al. 2011; Posner 2009). This suggests that those scholarly practices that could most significantly improve knowledge sharing between PA scholars and practitioners are the least likely to be rewarded by faculty-incentive structures.

Whereas these data confirm much of what has been anecdotally reported, they also suggest that recent calls for greater connectivity with regard to bridging the theory–practice gap have not yet had a significant impact on PA tenure and

promotion standards. As Boudreau (2015) suggested in the case of political science, these findings raise the question as to whether prevailing tenure and promotion standards are inadvertently diminishing the practical impact of PA research by creating disincentives for faculty who might be inclined to engage in knowledge-sharing practices that would carry the findings of their research forward into the world of practice. We believe that these concerns should be given consideration because previous studies indicate that faculty efforts are motivated primarily by institutional reward systems (Hardr'e and Cox 2009; Lagon 1995). In other words, given the high-stakes pressure to produce tenure-earning scholarship, faculty will be less inclined to engage in knowledge sharing unless it is more significantly and directly rewarded by institutional criteria for tenure and promotion.

INSTITUTIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Our analysis also examined how the importance ascribed to knowledge-sharing scholarship varied across major institutional

were identified for institutions credentialed as Carnegie Community Engaged Campuses.

In the case of institutions identified as "doctoral-granting and research-intensive," we found that significantly greater value was ascribed to scholarship that resulted in peer-reviewed publications, particularly basic- and applied-research articles published in PA-specific journals.

In contrast, when compared with non-doctoral-granting institutions, these programs ascribed significantly less value to knowledge-sharing practices, specifically the development of web-based videos and succinct research summaries for practitioner audiences. Although these results are not surprising given the institutional missions of doctoral-granting programs, we also found a similar pattern in the case of land-grant institutions. The development of these schools into research-intensive universities over time may partly explain these findings, but it is worth noting that the limited value ascribed to knowledge-sharing scholarship by these institutions seems to contradict their original purpose, as defined by the Morrill Acts.

In the case of institutions identified as "doctoral-granting and research-intensive," we found that significantly greater value was ascribed to scholarship that resulted in peer-reviewed publications, particularly basic- and applied-research articles published in PA-specific journals.

categories. By creating cross-tabulations of the responses, we identified statistically significant relationships for a few scholarly outcomes across different institutional types.[2] In particular, significant differences were identified for doctoral-granting and research-intensive universities as well as for land-grant institutions. We also found it notable that no significant differences

Although significant associations were not present across other institutional categories, we found it particularly noteworthy that institutions classified as Carnegie Community Engaged Campuses did not demonstrate a greater statistical likelihood to reward faculty efforts at knowledge sharing in their tenure and promotion guidelines. Given the focus of these institutions on

Table 2

Importance of Scholarly Outcomes for Tenure and Promotion (n = 144)

How important is each of the following scholarly products to a positive tenure decision in your academic unit...	Percentage of Respondents				
	Very Important	Important	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
An article addressing a current PA topic published in the popular press	2.4	44.1	26.0	23.6	3.9
A book addressing a current PA topic published in the popular press	5.5	59.8	15.7	16.6	2.4
An article reporting findings of applied research designed to solve a problem confronting PA practitioners published in a peer-reviewed journal	23.6	68.5	6.3	1.6	0.0
A program evaluation or policy analysis produced for a nonprofit organization that is publicly accessible online	3.1	52.8	22.0	18.9	3.1
A succinct research summary of one's own published research prepared for a PA practitioner audience	0.8	24.4	27.6	37.8	9.4
Development of an innovative PA-related technology for adoption by practitioners	0.8	47.3	26.0	19.6	6.3
An article reporting research findings designed to create new knowledge published in a peer-reviewed PA journal	56.7	37.0	6.3	0.0	0.0
A book reporting research findings designed to create new knowledge published by a university press	36.2	47.3	7.9	7.8	0.8
A web-based video presenting research findings designed to create new knowledge	0.0	22.0	33.1	33.9	11.0
A literature review on a PA topic published in a peer-reviewed journal	5.5	61.4	14.2	18.1	0.8

Ranked Importance of Scholarly Outcomes for Tenure and Promotion (n = 127)

Rank	Scholarly Outcome	Total Response Rating
1	An article reporting research findings designed to create new knowledge published in a peer-reviewed PA journal	450
2	An article reporting findings of applied research designed to solve a problem confronting PA practitioners published in a peer-reviewed journal	403
3	A book reporting research findings designed to create new knowledge published by a university press	394
4	A literature review on a PA topic published in a peer-reviewed journal	325
5	A book addressing a current PA topic published in the popular press	321
6	A program evaluation or policy analysis produced for a nonprofit organization that is publicly accessible online	299
7	An article addressing a current PA topic published in the popular press	279
8	Development of an innovative PA-related technology for adoption by practitioners	277
9	A succinct research summary of one's own published research prepared for a PA practitioner audience	217
10	A web-based video presenting research findings designed to cre ate new knowledge	214

Note: Possible response scale ranges from 0 to 508.

community engagement, it is surprising that they do not differ from their counterpart colleges and universities in promoting the scholarship of knowledge sharing, at least in the PA field.

CONCLUSION

Although calls for greater knowledge sharing between PA's academic and practitioner communities are mounting, the results reported in this analysis suggest that these efforts have not yet had a significant impact on faculty-incentive structures across the field. The survey responses show that prevailing tenure and promotion standards in PA place relatively less weight on activities associated with the scholarship of knowledge sharing. Instead, the predominant focus remains on the publication of basic and applied research in peer-reviewed scholarly outlets. Because these outlets are unlikely to be accessed by practitioners, this leaves PA schools and departments faced with the dilemma of "rewarding A but expecting B" (Snipes and Carter 2012). This is a problem that has the potential to diminish the value of the field's scholarly research by detracting from its influence on the practice of public management and governance.

To promote the dissemination of scholarly research and bridge the academic–practitioner gap in our field, we believe that PA departments and schools should consider placing greater emphasis on the scholarship of knowledge sharing in their tenure and promotion guidelines and, when possible, to codify these practices in specific and measurable terms (for guidance, see Campus Compact[3]). Recent evidence (Battaglio and Scicchitano 2013; Wang,

Bunch, and Stream 2013) about practitioners' sources and preferences for accessing knowledge suggests that scholarly outputs aimed directly at practitioner audiences (e.g., research summaries and web-based videos) and an increased emphasis on publication in practitioner-oriented outlets represent potentially effective ways for scholars to disseminate knowledge and research results to the PA practitioner community (see also Bushouse et al. 2011). Until they are duly rewarded by prevailing tenure and promotion standards, it is unlikely that tenure-seeking faculty will engage in these important scholarly practices.

To conclude, we reiterate that an increased emphasis on the scholarship of knowledge sharing need not diminish the quality of scholarship or the importance of basic research and theoretical development in PA. As Van de Ven and Johnson (2006, 815) noted, engaged scholarship may actually improve the comprehensive quality of scholarly research by compelling scholars to address the dual hurdles of rigor and relevance, thereby leading to scholarship that is "more penetrating and insightful" than research findings that fail to advance beyond academic circles. These benefits may be amplified by coproduced academic–practitioner research in which academics and practitioners collaborate at each stage of the research process (Buick et al. 2015; Orr and Bennett 2012). Likewise, Bushouse et al. (2011, 109) noted that calls for greater knowledge sharing do not suggest that PA scholars should "neglect critical theoretical issues or lessen the methodological rigor of their scholarship" but rather that the field as a whole should make greater efforts to reach out to the PA practitioner community with more easily accessible and applicable translations of research findings. Rather than diminishing the academic quality of PA research, we believe that greater attention to knowledge-sharing practices will make the field's scholarship more balanced and impactful by ensuring that the knowledge created through those scholarly endeavors ultimately reaches the professionals who are in a position to put it into practice. ■

NOTES

1. This historical development of institutional priorities is covered elsewhere in greater depth. For a more detailed discussion of these issues, see Boyer (1990) and Coggburn and Neely (2015).
2. Cross-tabulation tables are not included in this article but are available from the authors on request.
3. See Campus Compact's resources for engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure, available at http://compact.org/resource-posts/trucen-section-b (accessed July 27, 2016).

REFERENCES

Backes-Gellner, Uschi and Axel Schlinghoff. 2010. "Career Incentives and 'Publish or Perish' in German and U.S. Universities." *European Education* 42 (3): 26–52.

Battaglio, R. Paul, Jr. and Michael J Scicchitano. 2013. "Building Bridges? An Assessment of Academic and Practitioner Perceptions with Observations for the Public Administration Classroom." *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 19 (4): 749–72.

Boudreau, Cheryl. 2015. "Read but Not Heard? Engaging Junior Scholars in Efforts to Make Political Science Relevant." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 48 (4): 51–4.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

———. 1996. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 1 (1): 11–20.

Buick, Fiona, Deborah Blackman, Janine O'Flynn, Michael O'Donnell, and Damian West. 2015. "Effective Practitioner–Scholar Relationships: Lessons from a Coproduction Partnership." *Public Administration Review* 76 (1): 35–47.

Bushouse, Brenda K., Willow S. Jacobson, Kristina T. Lambright, Jared J. Llorens, Ricardo S. Morse, and Ora-orn Poochaaroen. 2011. "Crossing the Divide:

Building Bridges between Public Administration Practitioners and Scholars." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21 (1): 99–112.

Coggburn, Jerrell D. and Stephen R. Neely. 2015. "Publish or Perish? Examining Academic Tenure Standards in Public Affairs and Administration Programs." *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 21 (2): 199–214.

Dillman, Don A. 2007. *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method* (second edition). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Hardr'e, Patricia and Michelle Cox. 2009. "Evaluating Faculty Work: Expectations and Standards of Faculty Performance in Research Universities." *Research Papers in Education* 24 (4): 383–419.

Holland, Barbara A. 2005. "Scholarship and Mission in the 21st-Century University: The Role of Engagement." Sydney, Australia: Paper presented as Keynote Address to the *Australian Universities Quality Agency Forum*, July 5.

Jentleson, Bruce W. 2015. "The 'Bridging the Gap' Initiative and Programs." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 48 (4): 108–14.

Lagon, Mark P. 1995. "Rational Choice." *Perspectives on Political Science* 24 (4): 206–10.

McDonald, Michael P. and Christopher Z. Mooney. 2011. "Pracademics': Mixing an Academic Career with Practical Politics." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 44 (2): 251–3.

Newland, Chester A. 2000. "The Public Administration Review and Ongoing Struggles for Connectedness." *Public Administration Review* 60 (1): 20–38.

Orr, Kevin and Mike Bennett. 2012. "Public Administration Scholarship and the Politics of Coproducing Academic–Practitioner Research." *Public Administration Review* 72 (4): 487–96.

Posner, Paul L. 2009. "The Pracademic: An Agenda for Re-Engaging Practitioners and Academics." *Public Budgeting and Finance* 29 (1): 12–26.

Snipes, Robin L. and Fonda Carter. 2012. "The Case of Rewarding 'A' but Expecting 'B' in Higher Education: Revisiting Reward Systems that Fail in Universities." *Journal of the International Academy for Case Studies* 18 (5): 91–8.

Van de Ven, Andrew H. and Paul E. Johnson. 2006. "Knowledge for Theory and Practice." *Academy of Management Review* 31 (4): 802–21.

Wang, Junfeng, Beverly S. Bunch, and Christopher Stream. 2013. "Increasing the Usefulness of Academic Scholarship for Local Government Practitioners." *State and Local Government Review* 45 (3): 197–213.

STUDENT RESOURCES

The American Political Science Association provides many resources for graduate and undergraduate political science students. **Join today to take advantage of these opportunities!**

ORGANIZED SECTIONS & AWARDS

APSA Organized sections provide an opportunity for APSA members who share a common interest in a particular subfield to organize meetings, coordinate communications, and share knowledge and ideas. For a complete list and descriptions of all organized sections, please visit the website at **www.apsanet.org/sections** or contact us at **sections@apsanet.org**.

Numerous APSA Organized Sections offer awards specifically targeted to students of political science.

The following sections offer awards for **best graduate student papers**:
African Politics Conference Group, Elections, Public Opinion,and Voting Behavior, Foreign Policy, Law and Courts, Political Communication, Political Networks, Presidents and Executive Politics

The following section offers an award for **best undergraduate student paper:**
Presidents and Executive Politics

The following sections offer graduate student **travel awards**:
Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior, European Politics and Society, Political Psychology

RESEARCH FUNDING

Centennial Center for Political Science and Public Affairs encourages individual research and writing in all fields of political science. Check out our website for current funding opportunities.

GRADUATE STUDENT CONNECTION

APSA has a number of resources to offer graduate students, including:
Learn about *dissertation workshops at the Annual Meeting* (where students receive a significant discount) that provide in-depth guidance and discussion on dissertations in progress.

DIVERSITY & INCLUSION PROGRAMS

Ralph Bunche Summer Institute is an intensive five-week program held at Duke University designed to introduce the world of doctoral study in political science to undergraduate students from under-represented racial and ethnic groups.

Minority Student Recruitment Program is a collaboration between undergraduate and graduate programs in political science that connects undergraduate students from under-represented backgrounds who are interested in, or show potential for, graduate study with graduate programs interested in recruiting diverse cohorts of doctoral students.

Minority Fellows Program is a fellowship competition for individuals from under-represented backgrounds applying to doctoral programs in political science.

APSA Mentoring Program connects interested graduate students and junior faculty with political scientists who have made themselves available as mentors.

APSA AWARDS

Students can be nominated for one of the numerous APSA awards given each year to promising young scholars:

Gabriel A. Almond Award for the best dissertation in the field of comparative politics

William Anderson Award for the best dissertation in the general field of federalism or intergovernmental relations, state and local politics

Edward S. Corwin Award for the best dissertation in the field of public law

Harold D. Lasswell Award for the best dissertation in the field of public policy

Helen Dwight Reid Award for the best dissertation in the field of international relations, law, and politics

E.E. Schattschneider Award for the best dissertation in American government

Leo Strauss Award for the best dissertation in the field of political psychology

Leonard White Award for the best dissertation in the field of public administration

LEARN MORE AT WWW.APSANET.ORG