

# Post-War Development Analysis of Political Science: from Behaviorism to New Institutionalism: Political Science Development Trend, Challenges and Suggestions

Chenxi Gao<sup>1,a,\*</sup>, Yini Li<sup>2,b</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Zhou Enlai School of Government, Nankai University, Tianjin, 300350, China

<sup>2</sup>College of Tourism and Service Management, Nankai University, Tianjin, 300350, China

<sup>a</sup>g1979900184@163.com, <sup>b</sup>lyn1913735@163.com

\*Corresponding author

**Abstract:** The research on political system and the scientific development of discipline are of great significance to political science. Behaviorism after World War II is a research paradigm based on the rebellion against traditional political science and the adaptation to the needs of practical development, and then the new institutionalism is a political research paradigm emerging as the inheritance of traditional institutional research and the criticism of behaviorism. Both of them have great academic contributions but also have certain drawbacks. Through the analysis of the development of behaviorism and new institutionalism in political science after World War II, this paper attempts to summarize the development trend of political science since World War II, and analyzes the challenges faced by political science. Finally, it attempts to put forward corresponding disciplinary suggestions for the further scientific and vigorous development of political science.

**Keywords:** political science; behaviorism; new institutionalism

## 1. Introduction

The study of “system” is a tradition of political science. System refers to those social interactions and systems through which decisions made by a society are considered binding by most members of the society for most of the time. Classical political philosophy focuses on the consideration of the connotation and value of political system. Its long history can be traced back to the ancient Greek period in the West. Aristotle's philosophical thinking of Greek city-state system has opened a chapter in the study of political system. The study of political system in political science has become an important part of the study of political scholars. In ancient times, Plato thought about the “ideal country” where the king of philosophy ruled the country and had a clear division of labor. He believed that justice was a social consciousness that made the society harmonious and perfect. He respected the principle of strict social division of labor and hierarchy, and believed that people with three virtues of wisdom, courage and moderation should be allowed to play the professional roles of philosophers, soldiers and workers. Thomas Moore proposed the idea of a happy “Utopia” of eliminating private ownership, and put forward the principles of public ownership and equality based on organized production and universal labor. In modern times, such as Montesquieu's system of separation of legislative, administrative and judicial powers, he advocated that the three state powers of legislation, administration and justice should be controlled by different institutions, exercised independently, restricted and balanced each other, all reflect the thinking of the majority of political pioneers about political system. It also highlights the unique and lofty position of “institution” in the political tradition. Institution's definition is organization founded and united for a specific purpose.

When we study the development of political science after the Second World War, it is not difficult to find that political science has two new development paradigms after the Second World War: one is the behaviorism research paradigm<sup>[1]</sup>, which attaches importance to the study of political behavior of political subjects and the use of quantitative analysis methods; The other is the research paradigm of new institutionalism<sup>[2]</sup>, which attaches importance to the study of formal political systems and learns the theoretical methods of corresponding economics, sociology and other disciplines. First of all, we need to pay attention to the chronological order between the two, that is, the rise and development of behaviorism

first, and then the upsurge of new institutionalism research after the decline of behaviorism boom. In short, behaviorism is ahead in time. Secondly, through the research on the relevant theories and literatures of behaviorism and new institutionalism, we find that behaviorism and new institutionalism can be explained and compared from the dimensions of theoretical development and connotation, criticism of past theories, theoretical contributions and theoretical defects.

Through the analysis and comparison of the corresponding contents of behaviorism and new institutionalism, we can summarize the certain trends and directions of the development of political science after World War II, in which we can find that the emphasis on “system” shows a downward trend first and then an upward trend. Combined with the previous analysis and the current situation of the development of political science, we further draw some difficulties and challenges faced by the development of political science. Combined with the past experience of political science development and the current situation of the discipline, we try to put forward corresponding disciplinary development suggestions for the difficulties faced in these developments, so as to achieve the long-term and good development of political science. The above is a rough analysis idea of this paper. Later, the paper will explain the development trend, the challenges faced by the discipline and the suggestions for the development of the discipline.

## 2. Behaviorism

Behaviorism rose after World War II and began to decline in the 1970s<sup>[3]</sup>. Behaviorism preceded the new institutionalism in time, and part of the introduction of the new institutionalism needs to be based on behaviorism. Therefore, this paper first introduces the relevant contents of behaviorism. Behaviorism can be regarded as a rebellion against traditional political science, which opposes the excessive emphasis on politics and legal system in traditional political science. It advocates that the research of political science should focus on the political behavior of political subjects, and pay attention to the use of quantitative analysis to study the psychological “preference” and behavioral motivation of subjects, and then construct political science into verifiable, quantifiable and dynamic non-stationary science.

### 2.1 The Development and Decline of Behaviorism

*Table 1: The top 14 cited works in the new Handbook of political science*

| Ranking | Author                     | Title (School of Theory)  | Publication date |
|---------|----------------------------|---|------------------|
| 1       | Towns                      | Economic Theory of Democracy<br>(Rational Choice)   | 1957             |
| 2       | Mancur Olson               | The logic of collective action<br>(Rational choice)   | 1965             |
| 3       | Elinor Ostrom              | The Way of Governing Public<br>Things (Rational Choice)                                       | 1990             |
| 4       | North                      | Institutional Institutional Change<br>and Economic Performance (New<br>Institutionalism)      | 1990             |
| 5       | G.A. Almond and S. Verba   | The Civic Culture (behaviorism)   | 1963             |
|         | Campbell and Converse, et. | American elections (behaviorism)  | 1960             |
|         | Marchi and Orsen           | Rediscovering Institutions (New<br>Institutionalism)  | 1989             |
|         | Rolls                      | Theory of Justice (Political<br>Philosophy)   | 1971             |
|         | Barry                      | Sociologists, Economists, and<br>Democracy (Rational Choice)                                  | 1970/1978        |
| 6       | Fiorina                    | A Review of Electoral Activity in<br>National Elections in the United<br>States (Behaviorism) | 1981             |
|         | Lipset and Roquena         | Party system and electoral<br>alliances (behaviorism)   | 1967             |
|         | Rolls                      | Political Liberalism (Political<br>Philosophy)  | 1993             |
|         | Rickelle and Aude shock    | Positive Political Theory<br>(Methodology)  | 1973             |
|         | Skocpol                    | State and Social Revolution (Neo-<br>Institutionalism)  | 1979             |

After World War II, behaviorism rose and flourished in the United States, and finally reached its peak

in the 1960s. The pragmatic spirit of pursuing science and rationalism in the American cultural tradition, the Chicago school represented by Miriam's promotion of the scientization of politics, the active participation of many political scholars in the practice of political activities during the Second World War, the accumulation of practical experience for the development of the discipline, and the resource tendencies of various national organizations combined to create the results of behaviorism. Among them, we should also note the relationship between the prosperity of behaviorism at that time and the ideological and political needs of the cold war.

After 70 years of the 20th century, behaviorism began to decline. Since behaviorism has long been unable to achieve its disciplinary goals and some inherent defects, coupled with the rise of rational choice theory and new institutionalism, behaviorism has gradually fallen into the altar. However, it is worth noting that behaviorism has not disappeared. On the contrary, behaviorism is still an important part of political analysis framework and theoretical methods. In summary, although behaviorism is not as important as before, it is still an important part of today's politics. As shown in the table 1, among the top 14 cited works in the new Handbook of political science, there are four behaviorist works<sup>[4]</sup>, whose influence and significance to political science can be seen.

## ***2.2 Criticism of Behaviorism on Traditional Politics***

Traditional political science pays too much attention to formal political and legal systems, ignoring the research and exploration of informal political behavior. The main research objects of traditional politics are mostly macroscopic, especially focusing on the study of formal political system<sup>[5]</sup>, and often ignoring the study of important informal political categories such as political elites, political group behavior and pressure groups. With the development of national economy and politics and the improvement of national comprehensive quality, the public's attention to the participation of political activities is increasing, and the penetration of government organizations and political groups into the daily life of the public is also deepening. Traditional political research methods tend to be descriptive and static, and lack of explanatory research, which requires political research to study, explain and explain informal political behavior for the future.

Traditional politics usually ignores the absorption of natural discipline methods such as physics, biology and mathematics. The rise of the behaviorism school is closely related to the development of natural science and technology at that time. The behaviorism school believes that if political science wants to further become a 'science', it should draw more widely from and absorb the theoretical framework and analysis methods of advanced natural science at that time: such as computer information storage, statistical data analysis and processing, physical biology and other natural science analysis framework, so as to further enhance political science into a 'science' by drawing on natural science methods.

Traditional politics overemphasizes ideology. Behaviorists believe that the traditional politics existed as an ideology to some extent, which is contrary to the general direction of scientific politics. Therefore, political behaviorists are more inclined to cultivate a value-neutral political science, hoping to separate political science research from the previous strong ideological color with scientific and objective research methods<sup>[6]</sup>. Of course, some scholars point out that the so-called "de-ideologicalization" is essentially an ideology, and we do not have much discussion here. Behaviorists at that time did have a good vision for building value-neutral political studies.

To some extent, behaviorism can be regarded as a kind of reverse to traditional politics, which combines the factors of scientific research. The research method of behaviorism tries to make the observable empirical part of politics and political behavior scientific, and tries to analyze and explain all political phenomena through observable and observed people and things<sup>[7]</sup>. Its focus is on the reasons why the political subject acts in a certain way.

## ***2.3 Theoretical Contribution of Behaviorism***

Behaviorism has led the trend of American politics research, and has made important theoretical contributions to some key issues of politics. On the issue of election, scholars have conducted in-depth research and consideration on key issues such as the form of election under the guidance of behavioral theory<sup>[8]</sup>. At the level of leadership behavior, behaviorism has also carried on the corresponding key research, focusing on the relationship between individual values and specific actions taken by leaders, which plays an important role in the enrichment of today's political theory<sup>[9]</sup>. At the international level, behaviorism has made a corresponding analysis of various non-state actors and has made far-reaching

contributions to the development of international politics. At the level of social problems, behaviorist scholars have conducted in-depth research on the behavior of interest groups and political parties, filling gaps in this field in the past.

Behaviorism has opened up a new vision of politics. Behaviorism politics pays attention to the research of so-called political methods, pays attention to the analysis of people's behavior at the same time of political behavior analysis, transforms the static description of traditional politics into dynamic analysis, emphasizes the interconnection and organic interaction between politics and other disciplines, and adapts to the development and change of political practice. Under the guidance of behaviorism, a series of new scientific theories such as political psychology, political anthropology, group theory and decision-making theory have emerged and developed. Undoubtedly, the emergence and development of behaviorism theory is a major development and change of politics.

#### ***2.4 Defects of behaviorism***

First of all, behaviorism did not achieve its initial disciplinary vision and did not explore a set of scientific approaches to politics. To become a political science, political science must have its own things, and must have the self-confidence of the transcendental discipline of political science. The self-confidence of this transcendental discipline must come from its unique scientific methods, and behaviorism has not achieved its initial goal in this regard.

Secondly, it is not advisable to establish the foundation of politics as a social discipline on the theoretical framework of natural science. Behaviorism research itself pays too much attention to the theoretical methods of experience and science<sup>[10]</sup>. Political science is essentially a social science, and the methods and objects of natural science research are all aimed at the objective world. There are obvious differences between the two. The method of pursuing science based on the former research method is not scientific enough<sup>[11]</sup>, and it is wrong to establish social science and human action on the basis of any natural science.

### **3. New Institutionalism**

The upsurge of behaviorism research gradually declined. In the 1980s, the new institutionalism theory rose. This part will introduce some specific contents of the new institutionalism, and form a certain correspondence and contrast with the corresponding contents of the behaviorism mentioned above. New institutionalism combines the advantages of old institutionalism and behaviorism : it not only pays attention to the study of formal political and legal systems, but also pays attention to the study of individual behaviors and informal institutions and organizations. New institutionalism refuses to deny the view that behaviorism focuses on political behavior itself, and it absorbs a lot of economic and sociological theories such as rational choice theory, which has developed rapidly since the 1970s. It can be said that it is not only a critique of behaviorism, but also a return to the study of traditional political systems. It is also a transformation and absorption of social sciences such as economics and sociology, with strong comprehensive and interdisciplinary characteristics.

#### ***3.1 The Origin and Development of New Institutionalism***

Since the 1980s, behaviorism has been criticized because of its own defects and unable to achieve its long-term goals. Politics has again attached great importance to the study of political system. Based on the criticism of behaviorism, it conforms to the trend of contemporary discipline integration<sup>[11]</sup>. Combined with the theory of economics and sociology, politics has finally formed a new theoretical school - new institutionalism.

#### ***3.2 Criticism of New Institutionalism on Behaviorism***

As behaviorism is based on criticism of traditional politics, new institutionalism is based on criticism of behaviorism.

New institutionalism criticizes individual preference hypothesis of behaviorism. Behaviorism believes that individual preferences will appear through their behavior, so the study of their behavior itself can also understand the study of individual preferences. The new institutionalism criticizes this view of preference : the new institutionalism believes that people's 'preference' is not necessarily their real 'preference' when they choose, and their behavior choices are affected by various complex factors,

which cannot be simply equated.

New institutionalism criticizes the concept of preference aggregation of behaviorism. Behaviorists believe that the aggregation of individual preference choices eventually forms collective behaviors and choices, which is criticized and questioned by the neo-institutionalism school. Neo-institutionalism tends to believe that collective behaviors and choices are affected by the institutional factors of decision-making rules, and cannot be simply abstracted as a collection of individual preference choices. Taking the election as an example, which person is finally elected cannot be simply regarded as the result of the aggregation of individual preferences of each voter, but the output result under the action of certain electoral rules. At this time, the electoral system, rules and policies should be studied.

### ***3.3 The Difference between New Institutionalism and Old Institutionalism***

The tradition of political science focuses on the research of institution. The general academic circles tend to classify the institutional research before the rise of new institutionalism into the category of old institutionalism. Since institutions are the central focus of their research, why should we distinguish the so-called old and new, and where are the differences and differences between them? Compared with the old institutionalism, the new institutionalism not only pays attention to the research system, but also absorbs the research characteristics of behaviorism that emphasizes the dynamic process, and combines the theoretical framework and theoretical methods such as quantitative research of modern science<sup>[12]</sup>. For the new institutionalism, the old institutionalism pays too much attention to the study of specific institutional rules and legal framework, and its research process is often static, and its research content is often descriptive, which is not conducive to the development of the scientific trend of politics<sup>[13]</sup>. Julia believes that the new institutionalism tries to combine the old institutionalism's attention to institution with the behaviorism's attention to political behavior<sup>[14]</sup>. From this point of view, we can also think that the new institutionalism is a new focus on both systems, but also pay attention to absorb behaviorism focus on dynamic and quantitative analysis.

### ***3.4 Differentiation within New Institutionalism***

Obviously, new institutionalism is not monolithic, and there are various factions within it. There are also differences and disputes between the theories of different new institutionalism factions. For the classification between the schools of new institutionalism, the most famous scholars are Peter Hall and Rosemary C.R. Taylor published in 1996 in the "political science and three new institutionalism" in the "political research" the new institutionalism is divided into "rational choice institutionalism" "historical institutionalism" "sociological institutionalism"<sup>[15]</sup>. Although there are various views on the division of new institutionalism in the academic circles, the division of new institutionalism into the above three is basically recognized by the academic circles, so this paper also chooses to follow this division.

Rational choice institutionalism, as its name implies, combines the theoretical results of rational choice theory and new institutional economics. Rational choice institutionalism regards "rational man" as the basis and logical starting point of its analysis<sup>[16]</sup>. Among them, Douglas North's property rights theory and institutional change theory<sup>[17]</sup>, Williams' transaction cost theory<sup>[18]</sup>, Pratt's principal-agent theory and a series of economic institutional economics theories have a profound impact on rational choice institutionalism<sup>[19]</sup>. Although rational choice institutionalism has been influenced by many economic theories, the most concerned problem is undoubtedly the institutional problem. In the context of rational choice institutionalism, any action is carried out under a certain institutional framework, in which the system plays the role of the rules of action. Under the constraints of the system, the actors pursue their own interests, and the system can also play a good role in saving the cost of activity loss and improving efficiency. In the view of the school, the system runs through and restricts the whole process of the subject's behavior, which not only sets a certain boundary and framework for the action of the actor, but also provides certain information for the decision-making action of the actor. Rational choice institutionalism tends to believe that the construction of the system is to achieve certain goals, and the system itself carries certain functions. In short, the instrumental logic is used as the basis of its theory, that is, "considering that the actor is rational, once there is a logical need for the system, it will be created."<sup>[2]</sup>

Historical institutionalism combines the theory of political development and structural functionalism in comparative politics. The main focus is on the long-term impact of institutional factors on policy and political behaviour, which states: 'Once the Government has made the initial policy and institutional choices in a policy area, this created pattern will continue without sufficient strength to overcome the

inertia created initially<sup>[20]</sup>. Historical institutionalism is called 'historical' institutionalism because it advocates the study of history and overcomes the limitations of rationality through history<sup>[21]</sup>. The reason why it was named 'institutionalism' is because it takes the system as the core to study history and studies the system in the historical category. In the view of historical institutionalism, institution is the organizational structure of political system or the formal and informal procedures and practices in political economy, including constitutional rules and the implementation procedures of bureaucratic standards<sup>[22]</sup>. They regard institution itself as a subject of action. The political system has an organic interaction with political actors through the provision of information, which has a corresponding impact on political behavior. For the problem of individual behavior and individual preference, historical institutionalism tends to analyze the paradigm, that is, individual choice cannot truly reflect individual preferences, but should be understood as individual choices made in accordance with the corresponding rules and systems<sup>[23]</sup>.

Sociological institutionalism originates from the challenge of some scholars to the completely different views of culture and organization in traditional organizational theory. Sociological institutionalism believes that system is essentially a culture, and there is no difference between system and culture. So the main task of the school of institutionalism is to study and explain why the whole organization should adopt a certain form of organization, why to form a certain symbol and symbolic form, and how to further spread and develop within the organization. Sociological institutionalism believes that system is not only the relevant political system and organizational rules, but also includes language symbol system and moral ethics system<sup>[24]</sup>. In the view of sociological institutionalism, organization has a significant impact on individuals and the function of education. It can be understood as a kind of interest organization, which can have an expected effect on political results and public policy.

The reason why these schools are considered as neo-institutionalism schools is that they all recognize the influence and restriction of the combined system of rules, organizational models and cognition on political preferences, which in turn affects power and political behavior. When studying individual behaviors, new institutionalism tends to put individual behaviors into a certain institutional framework for analysis. Despite the differentiation within the new institutionalism, we can clearly see that on the basis of studying the political system, it draws excellent and fashionable disciplinary theories such as institutional economics theory, game theory of economics, macro-history view of history, organizational culture theory of sociology and so on, which are based on different disciplines. It is also these disciplines that also have contradictions and differences among themselves, which further increases the academic differences and contradictions among various schools of new institutionalism<sup>[25]</sup>.

### ***3.5 Theoretical Contribution of New Institutionalism***

Institutional research was developed. The new institutionalism opposes the neglect of behaviorism on the study of political system, putting the study of system at the core of political science<sup>[26]</sup>, but unlike the traditional political science of the old institutionalism, it only focuses on the formal political and legal system. For the old institutionalism, the new institutionalism also greatly broadens the connotation of the definition of the system itself, including not only the formal structure organization, but also other informal structure organization<sup>[27]</sup>, customary concept and so on, making the concept of the system more perfect. While focusing on the impact of formal institutions on political ecology, new institutionalism also focuses on informal political behaviors, organizations, and consciousness and morality. At the research method level of institution, new institutionalism combines normative research with empirical research. Corrected the neglect of political value by behaviorism. Behaviorism ignores the thinking and research of value in the pursuit of scientific politics, while the new institutionalism thinking research: what is a good system? What is the system of justice? Focus on thinking "good" in the scope of the system. The new institutionalism regards value as an indispensable part of the system itself, and attaches importance to the justice and rationality of the system itself, which is a metaphysical sublimation for politics itself.

Both institutional analysis and political actors' specific behavior and interest analysis. New institutionalism places these elements in specific situations for analysis, and then analyzes the ways in which various factors interact, providing an effective way to analyze political situations<sup>[28]</sup>. It reaches a certain balance between the necessary complexity and the sought simplicity. The analysis logic of the old institutionalism is mostly based on the institutional factors directly to the corresponding macro political effect. While the new institutionalism emphasizes the significance of the system, it also adds the analysis and interpretation of individual behavior and choice preference: starting from the system, docking affects individual preference behavior, and then falls to the corresponding macro political effect. In this way, it

not only takes into account the analysis of the macro role of the system, but also takes into account the analysis of individual behavioral preferences and interest choices<sup>[29]</sup>, which further enhances the scientificity and explanatory power of politics.

Abstract the common reasons from the particularity of political systems in different countries. Some scholars believe that the new institutionalism plays a role of bridge intermediary in political science, which connects the macro and micro of political science, as well as the interdisciplinary relationship between politics and various disciplines, thus helping to abstract commonness from different particularities.

### ***3.6 Shortcomings of New Institutionalism***

Lack of dynamic explanation for politics. There are some similarities with the criticism of old institutionalism. The theory of new institutionalism has also been criticized as paying too much attention to the static and orderly process, but ignoring the dynamic tension interpretation of politics. For example, when explaining political change, neo-institutionalism tends to assume that some or some factors have changed, which leads to a series of causal changes, but sometimes it will pull out a long static logical causal chain, so that it is difficult to understand the essential factors behind the real change.

Internally, it is divided into multiple schools, and each school has its own defects. The failure to reach a consensus among schools weakens the explanatory power of the theory. Rational choice institutionalism combines the rational choice theory of economics with the viewpoint of institutional rules, but it cannot make enough reasonable explanations for some deeper internal rules, such as moral constraints and ethical concepts in people's minds; historical institutionalism studies institutions from the perspective of history and state, but due to its research focus is too grand and often unable to explain some subtle political struggle and interest disputes; sociological institutionalism, although the theory of institutional and cultural equivalence helps to explain some internal abstract reasons, has fallen into a big prison in humanities and social sciences — unable to conduct more effective quantitative research. The differences and debates among various schools of neo-institutionalism weaken the authority and scientificity of the whole neo-institutionalism school, and the defects exposed by the differentiated individual schools are too obvious, which is not conducive to the further development of the whole neo-institutionalism.

Drawing on the theories of other disciplines is likely to ignore the "own things" of political science. Indeed, the interdisciplinary intersection and development is the general trend of all disciplines, and it is necessary for political science to comply with the trend of the times. However, we should also note that the cross integration between this discipline and other disciplines should be based on the full and mature development of this discipline. It is necessary to develop the exclusive theoretical content of this discipline that is detached from other disciplines, rather than allowing other disciplines to "turn away from the objective" when disciplines blend and learn. A major contradiction exposed by the new institutionalism is the contradiction between politics itself and the theories of other disciplines.

For the neglect of empirical facts, the theory is unverifiable. The theoretical viewpoints of new institutionalism are more derived from theoretical derivation, which inevitably lacks the explanation of empirical facts, and the explanatory power of theory for reality will be insufficient. When the system cannot affect individual behavior and choice in real political life, the neo-institutionalists often attribute it to the incomplete development of the system, or to the choice within the allowable range of the system. Therefore, the theory does not have 'falsification', or is difficult to falsify, which is a major defect in terms of scientific and explanatory power.

## **4. The development trend of Political Science**

Based on the previous analysis of the background and specific theoretical content of the rise of behaviorism and new institutionalism after World War II, we can try to summarize some trends and directions of the development of political science since World War II.

### ***4.1 Scientific and Academic Development of Politics***

The use of quantitative analysis and mathematical models is increasing. One of the common features of behaviorism and neo-institutionalism after World War II is the use of quantitative analysis tools, which highlights a major trend in the development of politics since World War II. With the further development of economics and natural science, the use of quantitative statistical methods and mathematical models

has gradually increased in the field of politics<sup>[30]</sup>. Research methods for political science: Quantitative and qualitative methods. The increase in the use of quantitative analysis and mathematical models directly aggravates the scientific and academic color of political science<sup>[31]</sup>. Intuitively, it the explanatory power and verifiability of political science.

#### ***4.2 Interdisciplinary research and interdisciplinary development in political science***

In essence, behaviorism, new institutionalism and their differentiation, which are mainly studied in this paper, are more or less the product of the cross integration of political science and other disciplines, of which the more prominent is the cross integration of economics<sup>[32]</sup>, psychology, sociology and political science. In the process of intersection and integration of political science and other disciplines, other disciplines provide corresponding theoretical framework and theoretical perspective for political science, and endow political science with new vitality. For example, the quantitative analysis of natural science, the rational choice theory of economics, and the macro national system perspective of history have effectively promoted the rapid development of political science.

#### ***4.3 Increasing Reality of Political Studies***

After World War II, the climax of western political science research experienced a transition from behaviorism to new institutionalism, which essentially reflects the reality of political science as a contemporary social science. Political science is essentially a social science, and the purpose and starting point of social science is to solve practical problems. However, due to the prevalence of behaviorism and positivism research methodology, political science once blindly focuses on the scientific research of political science, resulting in a certain degree of disconnection between theory and practice. After that, the rise of new institutionalism is to correct the deviation of political science. The theoretical research of political science seeks to explain and solve practical problems. When the relevant theories of political science are inconsistent with reality, political science will develop and sublate itself. The purpose of political science is not only for simple theoretical and scientific research, but also for the development and innovation of practice. Political science is a science with strong application and its application is still in a process of continuous improvement, reflecting the high unity of theory and practice. The theory comes from practice and continues to develop in practice.

#### ***4.4 Revival of Political System Research and Development of Political Philosophy***

Traditional political science focuses on the research and exploration of the system, and the rise of behaviorism after the Second World War as a rebellion against traditional political science, which emphasizes the promotion of political behavior in the informal political level of theoretical research and exploration, and the rise of the new institutionalism in the 1980 s has restarted the exploration of the value of the political system, and not only the connotation of the system is limited to the legal, institutional structure level, but also the market, values, etc. as part of the system to study. In today ' s political development trend, not only the research on the system itself has been re-emphasized, but also the connotation of the system itself has been expanded, and more analytical research methods have been used to conduct in-depth research and discussion on the system itself. In the study of the relationship between individuals and institutions, today's political science pays more and more attention to the study of the organic interaction between individuals and institutions, rather than just focusing on a one-dimensional aspect, and paying more attention to the value of the system, studying what is a just and good system, which promotes the development of political philosophy and system value judgment<sup>[33]</sup>.

### **5. Challenges to Politics**

Based on the previous criticism of behaviorism and new institutionalism theory and the summary of the development trend of political science, combined with the current situation of the development of political science, this paper attempts to summarize some challenges faced by political science.

#### ***5.1 Practice and verifiability need to be improved.***

There are two major problems and difficulties in the mainstream school of today's political science represented by new institutionalism: one is the lack of practicality of theory, and the other is the lack of falsifiability of theory. Practically speaking, the study of institutions and rules in today ' s political science



often contradicts with some behaviors that violate and destroy the rules and systems in real life, and cannot explain the phenomenon well through the theory itself. In terms of falsifiability, the current political science theory does not have enough falsifiability. For example, the system that is the focus of today's political science research does not have strong falsifiability. Sometimes the setting of the system seems to be perfect and excellent, but it will be distorted when it is implemented. The theory of political science itself has many falsifiable parts, which weakens and reduces the corresponding practicality and scientificity of the theory<sup>[34]</sup>. Lack of practicality and falsification is a major challenge in contemporary politics

### 5.2 Lack of popularity

Since the 20th century, the scientific process of political science has made great progress. From behaviorism to post-behaviorism, from old institutionalism to new institutionalism, political science has been greatly influenced by economics and natural science. Under the scientific request, the political science specialization tendency and the quantitative analysis tendency unceasingly rises, excessively pursues the scientific possibly instead causes the political science to enter a "self isolation" dead end. To some extent, too specialized political science will obliterate the general interest of the people, which is contrary to the nature of the humanities and social disciplines of political science<sup>[35]</sup>. Excessive pursuit of specialization leads to insufficient popularity<sup>[36]</sup>, which is a major challenge for political science today.

### 5.3 Controversy between Qualitative Research and Quantitative Research: Strong Performance of Quantitative Research

Table 2: Research methods used in the papers submitted to the American political science review from 2003 to 2012

| Year      | Mathematical modeling | Quantitative analysis | Mathematical modeling combined with quantification | Small sample | Concept elaboration | Qualitative (empirical analysis) | other |
|-----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-------|
| 2012-2013 | 8                     | 54                    | 9  | 1            | 22                  | 5                                | 1     |
| 2011-2012 | 9                     | 53                    | 12   | <1           | 20                  | 5                                | <1    |
| 2010-2011 | 8                     | 50                    | 10   | 3            | 29                  | NA                               | <1    |
| 2009-2010 | 11                    | 49                    | 12   | 1            | 26                  | NA                               | 1     |
| 2008-2009 | 12                    | 49                    | 13   | 2            | 23                  | NA                               | 1     |
| 2007-2008 | 14                    | 49                    | 8  | 2            | 25                  | NA                               | 2     |
| 2006-2007 | 11                    | 55                    | 4  | 2            | 24                  | NA                               | 4     |
| 2005-2006 | 14                    | 51                    | 5  | 2            | 23                  | NA                               | 4     |
| 2004-2005 | 13                    | 52                    | 6  | 1            | 27                  | NA                               | 1     |
| 2003-2004 | 11                    | 51                    | 8  | 2            | 26                  | NA                               | 2     |

The political schools represented by behaviorism and new institutionalism since the Second World War have paid more attention to the use of quantitative methods. This preference is obviously reflected in the political works and journals, and this bias also causes political scholars to use quantitative analysis methods. As can be seen from the table2, we have counted the distribution of research methods used in the papers submitted to the American political science review from 2003 to 2012, and it can be clearly found that the use of quantitative analysis methods is higher than that of qualitative analysis. Scholars who advocate qualitative research are dissatisfied with this, thus constantly questioning and promoting the development of qualitative research. In this way, the preference dispute between qualitative research and quantitative research will lead to the breakdown of disciplinary differences and consensuses within political science, which is essentially not conducive to the further rapid development and explanatory power of political science, thereby leading to the credit crisis and utility crisis within the discipline, and the decline of the authority of the discipline. However, focusing on quantitative research while ignoring qualitative research may cause damage to political science research itself. As David Rich once pointed out, quantitative research shows that it will make political science appear scientific, but instead it will cause "tragedy of political science" – reduce the role of national democratic value cohesion of political science<sup>[37]</sup>.

### 5.4 Discipline Crisis and Identity Crisis

To a certain extent, the internal disputes of political science theory and the reference of political

science development for the theory of other disciplines also make political science fall into the crisis of subject identity with the decline of subject scientific influence and fuzzy subject positioning. Among the 2200 domestic academicians and 437 foreign academicians selected or incumbent by the National Academy of Sciences in 2014, only 21 are political scientists, which is much lower than the number of disciplines such as economics. To some extent, it also reflects the decline in the scientific influence of political science. When political science draws on and refers to the theoretical methods and analytical framework of other humanities and social sciences and natural sciences, there is sometimes a certain blind reference and use. The logical premises and assumptions between various disciplines and theories are often inconsistent. The harmony between internal logic and assumptions should be fully examined between reference and use. When political science draws lessons from social science, economic science, physics, biology and other natural disciplines, sometimes it often ignores the differences between disciplines and blindly draws lessons from the concepts and terms of its disciplines<sup>[38]</sup>, and then ignores the characteristics of the political discipline itself, which causes the identity cognition crisis of the discipline and is not conducive to the rapid development of the political discipline<sup>[39]</sup>.

## **6. Suggestions on the Development of Politics**

Combined with the challenges faced by today's political science, this paper attempts to put forward some suggestions on the development of today's political science by combining the previous inductive analysis and the current development situation of today's political science.

### **6.1 Some Integration in Politics**

Taking the new institutionalism as an example, the explanatory power of the three university factions differentiated by the new institutionalism school in the political phenomenon has certain deficiencies. For example, the rational choice institutionalism theory is difficult to explain the rules and moral constraints that are internalized in people's minds, and the historical choice doctrine pays too much attention to the macro level. The new institutionalism should further enhance the explanatory power and scientific nature of its theory on the basis of obtaining sufficient basic consensus within it, which is conducive to its further rapid development. As for the political science as a whole, it also needs certain integration and unification, which is not to deny and obliterate the characteristics and characteristics of various factions within the political science, but requires that the political science as a whole should seek to reach consensus and unification at some core concepts and basic theoretical levels. For example, the three major schools of new institutionalism should seek to reach unification on some basic and key issues such as institutions, so as to enhance the scientific and authoritative nature of the political science as a whole, which is conducive to the rapid development of political science. Similarly, the discipline of political science should focus on the integration of relevant theories and frameworks, and form sufficient consensus and solid theoretical basis within the discipline itself, so as to be conducive to the enhancement of the scientificity and authority of the discipline.

### **6.2 Constructing the Bridge of Qualitative and Quantitative Research, Paying Attention to the Balance of Different Research**

There are great disputes and differences between qualitative research and quantitative research among contemporary political scholars. Quantitative researchers doubt the scientificity and persuasiveness of qualitative researchers' research methods, while qualitative researchers doubt whether politics, a social science, can be expressed by quantitative methods. Although there are contradictions and differences between the two, we should try to find a third party, or a compromise, so as to build a bridge between qualitative research and quantitative research, and effectively avoid the shortcomings and defects of single qualitative or quantitative research. Through a research method of eclecticism, quantitative research and qualitative research are in a relatively stable state. They can not only highlight their scientificity through quantitative analysis and case analysis, but also use the logical reasoning of multiple causes and effects to interpret and judge their value, so as to build a bridge between qualitative and quantitative research, which is conducive to a more comprehensive and detailed analysis of problems in political research, so as to cross the appearance of things and directly hit their essence.

### **6.3 Drawing lessons from other disciplines, focusing on interdisciplinary**

Political science should be said to have made considerable achievements at the level of

interdisciplinary and integrated learning. Regardless of the behaviorism or new institutionalism described in this paper, political science should continue its pace of integration with various natural and humanistic disciplines. In particular, I believe that political science should not only learn the analysis model and theoretical framework of various disciplines, but also learn some strict academic concepts of natural science, because such as physics, biology and other natural sciences have a more rigorous normative attitude in academic research, and political science as a humanities and social sciences sometimes have the randomness of research. Political science should also actively learn and draw lessons from the theoretical methods and scientific thinking of other scientific disciplines on the basis of guaranteeing the characteristics and principles of this discipline, so as to enrich the theoretical tools of political science. As a famous western proverb says: 'In the people who only have hammers, all the problems are like a nail.' Politics must also learn to avoid the so-called 'hammer man' error, that is, we should enrich our own theoretical perspective and theoretical tools to deal with a variety of practical and theoretical problems.

#### ***6.4 Mining typical cases and talking with empirical facts***

The development of today's political science must pay attention to the practicality of its theory, and insist that practice is the only standard to test the truth. By discovering typical cases from history and reality and using basic theories, on the one hand, the discipline of social science of political science can be repaid; on the other hand, the basic persuasiveness and explanatory power of the discipline can be strengthened, so as to promote the considerable development of political science, rather than making political science a pure theoretical science. No matter to what extent political science develops, it should uphold its inherent nature as a social science. The ultimate foothold of relevant research and theory of political science should be social practice and social development. Political science should constantly explore real and typical cases, apply relevant theories of political science to practice, improve the practicality and practicability of political science, and in turn promote the further vigorous development of political science, and achieve the positive circular development of political science by improving the practicality and practicability of political science.

#### ***6.5 Reflection on the Phenomenon of Simple Replication and the Worship of Methodology***

It is true that the reference and absorption of other disciplines after World War II is a major boost factor in the development of political science, such as the reference of behaviorism for psychology, and the study of rational choice of new institutionalism for economics. However, we should also reflect and pay attention to the phenomenon of crude copying in drawing on the theories of other disciplines. For example, when introducing economic theories, we should take into account the differences between the internal logic of politics and economics. When introducing the theoretical framework of other disciplines, we should first consider whether its internal prerequisites and basic logic are harmonious, rather than simply copying. Hirschman's comments on political science today are still thought-provoking: "Contemporary social science research, whether blind digital games or blind theoreticalization that is difficult to self-control, can easily create obstacles to understanding political phenomena."<sup>[40]</sup> For the study of political science, we cannot blindly pursue the simple application of theoreticalization and other disciplines, but should fully consider the applicability of its theoretical core and the rationality of its logic.

### **7. Conclusion**

Political science has been on the road of pursuing scientific since modern times, and political science has always attached importance to the discipline tradition of institutional research. The trend and direction of today's political science can be seen from the rise of behaviorism after the Second World War and the new institutionalism that has flourished since the 1980s. Although political science learns the corresponding analytical theory and scientific thought from other natural science and humanities, which greatly promotes the scientific development of political science, it also highlights some problems and challenges. Some of these problems and challenges are inherent in political science itself, and some are brought by learning from the theory of other disciplines. These are problems and challenges faced by today's political science. How to find and carry forward the unique theory and framework of politics, and on this basis to deal with the relationship with the theoretical thinking and framework of other disciplines; it is necessary for all political scholars to work together to promote the scientific development of political science without losing the original characteristics of political science.

## References

- [1] Dahl, R. A. (1961). *The behavioral approach in political science: epitaph for a monument to a successful protest*. *American Political Science Review*, 55(4), 763-772.
- [2] March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1983). *The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life*. *American political science review*, 78(3), 734-749.
- [3] Braat, M., Engelen, J., van Gemert, T., & Verhaegh, S. (2020). *The rise and fall of behaviorism: The narrative and the numbers*. *History of Psychology*, 23(3), 252.
- [4] Goodin, R. E., & Klingemann, H. D. (Eds.). (1998). *A new handbook of political science*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- [5] Gunnell, J. G. (2013). *The Reconstitution of Political Theory: David Easton, Behavioralism, and the Long Road to System*. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 49(2), 190-210.
- [6] Easton, D. (2017). *A systems analysis of political life*. In *Systems Research for Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 428-436). Routledge.
- [7] Hauptmann, E. (2012). *The Ford Foundation and the rise of behavioralism in political science*. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 48(2), 154-173.
- [8] Heath, A. (2016). *Understanding political change: The British voter 1964-1987*. Elsevier.
- [9] King, A., & King, A. S. (Eds.). (1985). *The British prime minister*. Duke University Press.
- [10] Lowndes, V., Marsh, D., & Stoker, G. (Eds.). (2017). *Theory and methods in political science*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- [11] Hood, C. (1990). *JG March and JP Olsen Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*, New York, Free Press, 1989. *Journal of Public Policy*, 10(3), 349-351.
- [12] Orren, K., & Skowronek, S. (2018). *Beyond the iconography of order: notes for a "new institutionalism"*. In *The dynamics of American politics* (pp. 311-330). Routledge.
- [13] Abrutyn, S., & Turner, J. H. (2011). *The old institutionalism meets the new institutionalism*. *Sociological Perspectives*, 54(3), 283-306.
- [14] Black, J. (1997). *New institutionalism and naturalism in socio-legal analysis: Institutional approaches to regulatory decision making*. *Law & Policy*, 19(1), 51-93.
- [15] Peters, B. G. (2019). *Institutional theory in political science: The new institutionalism*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [16] Hall, P. A., & Taylor, R. C. (1996). *Political science and the three new institutionalisms*. *Political studies*, 44(5), 936-957.
- [17] Hay, C., Rhodes, R. A. W., Binder, S. A., & Rockman, B. A. (2006). *The Oxford handbook of political institutions*.
- [18] North, D. C. (1993). *Toward a theory of institutional change*. *Political economy: Institutions, competition, and representation*, 31(4), 61-69.
- [19] Williamson, O. E. (1979). *Transaction-cost economics: the governance of contractual relations*. *The journal of Law and Economics*, 22(2), 233-261.
- [20] Zeckhauser, R. J. (1985). *Principals and agents: The structure of business* (p. 37). J. W. Pratt (Ed.). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- [21] Peters, B. G. (2019). *Institutional theory in political science: The new institutionalism*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [22] Fioretos, O., Falleti, T. G., & Sheingate, A. (Eds.). (2016). *The Oxford handbook of historical institutionalism*. Oxford University Press.
- [23] Kickert, W. J., & Van Der Meer, F. B. (2011). *Small, slow, and gradual reform: What can historical institutionalism teach us?*. *International journal of public administration*, 34(8), 475-485.
- [24] Bill, J. A., & Hardgrave, R. L. (1973). *Comparative politics: The quest for theory*. Merrill Publishing Company.
- [25] DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). *The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields*. *American sociological review*, 147-160.
- [26] Farrell, H. (2018). *The shared challenges of institutional theories: Rational choice, historical institutionalism, and sociological institutionalism*. In *Knowledge and institutions*. Springer, Cham.
- [27] Ansell, Christopher. "Institutionalism." *The Palgrave Handbook of EU Crises*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, 2021. 135-152.
- [28] Lowndes, V., & Roberts, M. (2013). *Why institutions matter: The new institutionalism in political science*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- [29] Schmidt, V. (2005). *From the old institutionalism to the new institutionalism. The state: Theories and issues*, 98.
- [30] Stark, A. (2018). *New institutionalism, critical junctures and post-crisis policy reform*. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 53(1), 24-39.

- [30] McNabb, D. E. (2015). *Research methods for political science: Quantitative and qualitative methods*. Routledge.
- [31] Schram, S. F., Flyvbjerg, B., & Landman, T. (2013). *Political political science: A phronetic approach*. *New Political Science*, 35(3), 359-372.
- [32] Easton, D. (1985). *Political science in the United States: Past and present*. *International Political Science Review*, 6(1), 133-152.
- [33] Dowding, K. (2015). *The philosophy and methods of political science*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- [34] Simon, D. W., & Romance, J. (2022). *The challenge of politics: an introduction to political science*. CQ press.
- [35] Brown, W. (2010). *Political theory is not a luxury: a response to Timothy Kaufman-Osborn's "political theory as a profession"*. *Political Research Quarterly*, 63(3), 680-685.
- [36] Gaman-Golutvina, O. V. (2016). *Political science facing the challenges of modern politics. to the 60th anniversary of RPSA/SPSA*. *Polis. Political Studies*, 1(1), 8-28.
- [37] Ricci, D. M. (1984). *The tragedy of political science: Politics, scholarship, and democracy*. Yale University Press.
- [38] Harold D L. *The future of political science [M]*. Routledge, 2017.
- [39] McDermott, R. (2002). *Experimental methods in political science*. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5(1), 31-61.
- [40] Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *The search for paradigms as a hindrance to understanding*. *World Politics*, 22(3), 329-343.