



Seymour M. Lipset, a Political Sociologist, Says: Thought of In Political Science, but Forgotten in Sociology

Dr. Riyaj Malik*

Department of Social and political science, sociology, ABD University of Science and Technology, Pakistan

*Corresponding Author's E-mail: riyajmalik@gmail.com

Received: 04-Jan-2023; Manuscript No: irjass-23-86393; **Editor assigned:** 10-Jan-2023; Pre-QC No: irjass-23-86393 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 23-Jan-2023; QC No: irjass-23-86393; **Revised:** 27-Jan-2023; Manuscript No: irjass-23-86393 (R); **Published:** 30-Jan-2023, DOI: 10.14303/2276-6502.2023.78

Abstract

This article highlights Lipset's divergent reception in both fields: While Lipset becomes more well-known in political science, his popularity in sociology only lasts a short time. This paper reconstructs the ideas that have received the most attention in both fields since the 1950s in order to better comprehend these distinct legacies. It also identifies key themes in Lipset's work. Lipset's demise in sociology can be explained by his declining influence on studies of social stratification and the fact those three major contributions Political Man, Party Systems and Voter Alignment, and Some Social Requisites of Democracy were never included in the field's canon. On the other hand, Lipset's work on democracy has established a solid foundation in political science, and his ground-breaking "cleavage theory" is still relevant to political scientists.

Keywords: Seymour M. Lipset, reception studies, political science, sociology, citation analysis, scientometrics.

INTRODUCTION

His principal distributions worked with the foundation of the subfield 'political humanism and he was the main figure behind the underpinning of the global Exploration Council on Political Social science. Lipset himself contended that the explanation his book, Political Man, is usually positioned in programs of the most-referred to works in the sociologies lays on its accessibility in numerous dialects as well as in its interdisciplinary direction (Bornmann L, 2008). Lipset's reference influence has frequently been the wellspring of much critique. It has been, in addition to other things, set that living political researcher or social scientist is all the more habitually referred to' and one of his tutors, the humanist revealed that 'of the almost 3 million logical creators referred to in the have had their work drawn upon as frequently which would propose Lipset to be one of the really important social researchers within recent memory. What these pundits don't focus on was the discipline-explicit gathering of Lipset's work. In the event that one accepts references as a marker for research influence, two particular heritages become clear in social science, the

Lipset gathering arrived at something of a peak in the and afterward declined consistently over 50 years; in political theory, an ever increasing number of researchers began to get thoughts from Lipset after a decrease in consideration between and while Lipset got almost equivalent consideration in the two disciplines between referred to two times as frequently in political theory than in social science starting around 2000. Due to the diversity and scope of his work, it would appear that Lipset's case is ideal for this kind of endeavour (Da Silva FC, 2011). Lipset strayed so frequently across the lines of political science and sociology that it is difficult to determine where he belongs in the larger community of social scientists. In addition, his work covers a wide range of subjects, including research on social mobility and student politics. It is difficult to predict which ideas will "survive" in the long run due to the abundance of academic contributions. At the risk of simplifying too much, considering the insights gained from two major scenarios, it is possible to imagine. Political scientists pay more attention to Lipset than sociologists do, so the two fields either borrow ideas from one another or from one another. This article goes through three steps to determine which

of these idealized scenarios is more applicable to the real world (Diamond L, (2006). Our methodology aims to be as neutral as possible between competing theoretical positions in order to attempt to provide a fair overview of the fields we are discussing.

METHODS

Lipset's academic career

In 1922, Lipset was born into a working-class East European Jewish family in New York City. Member of the Young People's Socialist League, the Socialist Party's youth group. Lipset attended lunchtime meetings at City College of New York on a regular basis to investigate Marx's writings. Lipset began his studies at Columbia University in the fall of 1943. Columbia became the most influential base for Ph.D. training after becoming a major center for graduate education in sociology. Lipset refers to the sociologist Merton as the "most important intellectual influence" in his own brief memoir, the article-length "Steady Work" (Gill TM, 2013). Merton's theory and methodological expertise were combined in Columbia sociology. The Bureau of Applied Social Research (BASR) was its "research laboratory." Students were able to access data and gain research experience through the numerous large-scale social research projects conducted by BASR. Lipset was granted a fellowship by the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) to conduct research on the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) of Saskatchewan for his doctoral dissertation, which was completed between the years 1945 and 1946. He was a lecturer at the University of Toronto from 1946 to 1948, defended his dissertation in the spring of 1948, and accepted an associate professorship at UC Berkeley from 1948 to 1950. During this time, he was able to access massive job history data that was gathered by the Institute of Industrial Relations, which was based in Oakland, California, along with Reinhardt Bendix. Merton offered Lipset a position as an associate professor at Columbia from 1950 to 1956. This led to a period of intense cognitive interaction between Lipset, who had been a student before becoming a professor, and a lot of talented students. He travelled frequently to Europe and other parts of the world starting in the 1950s, becoming a well-known intellectual outside of the United States (Glock CY, 1958). For a project on the social bases of political diversity, Lipset and his research assistant Juan Linz spent a year at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioural Sciences (CASBS) in Palo Alto in 1956. A co-authored book that served as the foundation for *Political Man* was produced as a result of this collaboration (Grimmer J, 2013). He went on to become a full professor at UC Berkeley, where he rekindled his relationship with (Horowitz IL, 2003). He moved to Harvard University in 1965 primarily to escape his time-consuming involvement in academic politics at Berkeley (Lakin JM, 2011). During his time at Harvard, he worked as a mentor for the student

Theda Skocpol and developed a pleasant relationship with Talcott Parsons Bendix (Lamont M, 1987).

CONCLUSIONS

This study used a novel research design that could be useful for reception studies in general to better comprehend this paradox. Using computer-assisted content analysis, the analysis began by distilling major research topics from Lipset's work. It was demonstrated that, despite Lipset's numerous contributions to a wide variety of fields, the majority of his books and journal articles dealt with democracy and American exceptionalism. It's interesting to note that Lipset wrote much less about social stratification. In addition, it was demonstrated that similar gradients of reception in the literature correspond to gradients of productivity in Lipset's case. Political science and sociology's most cited works touch on the two identified major topics. However, there is one significant reception distinction between the two fields. Lipset's research on social stratification has received significantly more attention from sociologists. Therefore, the reality is more "messy" than stylized models of reception would suggest, and neither scenario political scientists nor scenario sociologists fully apply the ideas they borrow from each other.

REFERENCES

1. Bornmann L, Daniel H (2008). What do citation counts measure? A review of studies on citing behaviour. *J Doc.* 64: 45-80.
2. Daipha P (2001). The intellectual and social organization of ASA 1990-1997: Exploring the interface between the discipline of sociology and its practitioners. *Am. Social.* 32: 73-90.
3. Da Silva FC, Vieira MB (2011). Books and canon building in sociology: The case of mind, self, and society. *J Class Social.* 11: 356-377.
4. Diamond L (2006). Seymour Martin Lipset. 1959. Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy. *Am Polit Sci Rev.* 53: 69-105.
5. Gill TM (2013). Why Mills, not Gouldner? Selective history and differential commemoration in sociology. *The American Sociologist.* 44: 96-115.
6. Glock CY, Sills DL (1958). Political sociology at the Bureau of Applied Social Research. *PROD.* 1: 22-26.
7. Grimmer J, Brandon MS (2013). Text as data: The promise and pitfalls of automatic content analysis methods for political texts. *Political Analysis.* 21: 267-297.
8. Horowitz IL (2003). Books, monographs, and pamphlets by Seymour Martin Lipset. *The American Sociologist.* 34: 131-154.
9. Lakin JM (2011). Seymour Martin Lipset. *Proc Am Philos Soc.* 155: 336-350.
10. Lamont M (1987). How to become a dominant French philosopher: The case of Jacques Derrida. *Am J Social.* 93: 584-622.