

The U.S. Monopoly in International Relations and History

A Comparative Analysis of Leading Academic Journals

University of Groningen
Research Master Modern History and International Relations

Sabine Dankbaar
S1559265
October 2012
Supervisors: Prof.Dr. Jaap H. de Wilde & Prof.Dr. Maarten G.J. Duijvendak

Contents

Introduction.....	3
'International' Relations	3
Problems with American IR	4
Role of Journals	6
Previous research of IR journals	8
IR Journal reviews 2006-2010	10
A comparison: historical journal reviews 2006-2010.....	13
How can the Anglo-American dominance be explained?	14
Conclusion	18
Literature.....	20
Appendix.....	23
I. Journals ranked by impact 2008.....	23
II. All ISI journals	24

Introduction

This article examines where International Relations (IR) stands as an international discipline, based on a comparative journal review. The introduction provides a short overview of the discussion on spatial divisions and limitations of IR. Subsequently, the role of journals in IR is discussed, followed by an overview of the trends of the 1980s and 1990s based on earlier journal assessments. Next, an overview is given of the trends in IR journals between 2005 and 2012. A selection of leading IR journals has been analysed with regards to authors, topics and refereeing processes. To put the conclusions in a broader perspective, a comparison is made with History journals. This study shows to what extent the trends of the 1980s and 1990s have continued in the twenty-first century. Has globalization led to a more ‘international’ IR, or should we still speak of an “American science”?

‘International’ Relations

Discussions on the spatial divisions and limitation of the discipline of International Relations (IR) are not new. Already in 1977, Stanley Hoffmann, in “An American Social Science: International Relations”, criticized the overwhelming American, read U.S., dominance of the discipline. According to Hoffmann, the American orientation puts serious limits to the development of ideas and the variety of thought in the field.¹ He argued that some typically American features are characteristic for the discipline, such as a strong focus on the present and a search for objective truths. Thereby a more revolutionary view and knowledge derived from past experiences are neglected. Hoffmann, by the way, is himself a typical example of European migrants to the USA, who came to play a dominant role in the development of IR. He was born in Vienna (1928), spent his youth in France and then moved to the Harvard.

Another influential (again American) contribution to the debate on the discipline of IR, has been made by Kal Holsti in 1985. In *The Dividing Discipline* he argues that, although IR had spread worldwide, the USA and the UK remained dominant, and unaware of studies being done in other parts of the world. He discovered that in their publications, Americans primarily referred to other American scholars, who made up about 74 percent of the references. He identified a trend of ever increasing intellectual self-reliance and parochialism.²

Holsti’s findings have been confirmed by later scholars and studies. In 1995, in her ISA Presidential Address, Susan Strange warned IR scholars that they appeared ‘to be deaf and blind to anything that

¹ Hoffman, 1977, pp. 58-59.

² Kal Holsti (1985), *The Dividing Discipline* (Boston: Allen & Unwin), as quoted in: Smith, 2002, pp. 78-79.

is not published in the USA'.³ She called on authors and journal editors to pay more attention to non-American literature.⁴ Ole Wæver's study of the American dominance in the field of IR offered the same perspective. After a thorough study of twenty leading IR journals between 1970 and 1995, this Danish IR scholar (cynically?) concluded that: 'there is a global discipline of IR, since most national IR communities follow the American debates, teach American theories, and Americans publish in European journals'.⁵ That IR is studied all over the world, does not mean that the discipline is international.

There are some scholars who show optimism concerning influences of the periphery on IR. The influence of Latin American scholars through Dependency Theory in the 1960s and 1970s is often used as an example, as well as the increasing amount of research in the field of IR outside of the U.S., as reported by Aydinli and Mathews.⁶ However, the dominance of the United States is still obvious, compared with 'periphery'-research. Moreover, as Chen has argued 'simply calling for greater incorporation of ideas from the non-West and contributions by non-Western scholars from local "vantage points" does not make IR more global or democratic ...'.⁷ Aydinli and Mathews have noted that the theories are still created in the USA, and the topics and ideas that are studied and discussed are based on a limited number of scholars: 'as long as the periphery is only on the receiving end of this division of labour, it will remain a weak, subservient partner in the discipline, and this imbalance will continue to limit the extent to which the discipline can achieve its goal of understanding global politics'.⁸

Problems with American IR

An evident question is why it matters that IR is actually American IR? What makes American IR problematic? And what makes IR American? One of the scholars often quoted in this regard is Robert Cox: 'theory is always for someone and for some purpose'.⁹ Cox stressed that it is important to be

³ Strange, 1995, p. 290; Aydinli and Mathews, 2000, p. 291. The International Studies Association (ISA) is the USA umbrella organization for IR scholars, which has global individual membership. Its yearly conventions are the largest in the field. See: www.isanet.org. Susan Strange (1923-1998) was a dominant British IR scholar, specialized in International Political Economy (IPE). She held positions in the UK (LSE), Italy (European University Institute) and Japan.

⁴ Strange, 1995, p. 290.

⁵ Wæver, 1998, p. 723.

⁶ Palmer (1980) The Study of International Relations in the United States, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 24, pp. 343–364, as quoted in: Aydinli and Mathews, 2000, p. 291; Kahler, M. (1993) 'International Relations: Still an American Science?' in *Ideas and Ideals: Essays on Politics in Honor of Stanley Hoffmann*, edited by L. Miller and M. H. Smith, pp. 395–414, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, as quoted in: Aydinli and Mathews, 2000, p. 291.

⁷ Chen, 2010, p. 1.

⁸ Aydinli and Mathews, 2008, pp. 693-694.

⁹ Ayoob, 2002, p. 30; Aydinli and Mathews, 2000, p. 701; Cox, 1981.

aware of the context in which a theory is developed. He called on researchers to identify the underlying ideologies and assumptions of the theory. Several aspects can be identified that make American IR problematic.

First, the American scientific approach of IR has been called misleading. Most American scholars claim that political actors have certain pre-defined interests, which can be studied objectively.¹⁰ By taking a rationalist perspective, and using quantitative methods, they try to remain close to natural sciences.¹¹ However, the truths discovered by American International Relations scholars are not universally shared and, according to social constructivists, cannot be separated from the context in which they are made. It can become problematic when these claims are then used as 'objective' by policy makers, politicians, and analysts in decision making and strategies. This argument refers to the dominance of Political Science in American IR. Already in the late 19th century, the first academic positions and departments in IR developed within Political Science. British IR, on the contrary, developed more as an independent interdisciplinary enterprise, merging aspects of international law, diplomatic studies, and history.¹² The behaviourist 'revolution' of the 1950s and 1960s (highlighted in the polemics between J. David Singer and Hedley Bull)¹³ was strongest in the USA. Methodologically, it dominated all IR paradigms in the USA up to the 'constructivist turn' of the 1990s.

Second, Smith has stated that American IR presumes too strict boundaries 'between politics and economics, between private and public, and between domestic and foreign policies'.¹⁴ He argues that the rigorous American distinctions do not reflect the variety of linkages that can exist between these topics. The too narrow American focus reduces the explanatory value of IR.

Third, scholars state that the American IR concepts serve US foreign policy, and that American dominance of IR helps to confirm the existing power relations in which the USA operates as hegemon.¹⁵ According to these scholars, current IR theories, dominated by American scholars, work to the advantage of Western states, at the expense of others. They legitimize the position of the most privileged international actors, produce knowledge and make decisions about the rest of the

¹⁰ Adler, 1997, pp. 321-324.

¹¹ Waever, 1998, pp. 701-703.

¹² Olson and Groom, 1991.

¹³ Singer, 1969; Bull, 1966.

¹⁴ Smith, 2002, pp.69, 79; Ayoob, 2002, p. 30; Nayak and Selbin, 2010, p. 2.

¹⁵ See for example: Nayak and Selbin, 2010; Ayoob, 2002; Chen, 2011.

world.¹⁶ Mohammed Ayoob argues that the U.S. has a monopoly over the construction of theoretical knowledge, and summarized his argument as follows:

'Not only is knowledge power, but power is knowledge as well. In IR theory, dominated as it is by American scholarship, the production and reproduction, construction and reconstruction of conceptual assumptions, as well as theoretical conclusions that have now come close to being accepted as "truths" (even if competing "truths") worldwide, depicts this phenomenon most clearly.'¹⁷

Thomas Biersteker came up with several examples of how the American influence shifts people's attention to certain issues, at the costs of other. One of his examples relates to the increased interest of IR scholars in the threat of global terrorism. He explained how the increasing interest in new types of threats from non-state actors, and the centrality of security and terrorism in IR, is the result of the attacks on the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and (failed) the White House on 11 September 2001. He stated that the theorizing of global terrorist threats which was initiated in the U.S. became globalized, despite that this threat is not so much shared all over the world. According to Biersteker, other issues, such as water scarcity and the proliferation of small arms, are far more relevant in the non-West, and are overlooked.¹⁸

American IR can be contrasted with non-American IR, which is mostly European based (mainly British). Scholars have identified some typically non-American (European) characteristics. For example Strange stated that non-American IR is more historically sensitive, and more open to postmodernist, Marxist, feminist, and constructivist approaches.¹⁹ Wæver came to the same conclusion after comparing the contents of American and European journals.²⁰ In general, European IR offers a broader variety of approaches, and tends more towards reflectivist instead of rationalist theoretical positions.

Role of Journals

In the previous sections it became clear that the U.S. is dominating IR and thereby limiting its scope and explanatory value. Such conclusions can be drawn based on different types of sources. Wæver identified three sources for assessing trends in the discipline of international relations. In the first place, one can look at books.²¹ In the second place, curricula can give a good overview of developments within the discipline.²² In the third place, journals can be examined.²³

¹⁶ Nayak and Selbin, 2010, p. 2. Ayoob, 2002, p. 30; Chen, 2011, p. 2.

¹⁷ Ayoob, 2002, p. 30.

¹⁸ Biersteker, 2009, p. 322.

¹⁹ Strange, 1995, p. 290.

²⁰ Wæver, 1998, p. 702.

²¹ See for example Holsti, 1985.

²² See for example H. R. Alker, H.R., Jr. and T. J. Biersteker (1984), 'The Dialectics of World Order: Notes for a Future Archeologist of International Savoir Faire', *International Studies Quarterly* (1984), No. 28, pp. 121-142 in Wæver, 1998,

Journals provide the most direct overview of where the discipline stands. They are published on a regular basis, and new ideas are often published in journals first, before they are available in books.²⁴ Wæver calls them ‘the crucial institution of modern sciences’.²⁵ Journals have an important role in setting the guidelines for international debates. He argues that whereas textbooks can give a good introduction to the discipline, for practitioners the field consists merely of journals. The key role of journals is further confirmed by the fact that publishing in a leading IR journal is essential for scholars and universities; it is the way to the top.²⁶ Tickner and Wæver specified that this certainly holds true for Western Europe, where publishing in U.S.-based journals is the ultimate way to get scholarly recognition and power. Also in Israel, Southeast Asia, and to a lesser extent in East and Central Europe and some parts of Latin America, publishing in these journals is important. For much of the rest of the world, however, publishing in a Western journal is not so relevant, unless scholars aspire to a career in the U.S. or Europe. Tickner and Wæver ascribe this to the lack of interest in journal publications of relevant power holders, but also to the difficulties for non-Western scholars to publish in one of the leading IR journals.²⁷

Publishing in a journal is mainly relevant when the journal is considered one of the ‘leading’ journals. Kyle Grayson states in her blog that the quality of articles is increasingly measured by the ranking of the journal in which the article was published.²⁸ The list with most authority is the Thomson-Reuters ISI Citation Index, which is considered to be ‘the gold standard journal ranking list’.²⁹ The index is used as measurement of quality of research, and often the distribution of research money is linked to it.³⁰ Journals high in the Thomson-Reuters index are the most highly valued journals.

The rankings of the Thomson-Reuters index are based on the rate at which published articles are cited by other Thomson-Reuters ISI ranked journals. As such, the ranking list reflects quantitative thinking: the production of knowledge as a numbers game – the more an article is quoted, the more important its contents. This ranking system leads to several problems. In the first place, citations of other sources such as books, are left out. In the second place, only journals with articles published in English are counted, which means that all non-English journals are left out. Due to this language

pp. 696-697; and A.C. Robles, Jr. (1993), ‘How “international” are international relations syllabi?’, *Political Science and Politics*, No. 26, pp. 526-528 in Wæver, 1998, pp. 696-697.

²³ Wæver, 1998, p. 697.

²⁴ Breuning, Bredehoft and Walton, 2005, p. 448.

²⁵ Wæver, 1998, p. 697.

²⁶ Wæver, 1998, p. 718.

²⁷ Tickner and Wæver, 2009, p. 332.

²⁸ Grayson, 2010.

²⁹ Grayson, 2010. For an overview of the top 10 IR journals with the most impact in 2008 is provided in Appendix I. A list of all IR journals included in the Thomson-Reuters index is provided in Appendix II.

³⁰ Paasi, 2004, p. 779.

barrier, non-native English speakers are put to a disadvantage. In the third place, some authoritative journals, such as the Canadian *International Journal*, and the Korean *Journal of International and Area Studies*, are not included in the list.

Previous research of IR journals

Several journal studies have already been carried out to assess the discipline of IR. A first study of journals was carried out by Wæver and published in 1998. He studied eight leading American and European journals between 1970 and 1995. These were for the USA: *International Organization*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *International Security*, and *World Politics*. For Europe these were: *Review of International Studies*, *European Journal of International Relations*, *Millennium*, and the *Journal of Peace Research*.³¹ The study shows that a large majority of the authors publishing in the four North American journals was a resident of the USA. The European journals showed a more balanced view. In most journals about 40 percent of the authors came from the U.S. and another 40 percent from Europe. Over the years, the study of Wæver shows that American journals were not becoming more international. In addition, the amount of authors from the U.S., publishing in European journals, increased slightly.³² Besides studying the residence of the authors, Wæver analysed the contents of the journal articles of two American journals (*International Organization* and *International Studies Quarterly*) and two European journals (*Review of International Studies* and *European Journal of International Relations*). His study shows that whereas articles in American journals were mostly focused on rationalism (quantitative studies, and formalized and non-formalized rational choice), reflectivism (post-structuralism, Marxism, feminism, and non-postmodern constructivism) got more attention in the European journals.

A second study of journals was carried out by Ersel Aydlini (Turkey) and Julie Mathews (Australia). In contrast to Wæver, they did not only analyse American and West-European journals, but included Canadian, Indian, Russian and Australian journals as well.³³ They analysed 20 journals between 1990 and 1997, and made a distinction between theory-based and policy-based journals. In contrast to Wæver they calculated the averages of the entire period and did not identify a trend. Their study shows that on average 84.75 percent of the articles in American, theory-based journals came from

³¹ Wæver, 1998.

³² Wæver, 1998, pp. 697-700.

³³ The American journals they analysed are: *Journal of International Affairs*, *International Studies Review*, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *International Organization*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *International Security*, *World Politics*, *Foreign Policy*, *Orbis*, and *World Policy Journal*. The European journals are: *Journal of Strategic Studies*, *Review of International Studies*, *Cooperation and Conflict: Nordic Journal of International Studies*, *International Relations*, *International Affairs* and *Aussen Politik – German Foreign Affairs*. The Canadian journal *International Journal – Canadian Institute of International Affairs*, Australian journal *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Russian journal *International Affairs*, and Indian journal *International Studies*, have been analysed as well; Aydinli and Mathews, 2000, pp. 291, 301-302.

authors of U.S. nationality or affiliation. Only a marginal number of articles came from authors outside the ‘core’ countries.³⁴ The analysis of the American policy-based journals shows similar results. The study of the non-American theory and policy-based journals shows that on average more than 92 percent of the contributions came from authors from the core. American based authors made up between 20 and 48 percent of the contributions to theory based journals. Regarding the two journals from the periphery, a majority of the contributors to the Indian journal *International Studies* came from the periphery, and more than 90 percent of the contributors to the Russian journal *International Affairs* came from Russia or former Soviet countries.

Aydinli and Mathews conclude that the higher the prestige of the journal, the less likely the authors come from periphery countries (with exception of the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* and the *Journal of International Affairs*). Especially in the four leading IR journals, which are all published in the U.S., very few authors were based in the periphery, or even in the periphery of the core.³⁵ Less than three percent of the contributions came from the periphery, and less than 12 percent from authors outside the U.S.³⁶ These outcomes lead Aydinli and Mathews to conclude that the unbalanced construction and spread of knowledge has not changed in the last 20 years. Hosti’s conclusions still hold.³⁷

In 2005, a study was published by the American IR scholars Marijke Breuning, Joseph Bredehoft and Eugene Walton on the gender and profession of authors, and the subjects and geographical focus of articles of research published in three top American IR journals from 1995-2004: *International Studies Quarterly*, *International Organization* and *World Politics*.³⁸ They discovered that articles in these journals focused on a rather narrow scope of topics (International Political Economy, democratization, ethnic politics and electoral systems), using quantitative methods or cases studies. Moreover, the authors in these journals formed quite a homogeneous group: male political scientists connected to a research institution in the USA. Breuning, *et al.*, conclude that these journals show solid parochialism; ‘at the very least, the systematic empirical analysis demonstrates that the performance of these three journals may not be synonymous with the promise of the field’.³⁹

Lastly, in 2007, the Dutch IR-scholars Arjan van der Assem and Peter Volten carried out a small analysis to investigate whether Wæver’s conclusions would still hold in the beginning of the twenty-

³⁴ The following distinction is made by scholars: core: USA; periphery of core: Canada, Great Britain, Western Europe (minus Britain; i.e., the Continent), Israel, and Australia; core of periphery: India, Japan, Russia, Eastern Europe, China, Korea.; periphery: all others. Aydinli and Mathews, 2000, p. 293.

³⁵ The four leading journals according to Aydinli and Mathews (2000: 298) are: *International Organization*, *International Security*, *International Studies Quarterly*, and *World Politics*.

³⁶ Aydinli and Mathews, 2000, p. 298.

³⁷ Aydinli and Mathews, 2008, pp. 693-694.

³⁸ Breuning, Bredehoft and Walton, 2005.

³⁹ Breuning, Bredehoft and Walton, 2005, p. 460.

first century. They examined two journals, *International Organization* (American), and *Review of International Studies* (British), for the years 2000 and 2004. Their analysis shows that in 2000, all authors publishing in *International Organization* came from the USA. In 2004, 76 percent of the authors was a resident of the USA, and 18 percent a resident of the UK. In *Review of International Studies*, American authors were responsible for 30 percent of the articles in 2000, and for 41 percent of the articles in 2004. British authors accounted for 63 percent and 47 percent respectively. Although their sample is too small to say much about broader trends, their findings are in line with Wæver's conclusions. In addition to examining the geographical background of the authors, Van der Assem and Volten analysed the content of both journals.⁴⁰ Again, Wæver's conclusions were confirmed, since in *International Organization* rationalist approaches dominated, while in *Review of International Studies* reflectivism was more popular.

IR Journal reviews 2006-2010

To assess to what extent the trends of the 1980s and 1990s have continued in the twenty-first century, in our project thirteen IR journals were studied. An analysis was made of the background of the authors and editors, and topics of articles in the years 2006-2011.⁴¹ Five of the analysed journals have American roots: *International Studies Quarterly*, *International Security*, *Foreign Affairs*, *Human Rights Quarterly*, *World Politics*; seven are European journals published in the UK: *European Journal of International Relations*, *Millennium*, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, *Journal of Peace Research*, *Global Society* and *Journal of Development studies*; while *Terrorism and Political Violence* has mixed European and American roots.

Just like in previous research, the background of the authors was assessed with regards to their country of residence or the university they were affiliated with. This focus was chosen to make the results better comparable. Moreover, according to Tickner and Wæver, the university scholars are affiliated with provides the strongest measure of how access is obtained to leading scholarly organs. Biological, national or educational origins are less relevant.⁴² The reviews show that an overwhelming majority of the articles in American journals is written by authors with an American background. The percentages ranged from *International Security* with 90 percent to *Human Rights Quarterly* with 68 percent (including Canada).⁴³ Moreover, the percentage of authors coming from the UK was relatively high, and the percentage of authors coming from the non-Western world was subsequently

⁴⁰ Assem and Volten, 2007, pp. 7-12.

⁴¹ Baron, 2011; Pfenninger, 2011; Duchac, 2011; Plaisier, 2011; Fruman, 2011; Van der Bij, 2011; Holz, 2011, Hoogenboom, 2011; De Lange, 2011; Bucking, 2011; Star, 2011; Van Hoef, 2011; Van Leeuwen, 2012; Sonneveld, 2012; Hielkema, 2012; Van 't Groenewoud, 2012; Langeveld, 2012.

⁴² Tickner and Wæver, 2009b, p. 5.

⁴³ Hoogenboom, 2011; Baron, 2011; Bucking, 2011.

low.⁴⁴ Also in European journals, authors affiliated with an American university made up the largest or second largest group, followed or preceded by authors from the UK. Again, the percentage of authors from the rest of the world was low. In sum, although the journals pretend to be ‘international’, from 2006 to 2011 American authors dominated most of the researched journals, followed by the British scholars.

Since some European journals are established especially to provide an alternative to the American dominance in IR, these results are quite remarkable. *Millennium*, the *European Journal of International Relations* and *Global Society* aim to counterbalance the American dominance in the discipline of IR. However, instead of incorporating a large amount of articles from non-American scholars, which would have been in line with these journals’ foundational principles, scholars from the USA are the single largest contributors to the *European Journal of International Relations*, and the second largest to *Millennium* and *Global Society*.⁴⁵ Furthermore, the *Journal of International Relations and Development* has been established with the objective to encourage publications of Central and Eastern European countries, but most authors in the researched period come from the USA and UK, followed by Germany, the Netherlands and France.⁴⁶

The study reveals interesting results regarding the editorial boards of journals as well. Whereas all editorial teams of American journals are made up of editors affiliated with an American university, the editorial boards of European journals are more diverse. Although a majority of the editorial boards of the European journals is still connected to American or British universities, European editorial teams are at least somewhat ‘international’. Moreover, in European editorial boards the American dominance is less strong than in the published articles. Whereas North-American authors dominate publications in the *Journal of Peace Research* and of the *Journal of Development Studies*, the editorial teams are mostly made up of Norwegians and Brits respectively.⁴⁷ Another interesting observation is that whereas the *Journal of International Relations and Development* aimed to feature more authors from Central and Eastern European countries, a minority of the editorial team comes from that region.⁴⁸ Non-Western countries are still largely underrepresented.

In some cases, the editorial boards are explicitly linked to a university, such as *Millennium* and *Human Rights Quarterly* (which are linked to the London School of Economics and the University of Cincinnati respectively), which explains why they are made up only of British or American scholars.

⁴⁴ The Western world is defined as: Europe, the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

⁴⁵ Holz, 2011; Baron, 2011; Bucking, 2011; Van ’t Groenewoud, 2012.

⁴⁶ Van der Bij, 2011.

⁴⁷ Langeveld, 2012; Hielkema, 2012.

⁴⁸ Fruman, 2011.

These journals are considered to be ‘student journals’. However, whereas *Millennium* is truly run by postgraduate students, students are said to have little influence on articles published in *Human Rights Quarterly*.⁴⁹

In addition to the geographical bias, the journal study shows remarkable results with regards to gender. The results are unambiguous: in all journals men were overrepresented. The percentage of male contributors ranges from 80 percent in the *European Journal of International Relations* to 60 percent in *Human Rights Quarterly*.⁵⁰ Most editorial boards are dominated by men as well. The only exception is the *Journal of International Relations and Development*, which has three female editors, and two male editors.⁵¹

As argued above it is possible to make a distinction between ‘American’ and ‘European’ IR. American IR is alleged to focus more on variants of realism and liberalism, using quantitative methodologies, while European IR is said to focus more on constructivist theories and qualitative, historical analyses. The journal study shows that European journals focus strongly on IR theory. From the different theories, critical theory, post-modern/structuralist and constructivist approaches are the most popular. In the *European Journal of International Relations*, many articles focus on realism as well. In the *European Journal of International Relations* and the *Journal of International Relations and Development* international security (theory) plays the second largest role.⁵² In the American journals, the link to (international) politics is more obvious. The American journals publish a relatively large number of articles on contemporary foreign-policy issues. *Human Rights Quarterly* forms an exception, since most articles are theoretical, and apply qualitative research methods.⁵³ Another observation is that many American and European journals focus on states, public policy and governmental institutions. An exception is *Global Society*, in which a majority of the articles concentrates on multiple (non-state) actors.⁵⁴

With regards to the geographical scope of the journals, the studies shows that American IR journals concentrate primarily on the USA. The USA dominates around 40 percent of all articles in *International Security* between 2005 and 2009, followed by Europe. In both *International Security* and *Foreign Affairs*, Russia and China are popular subjects of analysis as well, since they are of strategic importance to the USA. European journals concentrate less on a specific geographical

⁴⁹ Baron, 2011; Bucking, 2011; Pfenninger, 2011; De Lange, 2011.

⁵⁰ Holz, 2011; Bucking, 2011; Baron, 2011.

⁵¹ Fruman, 2011.

⁵² Holz, 2011; Fruman, 2011.

⁵³ Bucking, 2011; Baron, 2011.

⁵⁴ Van ’t Groenewoud, 2012.

region, which can partly be explained by their theoretical focus. The *Journal of Common Market Studies* pays clearly most attention to Europe.⁵⁵

A comparison: historical journal reviews 2006-2010

To put the assessment of IR journals in a broader perspective, 10 historical journals were analysed as well. It was examined whether the trends that have been identified in IR were also feasible in the discipline of History. The journals were analysed with regards to the geographical background of the authors and editors, gender, and the main topics and time periods covered, for the period between 2006 and 2012.⁵⁶ Four of these journals are U.S. based: *Journal of African History*, *History and Theory*, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, and *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*; five are published in the UK: *Past and Present*, *Journal of Global History*, *Journal of Urban History*, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* and the *Journal of Contemporary History*; and one is published in the Netherlands: *Social History*.

The results of the study of Historical journals are very similar to those of the analysis of IR journals. A majority of the articles is written by scholars affiliated to American and British universities. In the American based journals, scholars from the USA contribute the most, followed by the UK. Of the journals published in the UK, the U.S. based scholars are the single largest contributors to the *Journal of Global History*, the *Journal of Urban History*, and *Comparative Studies in Society and History*.⁵⁷ In *Past and Present* and the *Journal of Contemporary History*, authors from the UK contribute the most, followed by the USA.⁵⁸ In the Dutch journal *Social History* most articles are written by scholars from Europe, again followed by the USA. At the same time, scholars from non-Western countries are underrepresented in all the History journals. The analyses also reveals that few authors come from the other two large English-speaking countries Canada and Australia. An interesting observation is the fairly good representation of Dutch scholars. Not only in *Social History*, but also in the *Journal of Global History* and *History and Theory*, a relatively high amount of articles is published by Dutch scholars.⁵⁹

Similarly, the editorial boards of the History journals are mostly made up of American and British scholars. The *Journal of Global History*, *Journal of the History of Ideas* and the *Journal of African History* are the only journals that include non-Western editors. However, also in these journals they are in the minority. Another interesting outcome of the journal review is that, just like in IR journals,

⁵⁵ Hoogenboom, 2011; Van Hoef, 2011; Van der Bij, 2011.

⁵⁶ Knotterus, 2011; Dorhout, 2011; Tenger, 2011; Van den Heuvel, 2011; Middelbos, 2011; Parmentier, 2011; Greving, 2011; Nooij, 2011; Slaa, 2011; Plaisier, 2011; 't Haar, 2012; Draper, 2012; Heaton, 2012.

⁵⁷ Tenger, 2011; Middelbos, 2011; Slaa, 2011; Plaisier, 2011.

⁵⁸ Dorhout, 2011; Heaton, 2012.

⁵⁹ Van den Heuvel, 2011; Tenger, 2011; Slaa, 2011.

most published articles are written by men. Percentages of male contributors compared to female authors range from 80 percent (*Journal of Global History*, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, and *History and Theory*) to 62 percent (*Comparative studies in Society and History*).⁶⁰

These results are even more interesting, when compared to the aims of some of the History journals. Take for example the *Journal of African History*. The journal is dedicated to African history, and has been established to prove that there is an African history to tell. However, none of the four editors from the editorial board work at an African university, and only one of them is born in Africa. Moreover, the journal is dominated by American and European authors, which account for 88 percent of the contributions. Only 12 percent of the authors is affiliated to an African university. This example shows that even a journal focusing on a typically non-Western topic is dominated by American scholars.⁶¹

A correlation between the national background of authors and the regional focus of their articles could not be discovered. In all but two journals, West-European countries receive the most attention in the articles. Only the *Journal of Urban History* focuses mostly on the U.S., and the *Journal of African History* focuses on West and Southern Africa. With exception of the latter, no journal pays much attention to non-Western countries. Even *Past and Present* does not succeed to include more non-Western countries, despite its aim to broaden the horizon of the discipline of History in the English-speaking world, and to bring knowledge about the non-Western world to its readers. Only 16.5 percent of its articles concentrate on non-Western countries.⁶²

The time periods most journals focus on are the Modern and Contemporary times. The themes the journals focus on are diverse, and range from historiography, theory and debates (*Journal of Global History*), to labour history (*Social History*) and state formation, sovereignty, and political systems (*Comparative Studies in Society and History*).⁶³ The journal analysis did not bring any relation to the fore between the national origins of the journal or authors, and the topics or time period the journals concentrate on.

How can the Anglo-American dominance be explained?

The previous sections show that both IR and History journals are dominated by Anglo-American authors. Whereas this dominance has already been discussed in the realm of IR, the discussion is new to the realm of History. This does not mean that the observations are less relevant to History; a more

⁶⁰ Greving, 2011; Slaa, 2011; Tenger, 2011; 't Haar, 2012; Parmentier, 2011; Plaisier, 2011; Knotterus, 2011.

⁶¹ Knotterus, 2011.

⁶² Dorhout, 2011.

⁶³ Knotterus, 2011; Dorhout, 2011; Tenger, 2011; Van den Heuvel, 2011; Middelbos, 2011; Parmentier, 2011; Greving, 2011; Nooij, 2011; Slaa, 2011; Star, 2011.

extensive debate is necessary. Here, the comparison between journals in IR and History is used to put the already existing explanation for the (Anglo-)American dominance in IR in a new perspective.

The first explanation often mentioned is that the American dominance of IR can be ascribed to its American roots. Hoffmann is one of the representatives of this ‘typical historical roots’ argument, and argues that the rise of the USA as world power after the Second World War, together with specific intellectual predispositions, political circumstances, and institutional opportunities, led to the development of IR in the USA.⁶⁴ The intellectual predispositions identified by Hoffmann are the prevailing idea that problems can be overcome by using scientific methods, the prestige of natural sciences and economics that worked beneficially for IR as social science, and the larger substantial questions European scholars who came to the USA tended to ask. Moreover, the political circumstances and especially the changed role of the USA in the world after the Second World War, led to an interest of policy-makers in subjects touched upon by IR. Lastly, the institutional circumstances that contributed to the development of IR in the USA were the strong link between scholars and government officials, the wealthy foundations that facilitated the links between universities and the government, and the mass education market in the USA, which made it possible for universities to innovate and specialize.⁶⁵ According to Hoffmann, IR originated in the USA due to these specific American historical circumstances, which in turn shaped IR as an American discipline; American features shaped the framework, within which IR could be studied. The American dominance became an endemic feature of IR.

Although these specific American circumstances definitely played a role in the development and success of IR in the USA, they cannot sufficiently explain the Anglo-American dominance. Leaving the discussion on the historical roots of the discipline aside (in addition to the developments in the USA, IR in Europe, mainly the UK took a different route in reaction to the First World War) the explanation can be dismissed since the Anglo-American dominance is not only typical for IR. As the study of History journals shows, also in disciplines without American roots, there is an Anglo-American dominance in the journals. To trace the Anglo-American bias in History back to the historical development of the discipline would be farfetched, since History is typically a discipline with ‘local’ roots all over the world. The study of History is linked to local developments and experiences, and the development of national states cannot be separated from the development of national histories.

⁶⁴ Hoffmann, 1977, pp. 45-50.

⁶⁵ Hoffmann, 1977, pp. 45-50.

Moreover, in the field of Geography, Garcia-Ramon and Paasi identified a similar Anglo-American dominance of the discipline.⁶⁶ According to Garcia-Ramon, the Anglo-American dominance manifests itself in three ways in Geography journals. In the first place, about 75 percent of the contributions are from authors from the USA and the UK, as well as most journal editors. In the second place, the debates are dominated by developments in geography in Anglo-American countries. Little attention is paid to ‘other’ traditions and developments. In the last place, the refereeing system is almost exclusively Anglo-American. Certain topics are preferred over others.⁶⁷ These observations are very similar to those in IR; hence the Anglo-American dominance cannot be ascribed to features typical for IR.

The second explanation refers to the size of the USA, an economy of scales argument. There are different ways to approach this argument. First, one can look at population size. Since the USA has a large population, it can generate more output. However, the USA has a population of 313 million, whereas European countries together have a population of 711 million. Moreover, China and India have populations of 1,343 million and 1,205 million respectively.⁶⁸ These numbers show that American scholars contribute way more than their demographical volume would indicate. Obviously, in relation to demographic explanations the levels of education, the access to education and language are crucial.

The second way to approach the ‘size’ argument is therefore to look at the number of people enrolled in higher education. Douglas has assessed the worldwide distribution of enrolment in tertiary education in 2007. His study shows that 47 percent of the total amount of people enrolled in higher education lives in Asia, 22 percent in Europe, 12 percent in North America and in Central and South America, and 6 percent in Africa.⁶⁹ His findings would suggest a much higher contribution of scholars from Asia than the current figures show.

Another possibility is to look at the number of researchers in various countries. Data of 2000, based on UNESCO and OECD statistics and published by Paasi, show that the number of researchers is the highest in the USA, followed by China, Japan, Russia, Germany, France, and then the UK. Although these statistics do not specifically refer to IR scholars or Historians, it does not seem likely that the number of researchers per country can explain the lack of Asian and Russian publications in international journals. However, the numbers can explain the American dominance.⁷⁰ Specifically

⁶⁶ Paasi, 2004; Garcia-Ramon, 2003.

⁶⁷ Garcia-Ramon, 2003.

⁶⁸ CIA, 2012.

⁶⁹ Douglas, 2010, p.26.

⁷⁰ Paasi, 2004, p. 777.

related to IR, Biersteker found that ‘whether indicated by number of universities, think-tanks, or academic and research positions, there are more active IR research scholars working in the USA than in any other country in the world’.⁷¹ However, it is not likely that this is also the case for History departments, where the Anglo-American dominance was feasible as well.

Fourth, one can look at country size measured by its total Gross Domestic Product (GDP). GDP reflects the market value of all official final goods and services produced within a country, which in turn, according to various theories, reflects the influence the country can exercise on the world stage. GDP is generally taken as measurement of power, as in the ability to influence the behaviour of others.⁷² According to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, in 2010, the USA was the country with the highest GDP. The USA was followed by China, Japan, Germany, France, the UK, Brazil, Italy, India and Canada respectively.⁷³ When GDP is taken into account, one would expect Chinese and Japanese scholars to publish way more articles in leading IR and History journals than they do now.

The third explanation posits that the English language serves as a lingua franca, which empowers the Anglophone world. According to Short, *et al.*, linguistic hegemony privileges certain discourses at the expense of others.⁷⁴ Paasi argues that a common understanding of ‘international journal publication spaces’ is created, with the English language as an important medium. The dominance of the English language is strengthened by institutional demands to become ‘international’, since publications in English enhance the prestige of journals.⁷⁵ Since the USA and UK both have large English-speaking populations it seems plausible that they are in an advantaged position. However, the IR and History reviews show that although Canada and Australia have the third and fourth largest populations of native English speakers respectively, few articles were written by authors from these countries. Other countries with large populations of native English speakers are the Philippines, Nigeria, India, East and Southern Africa. The amount of contributions of these countries to the journals is around zero in the researched period. From the journal analyses, it became clear that for example in *International Studies Quarterly*, Norwegian and German scholars contributed the most from the non-UK/USA affiliated scholars. After the USA and UK, most published articles in the *European Journal of International Relations* came from authors from Canada, Germany, Australia and Sweden respectively. It is very likely that it is easier for scholars to publish in their native language. It also

⁷¹ Biersteker, 2009, p. 309.

⁷² Word Bank, 2012; IMF, 2012.

⁷³ Word Bank, 2012; IMF, 2012.

⁷⁴ J. Short, A. Boniche, Y. Kim, P. Li Li (2001), ‘Cultural globalization, global English and geography journals, *The Professional Geographer*, No. 53, pp. 1-11 in Garcia-Ramon, 2003, p.1.

⁷⁵ Paasi, 2004, pp. 769-775.

came to the fore that countries where many people speak English as a second language such as the North-Western European countries, do relatively well. But this cannot be the main or only reason for the overwhelming dominance of American and British authors. The contributions of Asian and African countries are by no means proportional to their large native English speaking populations.

The fourth explanation argues that market-like operations govern knowledge production. Economies of scale privilege the American market. Since most IR research is written and published in the USA, the USA can benefit from its sheer market size. There are more publication outlets than anywhere in the world, which drive the American demand and lead to significant sales opportunities.⁷⁶ This points at the commercial interests of publishers, linked to policies of libraries (in fact, worldwide given the *lingua franca* factor). It also points at the role of professional umbrella organizations, like the International Studies Association (ISA), which organizes by far the largest IR conferences worldwide, as well as the American Political Science Association (APSA).

The fifth explanation for the Anglo-American dominance focuses on the homogenization of social science publication practices; a point strongly emphasized by Paasi. In his article, he quotes Slaughter and Leslie who referred to this practice as ‘academic capitalism, in which market-like behaviour and the principle of performativity become crucial’.⁷⁷ According to Paasi homogenization is not only evident in relation to the form in which the research is published, but also regarding the academic content and quality. All examined journals were either published in the UK or in the USA. The analyses show that scholars affiliated with American universities make up the majority of the editorial boards of American IR journals. What is understood or recognized as ‘good’ research, is usually broadly similar to one’s own research approach and orientation. This comes back in hiring, promotion, and examination of results at universities. American editors will have a tendency to privilege American authors, since their academic writing, in form and content, will be more similar to theirs. In the academic world there is a strong tendency towards intellectual reproduction.⁷⁸ Yet, the process is normally ‘blind’. So, if selection is influenced by an Anglo-American bias, this cannot be traced back to the origins of the authors as such. Hence, it should be more subtle, e.g. be related to writing style and underlying norms and values.

Conclusion

This study shows that the latest phase of globalization did not lead to internationalization in the realm of IR. The American dominance of the discipline of IR, signalled by Hoffmann in 1977, is still evident. In 1998, Wæver stated that IR is ‘global’ in the sense that American debates are followed by

⁷⁶ Biersteker, 2009, p. 309.

⁷⁷ Paasi, 2004, p. 773

⁷⁸ Paasi, 2004; Ayoob, 2002, p. 27.

national IR communities, American IR theories are taught all over the world, and American scholars publish in European IR journals. Since then, little has changed. Given the dominant second place of UK scholars in the journals, and missing clear runner-ups on the third place, the imbalance is even much stronger in favour of Anglo-American dominance.

The current journal review shows that the group of contributors to leading IR journals is quite homogeneous. From 2006 to 2012, the large majority of scholars that published in leading IR journals were males affiliated with an American universities. Scholars from the UK were the second largest group of contributors. Whereas the topics of American IR journals were more linked to foreign policy, European journals focused more on theory. Scholars from Asia, Latin-America, Africa and the Middle-East were almost completely absent.

A review of History journals was carried out to assess whether the Anglo-American dominance could be ascribed to features typical for IR. It became clear that the academic hegemony of the USA was not only evident in IR, but also in the discipline of History. American male authors also dominate leading History journals. In contrast to IR, the Anglo-American dominance of History journals has not been researched before. The current findings are a good starting point for further discussions on this topic in the realm of History.

Since the Anglo-American dominance could not be ascribed to typical historical roots of IR, other explanations were studied. American dominance appears larger than its demographical or economic size (GDP) would indicate. Moreover, these indicators could not explain why so few Asian scholars from countries such as China, India and Japan manage to publish in leading IR and History journals. Additionally, the number of researchers per country could not explain their lack of contributions either. The Anglo-American dominance could not be ascribed to academic or economic resources; more structural powers seem to play a role.

Economic power and institutional structures appear to underlie the academic hegemony of the USA (and the UK) in IR and other social sciences. In the first place, the Anglophone world is empowered by the position of the English language as lingua franca. In the second place, American scholars benefit from economies of scale. And in the third place, a global homogenization process has been identified, which works to the advantage of Anglo-American authors. Most high-ranked journals are published by American or British publishing houses, with editorial boards mostly made up of American or British scholars. Since people's understanding of what is 'good' research is usually similar to one's own academic traditions, research approach and orientation, American and British authors have an advantage.

It can be concluded that there is no single explanation for the Anglo-American dominance in IR and History, but that together language, economies of scale and the hegemony of the USA play a role. Further research is necessary to clarify these influences in more detail. Moreover, it should be explored how a more open market space can be created for IR and History research, with more opportunities for, and suppliers of, non-Western IR and History. In that regard it would also be interesting to take a closer look at the role of publishing houses, since a small group of publishing houses seem to dominate the market.

Literature

Adler, Emanuel (1997), 'Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 319-363.

Assem, Arjan van den, and Peter Volten, 'Political Culture and International Relations. American Hegemony and the European Challenge', in Nienke de Deugd, Margriet Drent, Peter Volten (2007), pp. 7-21.

Aydinli, Ersel and Julie Mathews (2000), 'Are the Core and Periphery Irreconcilable? The Curious World of Publishing in Contemporary International Relations', *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. I, pp. 289-303.

Aydinli, Ersel and Julie Mathews (2008), 'Periphery Theorizing for a Truly Internationalized Discipline: Spinning IR Theory out of Anatolia', *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 34, pp. 693-712.

Ayoob, Mohammed (2002), 'Inequality and Theorizing in International Relations: The Case for Subaltern Realism', *Presented at the ISA Annual Convention in February 2001*.

Biersteker, Thomas (2009), 'The Parochialism of Hegemony: Challenges for "American" International Relations', in Tickner and Wæver (2009), pp. 308-327.

Breuning, Marijke, Joseph Bredehoft and Eugene Walton (2005), 'Promise and Performance: An Evaluation of Journals in International Relations', *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 6, pp. 447-461.

Bull, Hedley (1966), "International Theory: The Case for the Classic Approach", *World Politics*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 361-377.

Chen, Ching-Chang (2011), 'The Absence of Non-Western IR Theory in Asia Reconsidered', *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, Vol. 11, pp. 1-23.

CIA (2012), *The World Factbook*, retrieved May 5 2012 from www.cia.gov .

Cox, Robert (1981), 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 126-155.

Deugd, Nienke, Margriet Drent, Peter Volten (2007), *Conference Proceedings: Towards an Autonomous European IR Approach – Relevance and Strategy*, University of Groningen.

Douglas, John Aubrey (2010), 'Higher Education Budgets and the Global Recession: Tracking Varied National Responses and Their Consequences', *Research & Occasional Paper Series*, CSHE.4.10, University of California, Berkeley.

Garcia-Ramon, Maria Dolors (2003), 'Globalization and International Geography: The Question of Languages and Scholarly Traditions', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 1-5.

Grayson, Kyle (2010), 'Journal Ranking Lists in Politics and International Relations', *Blog posted on 09/24/2010*.

Hoffmann, Stanley (1977), 'An American Social Science: International Relations', *Dædalus*, Vol. 106, No. 3, pp. 41-60.

IMF (2012), *World Economic Outlook Databases*, retrieved May 5 2012 from www.imf.org.

Nayak, Meghana and Eric Selbin (2010), *Decentering International Relations*, London and New York: Zed Books Ltd.

Olson, William C. and A.J.R. Groom (1991), *International Relations Then & Now: Origins and Trends in Interpretation*, London: HarperCollins.

Paasi, Anssi (2005), 'Globalisation, Academic Capitalism, and the Uneven Geographies of international Journal Publishing Spaces', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 37, pp. 769-789.

Singer, J. David (1969), "The Incomplete Theorist: Insight Without Evidence", in: Rosenau, James N. and Klaus Knorr, Eds., *Contending Approaches to International Politics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 63-86.

Smith, Steve (2000), 'The Discipline of International Relations: Still an American Social Science?', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, Vol. 2. No. 3, pp. 374-402.

Smith, Steve (2002), 'The United States and the Discipline of International Relations: "Hegemonic Country, Hegemonic Discipline"', *International Studies Review*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 67-85.

Strange, Susan (1995), '1995 Presidential Address ISA as a Microcosm', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 39, pp. 289-295.

Tickner, Arlene B. and Ole Wæver, eds. (2009a), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*, Oxon and New York: Routledge.

Tickner, Arlene B. and Ole Wæver (2009b), 'Conclusion: Worlding Where the West Once Was', in Tickner and Wæver (2009a), pp. 328-341.

Wæver, Ole and Arlene B. Tickner (2009), 'Introduction: Geocultural Epistemologies', in Tickner and Wæver (2009a), pp. 1-31.

Wæver, Ole (1998), 'The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations', *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4, pp. 687-727.

World Bank (2012), *GDP*, retrieved May 5 2012 from data.worldbank.org.

Appendix

I. IR Journals ranked by impact 2008

Rank	2008 Impact Factor	Impact 2001-08	Impact 1981-2008
1	Internat. Organization (2.82)	Internat. Organization (5.44)	Internat. Organization (25.73)
2	International Security (2.27)	International Security (4.75)	World Politics (20.30)
3	Eur. J. Int. Relat. (2.15)	World Politics (4.16)	Int. J. Geog. Info. Sys. (17.06)
4	Foreign Affairs (2.13)	J. Conflict Resolution (3.89)	J. Conflict Resolution (15.28)
5	Biosecurity/Bioterror. (1.98)	J. Common Market Stud. (3.78)	International Security (11.42)
6	J. Common Market Stud. (1.84)	Biosecurity/Bioterror. (3.59)	Int. Studies Quarterly (11.23)
7	J. Conflict Resolution (1.77)	J. Peace Research (3.42)	J. Common Market Stud. (7.16)
8	World Politics (1.69)	Eur. J. Int. Relat. (2.82)	J. Peace Research (6.67)
9	Int. Studies Quarterly (1.69)	Int. Studies Quarterly (2.64)	Eur. J. Int. Relat. (6.34)
10	Marine Policy (1.53)	Am. J. Internat. Law (2.22)	Am. J. Internat. Law (5.56)

Source: Thomson Reuters

II. All ISI journals

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| 1 International Organization | 31 Public Administration Review | 60 Comparative Studies in Society and History |
| 2 Journal of Political Economy | 32 American Behavioral Scientist | 61 Political Theory |
| 3 World Politics | 33 Review of International Political Economy | 62 Public Choice |
| 4 American Political Science Review | 34 Journal of Theoretical Politics | 63 American Review of Public Administration |
| 5 American Journal of Political Science | 35 International Interactions | 64 Judicature |
| 6 International Security | 36 Journal of Democracy | 65 Administration and Society |
| 7 European Journal of International Relations | 37 European Journal of Political Research | 66 Europe-Asia Studies |
| 8 Journal of Law and Economics | 38 Urban Affairs Review | 67 Middle East Journal |
| 9 Public Opinion Quarterly | 39 Legislative Studies Quarterly | 68 Women and Politics |
| 10 Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization | 40 Studies in Comparative and International Development | 69 Publius |
| 11 American Journal of International Law | 41 Political Research Quarterly | 70 Social Science History |
| 12 Political Geography | 42 Rationality and Society | 71 Studies in American Political Development |
| 13 Law and Society Review | 43 Social Science Quarterly | 72 Australian Journal of Political Science |
| 14 Politics and Society | 44 Signs | 73 PS: Political Science and Politics |
| 15 Journal of Conflict Resolution | 45 Conflict Management and Peace Science | 74 American Politics Research |
| 16 International Studies Quarterly | 46 Political Behavior | 75 Policy Studies Journal |
| 17 Urban Studies | 47 Party Politics | 76 Political Quarterly |
| 18 World Development | 48 Third World Quarterly | 77 Government and Opposition |
| 19 Comparative Political Studies | 49 Political Science Quarterly | 78 Justice System Journal |
| 20 Theory and Society | 50 International Affairs | 79 Asian Survey |
| 21 Journal of Politics | 51 Policy Sciences | 80 International Social Science Journal |
| 22 Journal of Policy Analysis and Management | 52 Electoral Studies | 81 Journal of Interdisciplinary History |
| 23 Journal of Common Market Studies | 53 Political Studies | 82 Journal of Strategic Studies |
| 24 China Quarterly | 54 Annals of American Academy | 83 Canadian Journal of Political Science |
| 25 British Journal of Political Science | 55 Security Studies | 84 Journal of Black Studies |
| 26 Comparative Politics | 56 Journal of Modern African Studies | 85 Public Interest |
| 27 Journal of Peace Research | 57 Journal of Latin American Studies | 86 Social Science Journal |
| 28 Journal of Urban Affairs | 58 International Political Science Review | 87 Polity |
| 29 Political Psychology | 59 Latin American Research Review | 88 Journal of Asian Studies |
| 30 Post Soviet Affairs | | 89 Political Science |
| | | 90 Middle Eastern Studies |