

Benchmarking Australian IR: Low Impact, a Bookish Lot, or a Very British Affair?

Author

Sharman, JC

Published

2008

Journal Title

Australian Journal of International Affairs

DOI

[10.1080/10357710802480709](https://doi.org/10.1080/10357710802480709)

Rights statement

© 2008 Routledge. This is the author-manuscript version of this paper. Reproduced in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher. Please refer to the journal's website for access to the definitive, published version.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/23146>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

**The Global Profile of Australian IR Scholarship:
Low Impact, a Bookish Lot, or a Very British Affair?**

J.C. Sharman
Centre for Governance and Public Policy & Griffith Asia Institute
Griffith University
170 Kessels Rd
Nathan, QLD 4111
Australia
Tel: +61 7 3735 6756
Fax: +61 7 3735 7737
Email: j.sharman@griffith.edu.au

ABSTRACT

This article assesses the global profile of Australian International Relations (IR) scholarship by measuring the presence of Australian-based scholars in leading journals and presses, relative to other non-US scholars. It presents three alternative conclusions, depending on the benchmark adopted. The first perspective, low impact, suggests that on the basis of publications in top journals, Australian IR scholars are doing a bad job, that is, Australian scholars have a much smaller presence in leading journals than could reasonably be expected. The second view, a bookish lot, is based on publication in leading book presses, and presents a much more positive picture. The third alternative, a very British affair, concludes that according to both journal and book data Australian scholars are notable for their disproportionate representation in British rather than American publication outlets. These claims are supported with publication data from top outlets over the past decade as determined by Australian and international rankings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the diligent research assistance of Lee Morgenbesser and the financial support of Australian Research Council Discovery Grant DP0771521.

The urge to measure and assess academic performance has become a key concern for universities and staple topic of conversation within the academy, from the highest policy-making circles to gossip in the corridors. In the spirit of the age, this article assesses the global research profile of Australian International Relations (IR) scholarship over the last decade. In broadest terms, ‘research profile’ is a rough proxy for the more straightforward question of whether Australian scholars are doing a good, bad or indifferent job in terms of our research. Instead of presenting one definite answer, this article presents three alternative responses, each depending on the benchmark adopted. The first view (Low Impact) suggests that Australian IR scholars are doing a bad job: according to a logic explained below, Australian representation in leading journals is much lower than it should be. The second, much more positive view (a Bookish Lot), is that in terms of books placed with leading university presses, Australian IR has a high international profile and is doing a good job. The third view, neither positive nor negative, observes that, again judging on the basis of publication data, Australian IR scholars are notable for their Anglophile and Americophobe tendencies (making Australian IR a Very British Affair).

The background of this article is the growing emphasis on ranking and measuring performance of universities, departments and individual academics, especially with regards to research performance. While colleagues in the United States and the United Kingdom have long dealt with the *US News and World Report* rankings and Research Assessment Exercise, respectively, detailed publication metrics are relatively new to Australia, being associated with the abortive Research Quality Framework. Rating the rankings has generated an international secondary literature in itself (Jackman and Siverson 1996; Guena and Martin 2003), one which this article largely ignores. What these and other research ranking exercises have in common is a finely-tuned methodology applied to vast amounts of empirical data. In contrast, this study

presents only a crude and narrowly-focused view. But although the methodology is undoubtedly primitive in nature and limited in scope, this does not obscure or invalidate some key findings for those interested in IR scholarship in Australia. It is increasingly recognised that questions like ‘Which is the best university in the world?’ are too broad to generate sensible answers, even if conceived of only in terms of research output. Thus the move internationally and in this country to assess lower levels of aggregation, particularly disciplines, and hence the narrow focus of this article. Furthermore, no matter how complex the methodology and how exhaustive the data collection process, objective attempts to generate research rankings are fundamentally dependent on value-based initial premises. This is not to say that anything goes or that rankings are completely arbitrary, merely that no amount of data or methodological sophistication will cancel out values and preconceptions that inform any such assessment exercise. Finally, even a fairly simple data-collection process provides a firmer basis from which to generalise about the state of the discipline in Australia than unsupported, impressionistic judgments and anecdote.

METHOD AND DATA

Before presenting each of the perspectives below, a few words on method are in order. The publication data are a simple count of author nationality by institutional affiliation, not citizenship, over the last decade (precise dates are included on individual tables). An Australian citizen working in the United States becomes American, and vice versa, nationality changes in line with international job moves. Many Australians have done important work while based overseas, but their output is not counted. Joint authorships are taken as fractions (two authors 0.5 each of a publication, three authors 0.33, and so on).

Turning to more fundamental issues, a central issue in assessing International Relations scholarship is the fact that the discipline is so dominated by the United States. In general there seems to be little reason to revise Stanley Hoffmann’s verdict of more than thirty years ago about

IR as an American discipline (1977; Crawford and Jarvis 2001). When evaluating the relative performance of countries like Australia this presents two problems. The first is that the US contribution is at least an order of magnitude greater than anyone else's: the American superpower's lead in IR scholarship makes its military dominance look tenuous and uncertain by comparison. The United States probably graduates several times more Political Science/International Relations doctorates in a year that are active in the entire Australian field. Comparing different orders of magnitude like US and Australian IR is difficult. Aside from the huge quantitative contrast, however, it may be that US scholars enjoy an additional 'home ground advantage': the leading journals and presses in the field are disproportionately US concerns. For this reason, it is said that US-based scholars may enjoy a playing field that is tilted in their favour, which may overstate their success relative to colleagues from other countries (Hix 2004: 96). Thus Waever observes that: 'Today, because dominance is American, the stylistic criteria are those of the American Brand of the Anglo-Saxon style... Had the discipline a German hegemony, Americans not only would have to struggle with expressing themselves in the German language but also would experience the challenge of adopting to an alien ideal of intellectual style' (1998: 694-5). Certainly similar issues have been raised in the context of the Australian Political Studies Association (AusPSA) ranking exercise discussed below. For these and other reasons, Dale and Goldfinch (2005) maintain that it is undesirable and in any case impossible to compare Australasian with 'North American' (i.e. the United States) Political Science output (2005: 426-27). In critiquing the method employed in this article, Donovan (2007) nevertheless sympathises with this point.

Although many Australian scholars take it as a given, due to the lack of hard evidence this article is agnostic about whether US scholars do in fact enjoy a home ground advantage in publishing; reasoning that we as Australians know how special we are and thus indices showing otherwise must *ipso facto* be wrong is certainly not sufficient. Either way, however, the problem of comparing different orders of magnitude remains. To cancel out both of these issues, US-based scholars are simply excluded from the comparison. Thus the original question becomes:

what is the global profile of Australian IR scholarship, relative to other non-US countries? This move provides the advantage of allowing comparison between countries whose presence in leading publication outlets are of the same order of magnitude, and ameliorates the problem of home ground advantage, though does not quite eliminate it because of the position of British scholars, discussed below.

Just as contentious, but much less amenable to a simple solution, is the question of how to rank publications, or if a threshold is set, which outlets are included and which excluded. This generates two sub-issues: the question of journal rankings, and the position of books. The conventional measure of journal rankings is Thomson ISI Journal Citation Reports. Of the various totals this measure reports, the headline factor is 'Impact Factor': roughly, the average number of times an article is cited in the two years after publication. There is a whole industry of proponents and critics of Thomson ISI (Monastersky 2005). The article side-steps this debate in order to concentrate on the relative prominence of Australian International Relations scholarship. Finally, there may be concerns that because Thomson ISI is the mainstream measure and itself a US concern, it may reproduce a broader US bias to the exclusion of other traditions. An alternative purpose-built IR ranking of journals is provided by Ole Wæver, a Danish scholar, whose long article published ten years ago in part inspired this piece. Wæver aims to capture relative national contributions by looking at eight journals: *International Organization*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *International Security*, *World Politics*, *Review of International Studies*, *European Journal of International Relations*, *Millennium* and *Journal of Peace Research*. Of these, *Review of International Studies*, *European Journal of International Relations* and *Millennium* are based in the UK, *Journal of Peace Research* in Norway, while the remainder are run from the United States (*International Organization* relocated to Canada in 2007, *EJIR* was previously based in Germany). If ISI Thomson represents the mainstream, and Wæver's eight those of a self-styled critical European outsider, a final perspective is a distinctly Australian one: the top tranche of the four-tiered system drawn up by the Australian Political Studies Association (AusPSA) in 2007. In response to the now-cancelled Research Quality

Framework the Association began compiling a ranking of journals and books to inform the peer-review assessment on the instructions of the Department of Education Science and Training. After soliciting feedback from members, the ranking was finalised by a small working group in late 2007. The federal ministry decreed that journals must be divided into four tiers: A* (the top 5 per cent), A (the next-highest 15 per cent), B (the next 30 per cent), and C (the rest). In line with the Thomson ISI precedent, AusPSA created separate sub-categories for Political Science, Public Policy/Public Administration, and International Relations. The A* journals for the last-mentioned are *International Organization*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *International Security*, *Review of International Studies*, *European Journal of International Relations*, *World Politics* and *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

Rather than pronouncing a ‘winner’ among these rankings, two alternative views are presented. The first takes the Australian ranking at face value. Although any such ranking is open to challenge, it makes sense to use the local ranking in assessing local output, even if findings are cross-checked with an alternative view. The second set takes only the four journals that are listed in the ISI top ten by Impact Factor, appear in Waever’s list, and are categorised as A* in the 2007 Australian ranking. This overlap set is thus comprised of *International Organization*, *International Security*, *International Studies Quarterly* and *World Politics*. These four journals are listed by Hix in first, second, fourth and fifth respectively for refereed International Relations journals (third is *Journal of Conflict Resolution*) according to citation data (2004: 298). Similarly, working from survey data Garand and Giles (2003) identify the top IR journals as being *World Politics*, *International Organization*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* and *International Security*, in that order. The logic behind favouring these four journals is that five rankings (Thomson, Waever, AusPSA, Hix and Garand and Giles) compiled inside and outside the US and using both survey and citation data repeatedly converge on the same four journals (it could be argued that *Journal of Conflict Resolution* should be included as well, but as can be seen from the figures in Table 1 this does not change the result from an Australian perspective). All non-US journals drop out, which has the added advantage of

nullifying any British home ground advantage; scholars of all countries are assessed against the same benchmark, leading publications outside their home country.

PERSPECTIVE 1: LOW IMPACT

Perspective 1 follows the logic of the ISI ranking and Waever in assessing research output only through journal publications, though exactly which journals count are heavily influenced by the Australian 2007 ranking exercise as described above. This perspective paints a generally unflattering picture of Australian IR. The journal data suggest that Australian scholars do a poor job placing their work in leading outlets, and hence that Australian IR scholarship has little if any profile outside this country. Table 1 presents the results from the seven A* journals selected on the local index, while Table 2 shows data for those four journals identified as top tier by ISI Impact Factor, Waever, and AusPSA, Hix and Garand and Giles, each over a ten-year period.

TABLE 1: A* journals as listed by AusPSA 2007, beginning 1998 to mid 2007 (*World Politics, EJIR, ISQ, Journal of Conflict Resolution, International Organization, International Security, Review of International Studies*)

	WP	EJIR	ISQ	JCR	IO	IS	RIS	TOTAL
UK	5.5	42.5	18.98	12	17.83	6.5	179.5	282.8
Canada	2.5	8.5	3.5	4.55	2	0.5	24.5	53.88
Germany	1.33	18	3.5	13	3.16		7.5	46.49
Scandinavia	2.33	18	3.33	8.93	6.75		8	45.34
Australia		9.5	0.5	.66		2	15.5	28.16
Israel	1		2	12.08	1	1	5	22.08
Norway	.83	4	3.33	6.93	3.75		1	19.84
Sweden	1.5	9		2			3	15.5
Italy	1	1.5	2	3.83	2			10.33
Denmark		5			1		4	10

TABLE 2: International Presence, Big Four Overlap Journals beginning 1998 mid-2007
(International Studies Quarterly, International Organization, International Security, World Politics)

	ISQ	IO	IS	World Politics	TOTAL
UK	19	17.83	6.5	5.5	48.83
Canada	11.33	2	0.5	2.5	16.33
Germany	3.5	3.16		1.33	8
Norway	3.33	3.75		0.83	7.91
Israel	2	1	1	1	5
Italy	2	2		1	5
Sweden	2			1.5	3.5
Korea	1		2		3
Australia	0.5		2		2.5
Mexico		1		1.5	2.5
Netherlands	0.5	2			2.5
Singapore		1	1		2

As noted earlier, this exercise aims to compare the profile of Australian IR relative to the rest of the world excluding the United States. But it is nevertheless worth reflecting on just how poorly Australians do relative to US scholars, especially in the four overlap journals. Even if there are a hundred US IR scholars for every one Australian, on a per capita basis Australians are still remarkably unsuccessful. Even compared with individual states like Alabama (population 4.5 million, usually lagging near or at the bottom among the 50 states in terms of education), Australia cannot compete. These figures would indicate that perhaps two-dozen individual US scholars have published more on their own in these elite journals than the entire body of Australian IR scholars combined over the last ten years. Not a single Australian-based scholar has published in *International Organization* or *World Politics* in the decade surveyed. This absence may be a product of the highly perverse incentives put in place by the Australian government financially rewarding quantity over quality. Thus a book chapter in any edited

volume is counted as equal to an article in one of these top journals. As such, it is individually and collectively rational to favour low-quality publications over high-quality ones. To the extent that the four overlap journals are exclusively American, these unflattering comparisons may also in part or whole reflect the home ground advantage at work. On the evidence available it is not possible to say, which leads back to the comparison with the rest of the world.

Here the picture is a little better for Australians, but not much. Even without the massive dominance of US scholars, it still seems a case of Australian IR scholarship punching well below its weight. That Australians do worse than Britons is probably no surprise: the UK has a population and economy almost three times as large, and is the birth place of the discipline. Additionally, Table 1 may be compromised by a home ground advantage for British scholars, particularly pronounced in the case of *Review of International Studies*. But it is not all clear why the British do so much better in Table 2, almost twenty times the output in leading journals compared with Australians. Even more surprising, however, is the poor performance of Australia vis-a-vis small non-English speaking countries like Israel, Sweden and Norway in the top four journals. Table 1 is more favourable, but even here the combined Scandinavian result (i.e., Denmark plus Norway and Sweden, a combined population of 19 million) exceeds that of Australia. In Table 2, Australia ranks only ninth overall. Unlike the US home ground advantage account, it hardly seems credible to say that Australians are especially disfavoured by US publication outlets relative to other third country nationals. Regarding the UK journals, although Australians might be at a disadvantage relative to their British peers who enjoy a home ground advantage, this doesn't explain Australians' relatively greater success in journals like *EJIR* and *RIS* compared with *International Organization* or *ISQ* (as discussed further below under Perspective 3: A Very British Affair). It seems surprising that Australians do so much worse in leading IR journals than countries with much smaller populations and economies (OECD figures are available for university funding, but of course this does not reveal the distribution of funding between disciplines within universities, see OECD 2007). More remarkable is that scholars operating in a second language can out-publish Australians working in their native language. In

the case of the Table 2 Results for Germany, Korea and Italy it might just be said that the size difference could negate the language advantage. Clearly for smaller countries that are also non-English speaking this excuse does not obtain. It is beyond the scope of this article to determine why this disparity exists (it is because Australians don't submit to top-ranked journals, or are disproportionately rejected from them?). Nevertheless, taking US scholars out of the equation, the verdict on the global profile of Australian IR as judged by publication in leading journals is a harsh one, even when the standard adopted is that composed by the Australian discipline.

PERSPECTIVE 2: A BOOKISH LOT

The second perspective offers a much more up-beat assessment of Australian IR scholarship. In contrast to the indictment above, this version argues that collating and extrapolating from journal publication data simply misses the point: Australian IR scholars are a very bookish lot, and are often not much interested in journal publications. To ignore books is to misunderstand and mischaracterise the nature of the field. This version is intuitively plausible, in that local IR scholarship tends to be much closer to the humanities than in North America, for example; large-*N* quantitative studies, rational choice work and formal modelling are all rare. On the other hand, historical, policy-oriented, constructivist, critical and explicitly normative works are the rule. The upshot is that for many, books are seen as both the main venue for publishing research and the main indicator of research achievement.

Books are a prominent stumbling block to journal-based metrics, and generally speaking they have been discounted or ignored. Wæver (to repeat, a European critic of US dominance of the field) strongly agrees with the American view on the pre-eminence of journals: 'Journals are the most direct measure of the discipline itself. The sociology of science from Merton to Whitley has pointed to journals as the crucial institution of modern sciences... For practitioners, the field exists mostly in the journals' (697). Simon Hix comes to the same conclusion in his ranking of political science departments (2004: 295). More pragmatically, even if Wæver and Hix had

wanted to include books in their coverage, there is no widely-accepted measure of top tier book presses in the same way as for journals. But from the Australian perspective, any system of assessing IR scholarship not including books would be widely regarded as at best seriously incomplete, and at worst useless. Fortunately, however, the 2007 AusPSA ranking exercise did produce just such a ranking of book presses, again in the four-tiered format in the same proportions, with the A* university presses being those of Cambridge, Chicago, Cornell, Harvard, MIT, Oxford, Princeton and Yale. Unlike the journal index, no sub-categories of Political Science, International Relations or Public Policy/Public Administration are distinguished. In deciding whether or not a volume from one of these publishers counted as International Relations, the publisher's own presentation was the deciding criterion. In some cases this meant examining the various series (Cambridge Series on International Relations, Cornell Series in International Security, etc.), but generally publishers organise their production by category-area listed as International Relations, international politics or one of the subfields (global governance, international political economy, etc.). The exception was Oxford, which included textbooks in its IR catalogues, discounted for this exercise. This creates some problems of comparability, though importantly including or excluding Oxford does not change the Australian position.

Turning to the evidence of the last decade, Australians do well, indeed featuring second after the British (again excluding the United States) in the list of book presses selected as comprising the top tier of International Relations/Political Science. Because there is no equivalent international book press ranking it is difficult to cross-check the validity of this league table. Superficially, however, given the concentration of Ivy League and Oxbridge university presses it seems unlikely that local success in this area is solely the result of parochial antipodean concerns or stacking the deck. This result may mean that Australians have found their 'natural' level, or in fact are doing better than other factors would suggest relative to other countries (e.g. number of universities, number of academics, funding devoted to higher education, and so on). As the fourth-largest Anglophone OECD country, perhaps Australians might be expected to rank

at the same level in Anglophone social science publications. According to this metric, Australia is slightly ahead of its 'natural' level, supplanting Canada at number three.

TABLE 3: Books, 1997-mid 2007

(Cambridge, Chicago, Cornell, Harvard, MIT, Princeton, Yale and Oxford University Press)

	Cambridge	Chicago	Cornell	Harvard	MIT	Princeton	Yale	Oxford	TOTAL
UK	19	1.5	2	4.2	2		2	35.65	66.35
Aus	6.25		3			1		3	13.75
Can	2.75		2.88	.2				6	11.83
Germany	1	1	1		2.16			4.66	9.82
Netherlands		5.75							5.75
Italy	.33		1.33	1		1	1	1	5.66
France		3.5	1	1					5.5
Switz		.25	.5		.5			2	3.25
Israel	1.5				2.5			.5	4.5
Norway				.5	1.5			2	4
Sweden								4	4
UN/ICG		1		1				1.5	3.5
Denmark	.5	1.25	1.5						3.25

Rather than regarding books as the only worthwhile research output, however, it seems much more likely that Australian IR academics see both books with leading presses and articles in top journals as indicating research prowess. Although many would disagree on the relative worth, surely few would maintain that books are the only research publications of value. In assessing how Australian IR compares, this raises the more complicated question of how to combine and weight books and articles. There does not seem to be any objectively correct answer to what fraction of a book an article is worth, and thus there can only be a value judgment. Clearly, though, in as far as the balance is tilted towards books Australian IR will be

portrayed in a favourable light, and to the extent that journal articles are weighted more heavily the Australian performance will look much less impressive. One possible reason for concern here is that the decision may not be the discipline's to make. If available international indicators concentrate on article output while tending to ignore books, as they do, then there may be increasing tendency for articles to become the benchmark of success. This is especially so during the evolution of a post-Research Quality Framework (and post-Research Assessment Exercise in the UK) metric (Butler and McAllister 2007). Rather than bureaucracies like the Australian federal government finding important things to measure and then working out a way to measure them, it is much more common for them to find easily measurable things and make them important for this reason.

PERSPECTIVE 3: A VERY BRITISH AFFAIR

Perspectives 1 and 2 have been explicitly evaluative, to come to a verdict on the research profile of Australian IR outside this country. The third perspective is different, and more descriptive. If anything comes out more strongly than the low figures on journal articles and the high figures on book publications, it is highly disproportionate success that Australians enjoy in British publication outlets. The only areas of strength in Table 1 journal publications are the UK based *RIS* and *EJIR* (the latter formerly based in Germany). Australian scholars drop from fifth place in Table 1 to ninth in Table 2 precisely because the latter excludes UK journals. This same pattern continues across other journals. In *International Affairs*, *International Relations* and *Millennium*, all British, Australians are in second, fourth and fourth place respectively. In contrast, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* sees Australians in twenty-first place (behind Lebanon and Singapore), while no Australian has published in *Studies in Comparative International Development* in the last ten years. Citation data presented by Dale and Goldfinch support this picture: the foreign journals in which Australians and New Zealanders are most cited are *Political Studies*, *European Journal of Political Research* and *RIS*, all British/European (2005:

428). Turning to books, the jewel in the crown of Australian book success is the presence in the elite Cambridge Series on International Relations (now with an Australian as Editor-in-Chief), while Australia is also strongly represented among the Oxford volumes. Like Australia, the field in Britain regards books as the single most important marker of research success (followed by articles, chapters in edited books, and lastly edited books, Butler and McAllister 2007: 5).

It might thus be that Australian IR scholars are not so much a very bookish lot as a very *British* lot. Certainly available publication data seem to bear out the view that Australian IR is a very British affair. This may indicate that either British scholars do not enjoy the same home ground advantage than is allegedly enjoyed by Americans, or that Australians are more willing and able to compete with third countries in British journals and presses. Judging impressionistically from the data, British journals do seem to draw from a wider range of countries than US journals, though some UK publications like the semi-refereed *International Affairs* seem just as parochial in its pool of authors: 217 British articles, Australians in second place with only 8 in the period 1998-2007. As shown in Table 1 for one reason or another *RIS* also has a strong local bias.

Albeit in a minor way, this finding of a definite Australian preference for or affinity with British publications tends to confirm Waever's verdict of 10 years ago, as well as much more recent studies by Cohen (2007, though see Ravenhill 2008) and Maliniak et al. (2007) that there are distinctly US and European or British arms of the field. The former tends to take its cues from micro-economics, is positivist, and is much more focused on quantitative, rational choice and formal modelling approaches. The key measure of success is journal publications, including those like *Journal of Conflict Resolution* that have little or no profile in Australia. The European or British strand in contrast is said to be much more attuned to the humanities, particularly history, philosophy and literature, with the measure of research success being some combination of books with leading presses and top journal articles. The evidence gathered for this study does not provide any grounds for prediction, but it is interesting to note that these authors foresee an increasing divergence between the two, and presumably the field in Australia will track with the

European, and away from the United States (or the US will continue to track away from everyone else, depending on one's point of view).

CONCLUSIONS

Governments around the world, and certainly in Australia, are increasingly concerned about getting their money's worth from universities. Measuring research output is a key component of this calculation. Although these assessments are most usually between universities or across time in the same country, in many ways the more important, logically prior comparison is international: how does Australia compare with peer countries? Notwithstanding the difficulties discussed above, for the field of International Relations in Australia to shy away from international comparisons seems defeatist and self-defeating. There are good reasons to think that the most meaningful comparisons are made within individual disciplines, rather than looking for a common metric that will capture Fine Arts, Physics and everything in between. Beyond the press of public policy and funding, there are also good intellectual reasons to take a more synoptic look and discuss whether Australian IR is as successful as it could or should be in terms of its global research profile.

No matter how sophisticated the methodology adopted (and the methodology adopted in this article has been anything but), there will always be prior value judgments to be made which will crucially affect the final verdict. This article has illustrated the sensitivity of final conclusions to initial premises in presenting the first two radically contrasting assessments of Australian IR. The more conventional picture based on journal output suggests that in the main Australian IR scholars have been doing a terrible job, or at very best have been devoting most of their effort to teaching, service, or anything but getting published in leading outlets. The success

of small, non-English speaking third countries belies excuses based on the sheer number of US scholars, or instinctive nativism among the editors and referees of top US journals: if Norwegian and Israeli scholars can crack elite US journals, why can't Australians? The second perspective based on book output would argue this harsh verdict entirely misses the point: because Australian IR scholars are a bookish lot, journals are simply not valued very highly and any index based on articles will be fundamentally misleading. When measured on the basis of what local scholars value, books in leading presses, Australians do very well. The third perspective, descriptive rather than evaluative, provides striking evidence confirming the impressionistic judgment that colonial ties with the UK are still very strong in Australian IR. Rather than just reflecting common historical origins, shared academic nomenclature or institutional structure, these ties are being constantly reproduced in contemporary patterns of publication. A final point is that while the field is dominated by the United States, it is also easy to overlook the degree to which Australians are part of an Anglophone hegemony in International Relations, and academia more generally. For scholars in countries like France, a retreat into intellectual isolationism is an option, for most others it is not. The temptation for Australians to play the marginalized battler on the periphery of the international scene (in IR or elsewhere) should be resisted; the title more properly belongs to those building research profiles by working in a non-native language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Butler, Linda, Margaret Hamilton and R.A.W. Rhodes. 2007. 'Australian Political Science: Journal and Publisher Rankings.' Unpublished paper on behalf of the Australian Political Studies Association. Available on request from info@auspsa.org.au.

Butler, Linda and Ian McAllister. 2007. 'Metrics or Peer Review: Evaluating the 2001 UK Research Assessment Exercise in Political Science.' Unpublished paper, 28 June 2007.

Cohen, Benjamin J. 2007. 'The Trans-Atlantic Divide: Why are American and British IPE so Different?' *Review of International Political Economy* 14 (2): 197-219.

Crawford, Robert M.A. and Darryl S.L. Jarvis (Eds). 2001. *International Relations—Still an American Social Science?* SUNY Press.

Dale, Tony and Shaun Goldfinch. 2005. 'Article Citation Rates and Productivity of Australasian Political Science Units 1995-2002.' *Australian Journal of Political Science* 40 (3), 425-434.

Donovan, Claire. 2007. 'The Hidden Perils of Citation Counting for Australasian Political Science Units.' *Australian Journal of Political Science* 42 (4), 665-679.

Garand, James C. and Michael W. Giles. 2003. 'Journals in the Discipline: A Report on a New Survey of American Political Scientists.' *PS: Political Science and Politics* 293-308

Guena, Aldo and Ben R. Martin 2003 University Research Evaluation and Funding: An International Comparison' *Minerva* 41 (4), 277-304.

Hix, Simon. 2004 A Global Ranking of Political Science Departments *Political Studies Review* 2 293-313.

Hoffmann, Stanley. 1977. 'An American Social Science: International Relations.' *Daedalus* 106 (1): 41-60.

Jackman, Robert W. and Randolph M. Siverson. 1996. 'Rating the Rating: An Analysis of the National Research Council's Appraisal of Political Science Ph.D. Programs.' *PS: Political Science and Politics* 29 (2), 155-160.

Monastersky, Richard. 2005. 'The Number that's Devouring Science.' *Chronicle of Higher Education* October 14.

Maliniak, Daniel, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, and Michael Tierney. 2007. 'The International Relations Discipline 1980-2006.' Paper presented at the American Political Science Association meeting, Chicago, Ill. http://64.112.226.77/one/apsa/apsa07/index.php?click_key=1

OECD. 2007. *Education at a Glance 2007*. Paris.

Ravenhill, John. 2008. 'In Search of the Missing Middle.' *Review of International Political Economy* 15 (1): 18-29.

Waever, Ole. 1998. 'The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations.' *International Organization* 52 (4), 687-727.