

MAY 2012

TRIP AROUND THE WORLD:
*Teaching, Research, and Policy Views
of International Relations Faculty
in 20 Countries*

**DANIEL MALINIAK,
SUSAN PETERSON, AND
MICHAEL J. TIERNEY**

*Published by the Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) Project
The Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations
at the College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia*



**WILLIAM
& MARY**

TRIP Around the World:
Teaching, Research, and Policy Views of International Relations Faculty in 20 Countries

Daniel Maliniak, Susan Peterson, and Michael J. Tierney

Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) Project
The Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations
The College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

May 2012

We thank the many international relations scholars in twenty countries who generously gave time to complete our survey and provide feedback on the survey instrument that will improve future versions. We especially thank our TRIP partners around the world who helped tailor the survey to their national academic populations, identify those populations, and persuade them to complete this survey: Jeff Chwieroth, Michael Cox, and Stephanie Rickard (United Kingdom); John Doyle (Ireland); Peter Marcus Kristensen and Ole Waever (Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden); Jacqui True (New Zealand); Jason Sharman (Australia); Soo Yeon Kim (Singapore); Jérémie Cornut, Anne-Marie D’Aoust, Stéphane Roussel, and Stephen Saideman (Canada); Zeev Maoz (Israel); Arlene Tickner, Rafael Duarte Villa, Roberto Russell, Jorge Schiavon, and Juan Gabriel Tokatlian (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico); Peter Vale (South Africa); Dario Battistella and Jérémie Cornut (France); and Mustafa Aydin and Korhan Yazgan (Turkey). For assistance in designing the survey, identifying our sample, offering technical support, and providing comments on early drafts of the survey, we thank our colleagues and students: Alex Atkins, Sagra Alvarado, Will Brannon, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Michael Campbell, Charli Carpenter, Bridget Carr, T.J. Cheng, Michael Desch, Jim Deverick, Dan Drezner, Luke Elias, Logan Ferrell, Audrey Glasebrook, Mike Horowitz, Lindsay Hundley, Bruce Jentleson, Mark Jordan, Richard Jordan, Sam Kennedy, Ben Kenzer, James Long, Helen Milner, Ana O’Harrow, Brad Parks, Ryan Powers, Haroun Rahman, Brian Rathbun, Ron Rapoport, Eric Sawchak, Alena Stern, Dustin Tingley, Sasha Tobin, Steve Van Evera, Kate Weaver, Michael Weissberger, and Emily Wilson. For financial support, we thank Arts and Sciences and the Reves Center for International Studies at the College of William and Mary and the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Methodology.....	4
I. Teaching International Relations	7
II. Questions About Your Research Interests.....	17
III. The International Relations Discipline	47
IV. Foreign Policy Views	70

This cross-national survey builds on previous Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) faculty surveys conducted in 2004, 2006, and 2008. In 2004, we surveyed international relations (IR) scholars in the United States. In 2006, we added respondents from Canada. In 2008, we expanded the survey to eight additional English-speaking countries.¹ By including ten new countries and many new questions on disciplinary practices and current foreign policy debates—for a total of twenty countries and five languages—the 2011 survey represents another substantial expansion of the TRIP project.²

The faculty survey is one part of the larger TRIP project, which is designed to study the relationships among teaching, research, and foreign policy.³ As political scientists who specialize in international relations, we spend most of our time assembling and analyzing data on foreign policy and international relations—whether trade or aid flows, terrorist attacks, the diffusion of democracy, or the outbreak of war—that fall in the lower right hand corner of Figure 1.

Figure 1: The TRIP Triad



The survey results reported here and in our three previous reports provide important data on two neglected parts of the triad, teaching and research, at the same time that they include systematic

¹ These included the United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, Israel, South Africa, Hong Kong, and Singapore.

² The new countries in 2011 are: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Mexico, Norway, Sweden, and Turkey. As in previous surveys, we ask a standard battery of questions of respondents from new countries, but we do not repeat questions that are not likely to vary over time for countries surveyed prior to 2011. Where possible, the questions are identical across countries. Because of different naming conventions and translation issues, however, some questions (and closed-end answer options) are modified slightly to fit the local context. On each survey, we add questions in the last section that reflect contemporaneous policy debates and issues in international relations.

³ For further information on the TRIP project, see <http://irtheoryandpractice.wm.edu/projects/trip/>

data on scholars' views of policy issues.⁴ In the larger TRIP project, we supplement our survey data with a database of all international relations articles published in the twelve top peer-reviewed IR and political science journals from 1980 to the present.⁵ These two types of data allow scholars to describe changes in the discipline over time, observe variation in research and teaching practices across different countries and regions of the world, analyze network effects, and identify areas of consensus and disagreement within the IR discipline.

These data also help us to understand the influence of academic research on foreign policy, the way research affects teaching, the effect of teaching on the foreign policy views of students (including some future policy makers), the impact of specific policy outcomes and real world events on both teaching and research, and a variety of other issues that have previously been the subject of vigorous speculation.

Below, we describe the results of the 2011 TRIP survey of IR faculty, providing descriptive statistics for every question. First, however, we detail the survey's methodology.

Methodology

Our sampling method follows those of previous years. We sought to identify and survey all faculty members at colleges and universities in twenty national settings who do research in the IR sub-field of political science and/ or who teach international relations courses. Table 1 lists these countries. The overwhelming majority of our respondents have jobs in departments of political science, politics, government, social science, international relations, or international studies, or in professional schools associated with universities. Given our definition of "IR scholar"—individuals with an active affiliation with a university, college, or professional school—we excluded researchers currently employed in government, private firms, or think tanks. Additionally, our definition is not broad enough to include scholars at professional schools of international affairs who study economics, sociology, law, or other disciplines. While many faculty at these professional schools do study international issues, for this survey we define IR primarily as a sub-field of political science, rather than as the interdisciplinary field taught at professional schools and many undergraduate institutions.⁶ As in previous years, we attempted to include any scholar who taught or did research on trans-border issues as they relate to some aspect of politics. Thus, our population may include political scientists who

⁴ Previous reports are available at <http://irtheoryandpractice.wm.edu/projects/trip/>

⁵ We are working with Jason Sharman and Kate Weaver to construct a parallel TRIP book database that tracks disciplinary trends as reflected in published books. See Jason Sharman and Catherine Waever, "Between the Covers: International Relations in Books," Paper presented at the 2011 TRIP Data Vetting Workshop at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Montreal, March 2011.

⁶ For a critique of the TRIP project based on its exclusion of economists, scientists, anthropologists, and lawyers teaching at schools of international affairs, see James Goldgeier, "Undisciplined: The Ivory Tower survey is asking the wrong questions of the wrong people," *Foreign Policy*, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/01/03/undisciplined>, accessed 16 April 2012.

specialize in American politics and who study defense policy, immigration, or trade. It includes researchers who study regional integration, as well as many specialists of comparative politics who teach IR courses. We adopt this broad definition because we are interested in those scholars who create knowledge, teach students, and provide expert advice to policy makers about trans-border issues – whether or not they explicitly identify themselves as IR scholars.

We identified the population of faculty to be surveyed in all twenty countries using similar methods, although we tailored our methods to each locale. For the U.S. survey, we used the *U.S. News and World Report* 2007-08 report on American higher education to compile a list of all four-year colleges and universities. There were 1,406 such institutions. We also included the Monterey Institute and seven military schools that were not rated by *USNWR* but that do have a relatively large number of political science faculty who do research and/or teach courses on international relations. We then identified IR professors at these schools through a systematic series of web searches, emails, and communications with departments and individual scholars. To identify the population of IR scholars at Canadian universities, we began with *Maclean's Magazine*, which publishes an annual ranking of all four-year universities in Canada. UNESCO data were used to identify all universities and colleges in the remaining eighteen countries in the survey, since that agency collects information on the educational systems of more than 200 countries and territories. The same procedures that were used in the United States were then followed to assemble lists of IR faculty in all other countries. We also consulted with our country partners to ensure that these lists were complete.⁷ By September 2011, we identified a total of 7,294 individuals in the twenty countries who met the TRIP criteria for inclusion. A total of 293 respondents or their representatives informed us that they did not belong in the sample because either they had been misidentified and did not teach or conduct research in the field of IR, or they had died, changed jobs, or retired.⁸ These individuals were not included in the calculation of the response rate. The sample size for each country is listed in Table 1 below.

After generating the pool of potential respondents, we sent emails to each of these individuals, asking them to complete an online survey. We promised confidentiality to all respondents: no answers are publicly linked to any individual respondent. We provided a live link to a web survey. If a respondent requested a hard copy or did not have an email address, we sent a copy of the survey via regular mail.

With the assistance of our country partners, we worked to construct and administer comparable, but not identical, surveys for each of the twenty countries. The surveys were adjusted to reflect differences in terminology, racial categorization, academic institutions, academic rank, and

⁷ In 2011 we did not have a local partner in Hong Kong. We had local partners in every other country.

⁸ If respondents said that they were not IR scholars, but nevertheless met the TRIP criteria, we urged them to complete the survey and did not remove them from the sample, even if they refused to answer the survey.

public and private institutions. The wording of some questions and answers was changed to reflect these differences. Finally, most of our partners contributed country-specific questions that were included at the end of their country survey.

In all, 3,466 scholars responded to the survey, either online or, in a small number of cases, by mail. If the intended respondents or their representatives did not inform us that they did not meet our sampling criteria, they remained in the total population used as the denominator in calculating the response rate. The total response rate of 49.5 percent, therefore, is conservative, since there probably were additional individuals who were misidentified by our selection process, did not inform us, and remained in the sample. There was significant variation in response rates across countries, as Table 1 shows, but no country had a response rate below 36.6 percent. Brazil, Colombia, South Africa, and Ireland had the highest response rates, while France had the lowest, followed by the United States.

Table 1: Response Rate by Country

	Sample Size	Responses (N)	Response Rate (%)
All	7001	3464	49.5%
Argentina	57	36	63.2%
Australia	280	165	58.9%
Brazil	270	193	71.5%
Canada	488	252	51.6%
Colombia	66	50	75.8%
Denmark	93	58	62.4%
Finland	24	11	45.8%
France	276	101	36.6%
Hong Kong	32	15	46.9%
Ireland	47	32	68.1%
Israel	67	33	49.3%
Mexico	230	114	49.6%
New Zealand	42	20	47.6%
Norway	82	49	59.8%
Singapore	47	24	51.1%
South Africa	40	28	70%
Sweden	104	67	64.4%
Turkey	456	227	49.8%
United Kingdom	842	404	48.0%
United States	3751	1585	42.3%

SURVEY RESULTS FOR 2011

I. Teaching International Relations

1: In the past five years have you taught Introduction to International Relations (or its equivalent) for undergraduate students at your current institution?

	Yes	No
All	57	43
US	62	38
UK	55	45
Canada	50	50
Australia	55	45
New Zealand	58	42
Ireland	50	50
France	49	51
Denmark	39	61
Finland	55	45
Norway	43	57
Sweden	55	45
Israel	28	72
Turkey	64	36
Hong Kong	40	60
Singapore	35	65
South Africa	71	29
Argentina	67	33
Brazil	48	52
Colombia	68	32
Mexico	53	47

2: In your undergraduate Intro to IR course, what areas of the world do you study in substantial detail (i.e. you devote one or more classes to discussion of that area)? Please check all that apply.

	Central Asia	East Asia	Eastern Europe	Latin America	M. E. and N. Africa	North America	Oceania	Russia/Soviet Union	South Asia	Southeast Asia	Sub-Saharan Africa	Western Europe	None
All	8	34	16	21	37	34	3	27	18	14	20	43	35
US	9	40	17	23	44	31	2	31	24	14	26	44	35
UK	2	22	18	8	30	34	< 1	22	11	7	16	39	47
Can	5	27	10	16	28	34	2	25	14	13	16	35	50
Aus	6	56	8	9	29	45	32	17	29	40	10	32	25
NZ	0	55	9	18	27	45	45	27	27	18	18	36	45
Ire	7	13	33	7	27	27	0	27	13	7	20	47	20
Fra	0	22	27	15	34	41	0	29	10	10	22	44	37
Den	0	42	5	0	26	42	0	21	5	11	11	58	26
Fin	0	0	50	25	50	25	0	50	0	0	0	50	25
Nor	6	6	19	6	0	25	0	25	0	6	13	50	38
Swe	4	26	19	4	30	30	0	15	15	11	15	33	41
Isr	0	0	0	0	71	43	0	29	29	14	14	43	29
Tur	25	19	22	7	46	33	0	37	7	7	5	56	32
HK	0	80	20	0	0	40	20	60	0	40	0	20	20
Sin	0	50	0	0	0	17	0	17	0	50	0	33	17
SA	0	15	0	5	20	35	0	10	0	10	65	45	30
Arg	13	26	9	65	17	48	0	26	13	22	17	48	26
Bra	2	20	4	48	17	30	0	10	9	5	11	32	36
Col	27	39	21	67	36	58	6	24	24	30	21	55	6
Mex	6	33	21	63	19	60	6	23	8	17	10	52	17

3: Approximately what percentage of your undergraduate Intro to IR course is devoted to policy analysis and/or policy-relevant research? The policies analyzed need not be current.⁹

	Policy Relevant
All	28
US	28
UK	22
Canada	25
Australia	30
New Zealand	13
Ireland	26
France	29
Denmark	25
Finland	14
Norway	30
Sweden	19
Israel	22
Turkey	39
Hong Kong	29
Singapore	14
South Africa	20
Argentina	25
Brazil	32
Colombia	25
Mexico	33

⁹ Respondents were offered the following response options: 0-5%, 6-10%, 11-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, and 76-100%. To generate these averages, we identified the midpoint of each range and multiplied by the number of respondents; those responses were then averaged in order to compare the overall percent variation between countries.

4: Approximately what percentage of your undergraduate Intro to IR course is devoted to contemporary empirical issues in IR -- i.e., 2000 or later?¹⁰

	Percentage
All	37
US	35
UK	40
Canada	34
Australia	45
NZ	30
Ireland	36
France	32
Denmark	39
Finland	19
Norway	38
Sweden	31
Israel	42
Turkey	40
Hong Kong	53
Singapore	18
South Africa	48
Argentina	38
Brazil	30
Colombia	36
Mexico	47

¹⁰ Respondents were offered the following response options: 0-5%, 6-10%, 11-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, and 76-100%. To generate these averages, we identified the midpoint of each range and multiplied by the number of respondents; those responses were then averaged in order to compare the overall percent variation between countries.

5: Approximately what percentage of assigned readings in your undergraduate Intro to IR course is written by:¹¹

	U.S. Authors	Country X Authors¹²	Latin American Authors¹³
All	58	25	20
US	71	--	--
UK	40	37	--
Canada	42	23	--
Australia	45	19	--
NZ	35	6	--
Ireland	45	5	--
France	43	27	--
Denmark	37	28	--
Finland	27	42	--
Norway	40	18	--
Sweden	51	11	--
Israel	71	9	--
Turkey	52	24	--
HK	49	3	--
Singapore	71	4	--
SA	43	17	--
Argentina	50	--	23
Brazil	43	25	19
Colombia	47	--	15
Mexico	50	--	25

¹¹ Respondents were offered the following response options: 0-5%, 6-10%, 11-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, and 76-100%. To generate these averages, we identified the midpoint of each range and multiplied by the number of respondents; those responses were then averaged in order to compare the overall percent variation between countries. These results should be viewed in light of the fact that respondents had to define for themselves what is meant by a “U.S. author” or “Country X author” or “Latin American author.” We cannot be sure whether respondents cue on an author’s institutional affiliation, location where Ph.D. was earned, nationality, or country of origin.

¹² “Country X” denotes the country in which respondents were surveyed. In surveys distributed to respondents who answered this question in 2008, we did not ask this question again. The 2008 data is included in these responses. Subsequent questions that contain 2008 data will be marked with a footnote indicating that they contain 2008 data.

¹³ In surveys distributed to Mexico, Colombia, Argentina, and Brazil, respondents also were asked: “Approximately what percentage of assigned readings in your undergraduate Intro to IR course is written by authors based in Latin America?” Respondents in these countries were not asked about readings produced by authors from their specific countries.

6: Approximately what percentage of your undergraduate Intro to IR course do you devote to the study and/ or application of each of the following international relations paradigms? (If you have multiple answers for other only record the most prominent other paradigm).¹⁴

	Constructivism	Realism	Liberalism	Marxism	Feminism	English School	Non-paradigmatic	Other
All	13	24	21	11	7	8	18	15
US	11	25	22	10	7	5	19	17
UK	11	19	16	10	7	10	19	12
Can	11	18	17	12	8	7	16	11
Aus	14	19	19	11	8	9	20	18
NZ	14	14	15	7	8	13	10	28
Ire	11	16	16	10	6	7	16	8
Fra	15	25	22	9	4	9	23	9
Den	13	26	23	6	3	14	17	23
Fin	11	11	9	6	4	5	11	10
Nor	17	20	19	10	9	8	18	8
Swe	18	24	19	10	9	5	8	15
Isr	7	20	20	6	4	5	18	3
Tur	17	33	24	17	8	16	19	20
HK	20	36	17	5	3	3	14	0
Sin	16	23	20	9	6	7	19	18
SA	13	25	22	15	6	6	16	12
Arg	15	35	24	11	4	15	14	18
Bra	13	26	23	14	5	18	16	20
Col	24	35	27	21	8	13	9	19
Mex	19	31	22	17	11	15	14	14

¹⁴ Respondents were offered the following response options: 0-5%, 6-10%, 11-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, and 76-100%. To generate these averages, we identified the midpoint of each range and multiplied by the number of respondents; those responses were then averaged across each paradigm in order to compare the overall percent variation across paradigms. Rows add to more than 100 percent because respondents were asked to estimate a percentage for each paradigm. Canada (100 percent), The UK (104 percent), and Sweden (108 percent) were closer to 100 percent, while scholars in Colombia (156 percent), Turkey (154 percent), and Mexico (143 percent) overestimated by larger amounts. Scholars in Finland (67 percent) and Israel (83 percent), on the other hand, significantly underestimated percentages in their responses.

7: In the past five years have you taught an International Relations class to graduate students?
Check all that apply.

	Yes, to PhD students	Yes, to MA international affairs/public policy students	Yes, to other graduate students	No
All	25	44	19	42
US	28	34	12	52
UK	22	64	24	25
Can	41	50	19	40
Aus	11	63	19	28
NZ	5	42	63	26
Ire	26	68	10	29
Fra	16	55	35	26
Den	8	59	22	33
Fin	22	67	56	22
Nor	20	60	22	31
Swe	12	35	18	53
Isr	17	66	14	34
Tur	22	44	14	45
HK	7	36	36	50
Sin	36	59	27	23
SA	11	67	70	15
Arg	12	53	26	41
Bra	22	42	37	35
Col	20	47	33	29
Mex	14	34	19	50

8: In your IR class for PhD students, which of the following best describes the way you organize your course material?

	Issue Areas or Problems	Levels of Analysis	Schools of Thought/Paradigms	Rational vs. Non-rational Approaches	Regions	Other
All	42	6	33	4	5	10
US	45	5	33	4	2	10
UK	39	4	31	3	11	13
Can	30	3	45	5	2	14
Aus	38	13	31	0	6	13
NZ	0	0	100	0	0	0
Ire	25	0	25	25	13	13
Fra	69	0	0	8	15	8
Den	33	0	67	0	0	0
Fin	100	0	0	0	0	0
Nor	78	0	11	0	11	0
Swe	14	0	86	0	0	0
Isr	25	0	50	0	0	25
Tur	17	24	33	2	21	2
HK	0	0	100	0	0	0
Sin	50	0	38	13	0	0
SA	33	0	33	0	33	0
Arg	50	25	25	0	0	0
Bra	55	8	21	3	5	8
Col	60	0	30	0	0	10
Mex	64	14	7	0	14	0

9: In your IR class for MA students, what areas of the world do you study in substantial detail (i.e., you devote one or more classes to discussion of that area)? Please check all that apply.

	Central Asia	East Asia	Eastern Europe	Latin America	M. E. and N. Africa	North America	Oceania	Russia/Soviet Union	South Asia	Southeast Asia	Sub-Saharan Africa	Western Europe	None
All	9	29	16	20	29	28	4	19	17	15	19	36	33
US	8	34	15	22	34	21	2	22	20	15	23	31	39
UK	7	22	18	10	24	29	2	17	15	9	18	42	37
Can	5	19	7	12	15	22	< 1	11	16	9	15	22	52
Aus	8	61	9	13	27	44	31	16	27	54	13	31	18
NZ	0	13	13	13	13	0	25	0	0	0	13	0	63
Ire	5	15	25	10	30	25	0	15	5	10	20	50	35
Fra	9	16	23	16	32	39	7	14	18	9	27	52	20
Den	4	22	15	4	33	26	0	7	11	4	11	52	30
Fin	0	50	67	33	33	33	0	67	33	17	33	83	0
Nor	4	17	26	0	13	30	0	22	4	4	13	57	35
Swe	0	32	26	16	5	26	5	11	11	5	21	32	37
Isr	6	6	11	6	83	39	0	11	17	11	28	22	11
Tur	33	20	24	6	49	27	1	39	11	8	7	59	17
HK	0	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0
Sin	0	38	0	0	15	23	8	8	15	54	8	8	31
SA	0	22	0	17	6	6	0	11	0	17	72	28	28
Arg	17	44	17	83	22	50	0	28	22	17	17	44	11
Bra	1	20	7	65	19	34	1	14	8	5	12	30	28
Col	22	22	26	57	22	39	4	26	17	26	13	43	17
Mex	11	31	26	63	37	60	3	20	11	23	6	57	0

10: Is your IR class for MA students designed more to introduce students to scholarship in the IR discipline, or more to prepare students to be informed about foreign policy and international issues and debates?

	Introduce students to scholarship in the IR discipline	Both, but primarily introduce students to scholarship in the IR discipline	Both about equally	Both, but primarily prepare students to be informed about foreign policy and IR debates	Prepare students to be informed about foreign policy and IR debates
All	14	27	18	27	14
US	13	25	18	28	15
UK	22	30	19	19	10
Canada	23	23	19	17	17
Australia	7	19	22	37	15
New Zealand	13	50	13	13	13
Ireland	10	35	0	35	20
France	12	33	12	33	12
Denmark	12	27	19	31	12
Finland	0	67	17	17	0
Norway	13	38	21	25	4
Sweden	5	40	20	20	15
Israel	17	28	11	33	11
Turkey	7	28	23	35	7
Hong Kong	33	0	0	33	33
Singapore	8	23	15	31	23
South Africa	11	22	22	33	11
Argentina	0	28	28	28	17
Brazil	14	18	12	31	26
Colombia	13	35	17	22	13
Mexico	11	26	29	20	14

II. Questions About Your Research Interests

11: What is the highest educational degree you have completed?¹⁵

	B.A./B.S.	M.A./M.S.	M. Phil	Ph.D/D. Phil	Other
All	< 1	7	4	85	3
US	< 1	6	< 1	91	2
UK	< 1	2	2	95	1
Canada	< 1	5	3	92	1
Australia	1	1	0	97	1
New Zealand	0	6	0	94	0
Ireland	0	3	0	97	0
France	0	0	20	70	10
Denmark	0	22	2	73	2
Finland	0	0	0	100	0
Norway	0	10	7	80	2
Sweden	2	19	0	77	2
Israel	0	6	0	94	0
Turkey	< 1	< 1	1	93	5
Hong Kong	0	0	0	100	0
Singapore	0	8	0	92	0
South Africa	0	14	9	77	0
Argentina	3	50	--	38	9
Brazil	0	< 1	29	62	8
Colombia	0	59	--	37	4
Mexico	< 1	17	--	79	3

¹⁵ Respondents in Argentina, Colombia, and Mexico did not receive the “M. Phil” option.

12: From what institution did you or will you receive your highest degree earned?¹⁶

Rank	Institution	Count	Percentage
1	Columbia University	80	2.75
2	London School of Economics and Political Science	77	2.65
3	Oxford University	56	1.92
4	Harvard University	54	1.86
5	University of California--Berkeley	52	1.79
6	Ohio State University	45	1.55
7	Universidade de São Paulo	43	1.48
8	Cornell University	42	1.44
8	University of Michigan--Ann Arbor	42	1.44
10	Stanford University	40	1.37
10	Yale University	40	1.37
12	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	39	1.34
13	University of Chicago	37	1.27
14	University of Pittsburgh	35	1.20
14	University of California--Los Angeles	35	1.20
16	Johns Hopkins University	34	1.17
17	IEP de Paris	33	1.13
18	Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico	32	1.10
18	University of Wisconsin--Madison	32	1.10
20	University of Virginia	29	1.00

¹⁶ Responses from all countries were counted and averaged to obtain the displayed results. We display the top twenty institutions sorted by the percent of all respondents who answered the question with that institution. Lists for individual countries were too cumbersome to include the report.

13: From what institution did you receive your undergraduate degree?¹⁷

Rank	Institution	Count	Percentage
1	Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México	48	1.64
2	Harvard University	47	1.61
3	Ankara Üniversitesi	44	1.51
4	University of California--Berkeley	32	1.10
5	Stanford University	31	1.06
5	Middle East Technical University	31	1.06
7	Oxford University	30	1.03
8	Boğaziçi Üniversitesi	29	0.99
9	Hebrew University of Jerusalem	21	0.72
9	University of Michigan--Ann Arbor	21	0.72
11	Georgetown University	20	0.68
11	University of Toronto	20	0.68
13	Universidad de Buenos Aires	19	0.65
13	Oberlin College	19	0.65
13	Cornell University	19	0.65
13	McGill University	19	0.65
17	University of Cambridge	18	0.62
17	Aarhus University	18	0.62
19	Bilkent Üniversitesi	17	0.58
19	Universidade de São Paulo	17	0.58

¹⁷ Responses from all countries were counted and averaged to obtain the displayed results. We display the top twenty institutions sorted by the percent of all respondents who answered the question with that institution. Lists for individual countries were too cumbersome to include in the report.

14: What is your age?¹⁸

	Average	Median	Standard deviation	Min	Max
All	46	44	12	21	87
US	49	47	12	26	87
UK	43	41	10	26	79
Canada	47	45	12	26	86
Australia	46	43	12	27	80
New Zealand	43	41	13	21	74
Ireland	38	38	6	28	50
France	40	38	11	25	65
Denmark	46	45	12	27	75
Finland	43	44	5	35	48
Norway	45	45	9	28	65
Sweden	42	39	11	27	74
Turkey	41	39	9	29	70
Israel	53	55	11	37	73
Hong Kong	46	48	12	32	63
Singapore	46	43	9	35	69
South Africa	44	44	11	27	61
Argentina	49	48	12	25	69
Brazil	43	41	12	26	72
Colombia	41	37	10	27	65
Mexico	49	46	11	27	77

¹⁸ In surveys distributed to respondents who answered this question in 2008, we did not ask this question again. The 2008 data is included in these responses and updated to reflect respondents' current age.

15: Are you:¹⁹

	Male	Female
All	69	31
US	69	31
UK	70	30
Canada	73	27
Australia	73	27
New Zealand	50	50
Ireland	67	33
France	62	38
Denmark	74	26
Finland	89	11
Norway	71	29
Sweden	53	47
Israel	74	26
Turkey	63	37
Hong Kong	91	9
Singapore	73	27
South Africa	58	42
Argentina	76	24
Brazil	68	32
Colombia	65	35
Mexico	60	40

¹⁹ In surveys distributed to respondents who answered this question in 2008, we did not ask this question again. The 2008 data is included in these responses.

16: What is your country of origin?²⁰

	Country X	US	Canada	UK	Other
All	24	38	8	9	23
US	--	76	2	2	20
UK	--	10	6	51	33
Canada	--	13	60	5	22
Australia	53	9	1	18	19
New Zealand	24	12	6	24	35
Ireland	53	7	3	17	20
France	82	2	1	1	13
Denmark	60	2	0	7	30
Finland	67	0	0	0	33
Norway	55	10	2	0	33
Sweden	63	0	0	2	35
Israel	93	7	0	0	0
Turkey	90	1	0	0	9
Hong Kong	20	0	0	0	80
Singapore	23	31	0	0	46
South Africa	50	9	5	5	32
Argentina	88	0	0	0	12
Brazil	69	0	0	1	30
Colombia	69	0	0	0	31
Mexico	66	2	2	1	29

²⁰ “Country X” denotes the country in which respondents were surveyed.

17: Which of the following best describes your primary field of study?²¹

	Area Studies	Foreign Relations	Global Studies	Int'l Affairs	Int'l Relations	Int'l Studies	Political Science	Politics	Other
All	10	5	5	6	38	6	14	3	14
US	10	5	4	6	41	5	17	2	10
UK	8	4	7	5	36	9	9	6	17
Canada	8	7	8	6	37	8	12	2	13
Australia	9	4	7	6	43	5	5	7	15
New Zealand	6	0	0	0	47	12	6	0	29
Ireland	7	0	0	3	20	7	37	3	23
France	14	7	4	1	40	2	19	0	13
Denmark	9	7	9	2	20	2	11	11	27
Finland	13	0	13	0	25	0	25	0	25
Norway	5	0	5	0	21	0	48	0	21
Sweden	2	2	5	2	33	9	28	5	14
Israel	0	12	0	8	35	19	8	0	19
Turkey	23	5	4	9	25	3	13	3	15
Hong Kong	9	18	9	0	27	0	27	0	9
Singapore	14	5	0	5	32	5	18	14	9
South Africa	0	8	0	0	50	4	13	4	21
Argentina	0	3	0	6	33	15	15	0	27
Brazil	4	8	4	4	47	4	7	1	20
Colombia	0	2	10	23	25	17	8	6	8
Mexico	16	2	2	8	27	11	12	5	16

²¹ In surveys distributed to respondents who answered this question in 2008, we did not ask this question again. The 2008 data is included in these responses.

18: What is your primary subfield within politics or political science?²²

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Country X Politics	7	10	8	8	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	5	0	20	0	0	0	0	7	0	7
Comparative Politics/Area Studies	37	46	35	42	38	0	83	0	40	100	37	21	0	17	50	33	25	25	21	29	20
International Relations	24	29	23	21	13	100	8	19	20	0	26	26	50	7	50	67	50	0	29	14	0
Political Philosophy/Political Theory	9	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	40	0	0	0	25	14	29	33
Methods	2	2	3	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	0	0
Development Studies	2	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	10	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	7
Political Sociology	3	2	10	4	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Political Communication	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0
Women's/Gender Studies	<1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Policy/Public Administration	7	4	8	4	0	0	0	25	10	0	26	5	0	0	0	0	25	0	7	14	20
Other Subfield/Other Discipline	8	3	10	13	38	0	0	6	0	0	11	16	50	10	0	0	0	50	7	0	0

²² Only those respondents who indicated in the previous question that their primary field of study was “Political Science” or “Politics” received this question on their survey. The number of respondents to this question represents 10.2% of the total sample (355 out of 3464).

19: How would you estimate your current working schedule to be divided between these components of academic life?²³

	Research	Teaching²⁴	Consulting	Community Service
All	36	42	8	12
US	33	44	6	12
UK	38	41	5	10
Canada	36	36	10	15
Australia	36	42	5	9
New Zealand	34	45	5	8
Ireland	41	36	4	11
France	45	22	23	16
Denmark	43	33	13	9
Finland	34	33	4	12
Norway	49	32	8	9
Sweden	46	35	4	4
Israel	40	36	16	11
Turkey²⁵	39	44	--	10
Hong Kong	35	38	3	9
Singapore	38	31	8	10
South Africa	26	45	9	7
Argentina	37	40	14	13
Brazil	34	47	11	8
Colombia	31	48	15	16
Mexico	40	37	15	14

²³ Respondents were offered the following response options: 0-5%, 6-10%, 11-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, and 76-100%. To generate these averages, we identified the midpoint of each range and multiplied by the number of respondents; those responses were then averaged across each activity in order to compare the overall percent variation between countries across activities.

²⁴ Includes time spent in the classroom, time spent preparing for teaching, and time spent grading students' work.

²⁵ Due to a technical error, Turkey was not given "Consulting" as a possible option for this question.

20: Which of the following statements best characterizes your work? (Choose the closest option if none of them is an exact fit.)

	I employ a rational choice framework.	My work is broadly rationalist, but I do not employ a strict rational choice framework.	My work does not assume the rationality of actors.
All	7	46	47
US	7	50	43
UK	3	30	67
Canada	5	41	54
Australia	3	34	63
New Zealand	0	29	71
Ireland	13	40	47
France	2	48	50
Denmark	9	36	55
Finland	0	25	75
Norway	12	54	34
Sweden	4	39	57
Israel	8	56	36
Turkey	13	56	31
Hong Kong	18	45	36
Singapore	0	60	40
South Africa	12	52	36
Argentina	9	53	38
Brazil	16	44	41
Colombia	6	66	28
Mexico	9	60	31

21: Which of the following best describes your approach to the study of IR? If you do not think of your work as falling within one of these paradigms, please select the category in which most other scholars would place your work.

	Constructivism	English School	Feminism	Liberalism	Marxism	Realism	Other	I do not use paradigmatic analysis
All	22	4	2	15	4	16	15	22
US²⁶	20	2	2	20	2	16	12	26
UK	22	10	3	7	7	7	24	20
Can	25	6	4	10	5	19	16	16
Aus	22	5	4	9	5	13	22	21
NZ	11	17	11	6	6	11	28	11
Ire	17	0	0	13	7	20	3	40
Fra	24	2	0	7	2	23	17	24
Den	23	7	0	16	0	11	20	23
Fin	25	0	0	0	0	0	50	25
Nor	8	3	3	23	3	13	10	38
Swe	33	4	6	9	2	9	11	26
Isr	28	4	0	8	0	36	4	20
Tur	24	4	1	15	7	26	11	11
HK	9	0	0	18	9	18	9	36
Sin	25	0	0	10	0	5	20	40
SA	33	4	4	21	0	13	17	8
Arg	22	9	3	0	6	16	16	28
Bra	20	9	1	13	8	14	16	19
Col	29	6	2	21	6	13	8	15
Mex	19	2	0	11	8	19	25	17

²⁶ The values reported here differ very slightly (less than one percent due to rounding from those we reported in *Foreign Policy* in January/ February 2011, because the data for this question originally were generated with a slightly smaller sample. We believe the results are qualitatively equivalent. Before rounding, constructivism remains the largest school in the United States at 20.39 percent, compared to 19.9 percent for liberalism.

22: What is your main area of research within IR?

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex	
Comparative Foreign Policy	4	5	2	4	2	0	0	7	2	0	0	9	0	5	0	0	8	3	6	6	1	
Development Studies	4	5	3	4	2	6	3	2	16	0	7	2	0	2	0	5	0	3	2	6	4	
Global Civil Society	1	2	<1	2	1	0	0	1	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
History of the Int'l Relations Discipline	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Human Rights	2	3	1	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	5	4	3	2	2	3	
Human Security	1	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	12	0	0	2	1	
Int'l Environment	2	2	2	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	
Int'l Ethics	1	<1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	
Int'l History	2	<1	3	<1	2	0	0	4	5	13	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	
Int'l Law	2	3	1	<1	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	0	0	0	2	4	3	
Int'l Organization(s)	5	6	2	6	3	0	7	7	7	0	0	5	4	2	9	5	4	6	3	0	3	
Int'l Political Economy	12	13	11	13	9	12	17	5	2	0	12	5	4	6	27	14	16	3	15	4	9	
Int'l Relations of a Particular Region/Country	7	4	6	7	11	0	7	11	5	13	2	7	8	12	18	14	4	25	10	25	21	
Int'l Relations Theory	7	6	9	6	8	18	0	7	11	0	0	5	16	8	0	10	12	16	5	10	5	
Int'l Security	19	21	20	21	19	35	13	14	5	13	5	13	24	11	9	29	16	19	22	2	8	
Int'l Health	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	
Philosophy of Science	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
US Foreign Policy	5	8	4	2	3	0	3	5	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	
Country X Foreign Policy	3	--	1	6	6	0	3	4	5	0	2	4	16	13	0	0	12	3	12	6	7	
Other	9	8	12	10	13	12	3	13	14	13	12	11	16	9	9	0	8	9	8	13	13	
I am not an IR scholar	6	6	4	5	6	6	20	4	2	13	17	11	4	5	9	10	4	6	2	2	6	
European Studies/ European Integration	6	4	12	4	1	0	17	11	23	25	24	14	0	11	0	5	0	0	2	4	5	

23: What are your secondary areas of research within IR? Check all that apply.

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Comparative Foreign Policy	15	14	11	15	19	6	5	29	18	20	12	9	9	17	30	25	21	28	15	35	19
Development Studies ²⁷	12	13	12	13	24	24	0	6	7	20	15	19	0	5	30	0	29	17	--	13	9
Global Civil Society	8	8	8	12	11	12	10	8	2	20	9	11	0	5	0	6	0	10	8	22	12
History of the Int'l Relations Discipline	5	3	7	6	7	6	5	8	7	0	6	2	0	6	0	0	4	7	7	11	9
Human Rights	10	11	9	8	11	12	10	4	7	0	15	9	5	7	20	6	13	3	12	9	13
Human Security	9	7	12	13	24	18	0	6	5	0	0	6	9	5	10	13	21	3	10	11	13
Int'l Environment	5	6	4	3	11	6	0	3	9	0	12	6	0	3	0	0	21	0	4	2	12
Int'l Ethics	5	3	7	4	13	12	0	4	7	20	9	6	14	2	0	6	4	3	2	7	8
Int'l History	9	7	12	8	14	12	0	9	9	0	0	6	0	12	0	0	8	17	13	22	13
Int'l Law	8	10	6	8	12	24	0	5	16	20	9	0	5	4	0	0	17	7	7	2	6
Int'l Organization(s)	19	20	18	19	21	24	10	26	9	0	35	21	0	10	10	25	29	10	30	20	17
Int'l Political Economy	15	17	13	13	22	6	0	13	20	0	21	9	9	7	20	0	33	21	15	13	16
Int'l Relations of a Particular Region/Country	17	12	17	16	31	18	10	24	23	40	6	6	23	22	30	19	21	45	38	33	30
Int'l Relations Theory	20	16	25	24	24	29	25	19	20	20	21	26	27	19	10	44	21	48	33	20	22
Int'l Security	18	18	18	20	17	24	10	29	16	20	18	17	23	15	20	6	25	21	18	20	14
Int'l Health	1	1	<1	1	7	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	2	1
Philosophy of Science	3	3	4	2	4	0	0	5	5	20	3	4	0	3	0	6	0	3	5	0	8
US Foreign Policy	17	22	12	14	18	12	10	22	7	0	15	2	5	6	10	0	8	10	21	24	20
Country X Foreign Policy	9	--	8	17	21	6	10	15	5	20	15	15	14	32	20	6	42	48	39	28	30
European Studies/European Integration	9	7	9	8	8	6	40	23	16	20	9	15	9	18	10	0	8	14	5	9	5
Other	11	11	15	12	14	6	15	15	20	0	3	6	9	7	10	13	8	10	11	11	15

²⁷ Due to a technical error, Brazil was not given this response option.

24: In your research, what is the main region of the world that you study, if any?

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Central Asia	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
East Asia	7	9	5	7	21	6	3	1	2	14	3	4	0	2	64	19	0	0	4	7	5
Eastern Europe	3	3	5	2	1	0	3	7	7	29	3	5	0	7	0	0	0	3	0	2	0
Latin America	9	8	3	5	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	65	31	37	29
M. E. and N. Africa	8	8	9	8	3	6	7	14	9	0	0	13	29	19	0	0	0	3	2	9	4
North America	5	1	9	17	5	0	0	10	2	0	3	2	4	2	0	0	4	0	10	7	19
Oceania	<1	<1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia/Soviet Union	3	2	4	4	1	0	13	2	2	0	3	2	0	8	0	0	0	3	0	4	0
South Asia	2	2	2	1	4	6	0	1	2	0	5	4	8	0	0	10	0	0	1	0	0
Southeast Asia	2	2	3	2	13	6	0	2	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	2	<1
Sub-Saharan Africa	6	7	5	5	2	0	3	8	14	0	13	5	4	1	0	5	64	3	5	2	<1
Western Europe	12	10	22	10	4	6	37	13	25	14	35	27	8	15	18	5	0	0	4	7	9
Country X ²⁸	8	8	4	--	8	0	3	4	5	0	8	4	21	22	0	0	20	16	16	9	11
Transnt'l Actors/Int'l Orgs/Int'l Non-Gov. Orgs	10	9	9	11	7	11	10	20	16	29	13	16	8	7	9	14	4	6	11	2	11
Global/Use cross-regional data	14	19	10	12	12	33	13	8	9	0	13	9	4	5	9	5	8	0	12	9	9
None	9	10	9	10	10	28	3	5	5	14	5	5	8	6	0	10	0	0	4	4	2

²⁸ Due to a technical error, not all respondents in Canada were given this response choice.

25: In your research, what other areas of the world do you study? Check all that apply.

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Central Asia	6	6	7	4	4	18	7	8	5	0	5	4	0	15	0	11	4	0	2	15	5
East Asia	13	16	12	8	24	29	4	8	12	14	8	2	12	4	9	42	8	13	9	13	9
Eastern Europe	11	11	13	8	9	12	22	9	7	14	18	13	4	15	9	0	4	9	3	11	7
Latin America	13	13	6	11	9	12	0	5	9	14	13	2	0	2	9	5	8	25	32	32	33
M. E. and N. Africa	15	18	13	6	15	18	7	10	19	14	5	6	31	22	0	26	12	9	13	11	8
North America ²⁹	17	10	19	22	28	35	26	33	30	14	21	9	27	13	18	16	4	25	32	23	37
Oceania	3	2	1	3	14	47	0	1	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	4	1
Russia/Soviet Union	11	13	9	6	11	12	7	8	7	29	13	2	0	18	18	5	4	9	7	17	7
South Asia	10	11	10	12	22	12	11	10	7	29	5	9	0	2	9	21	16	3	4	17	3
Southeast Asia	9	9	8	7	25	18	4	5	5	14	8	2	12	4	36	32	4	6	4	13	4
Sub-Saharan Africa	9	10	12	9	7	24	4	11	14	29	15	13	8	2	9	5	24	3	4	4	3
Western Europe	23	23	22	21	17	24	22	30	33	71	21	20	8	31	18	16	20	31	21	21	16
Country X ³⁰	30	29	20	34	35	24	37	24	16	57	23	17	46	38	55	37	24	44	27	36	45
Transnt'l Actors/Int'l Orgs/Int'l Non-Gov. Orgs	25	26	25	27	35	24	30	32	26	14	15	22	19	15	18	21	20	31	25	32	27
Global/Use cross-regional data	19	20	16	17	22	18	11	19	21	29	21	19	15	13	18	16	28	22	17	21	27
None	11	12	15	14	6	12	7	10	7	0	5	19	4	10	9	5	8	0	10	6	4

²⁹ On the Canada survey, respondents were given the response choice of “USA” instead of “North America.” Due to a technical error on the France survey, respondents were given the response choice of “USA” instead of “North America.”

³⁰ Due to a technical error, not all respondents in Canada were given this response choice.

26: In general, how would you characterize your work in epistemological terms?

	Positivist	Non-positivist	Post-positivist
All	47	28	26
US	59	21	20
UK	27	38	35
Canada	42	28	30
Australia	35	34	31
New Zealand	33	33	33
Ireland	70	7	23
France	32	36	32
Denmark	34	48	18
Finland	14	14	71
Norway	53	21	26
Sweden	30	39	31
Israel	62	15	23
Turkey	40	30	30
Hong Kong	64	27	9
Singapore	60	30	10
South Africa	39	17	43
Argentina	50	37	13
Brazil	28	44	29
Colombia	37	30	33
Mexico	33	33	34

27: In your research, do you emphasize the role of ideational factors (such as culture, perceptions, ideology, beliefs, etc.) when explaining international outcomes?

	Yes	No
All	84	16
US	80	20
UK	92	8
Canada	86	14
Australia	89	11
New Zealand	94	6
Ireland	63	37
France	93	7
Denmark	88	12
Finland	86	14
Norway	82	18
Sweden	93	7
Israel	92	8
Turkey	95	5
Hong Kong	73	27
Singapore	95	5
South Africa	88	12
Argentina	94	6
Brazil	77	23
Colombia	88	13
Mexico	88	12

28: In your research, what methods do you primarily employ?

	Quantitative Analysis	Qualitative Analysis	Formal Modeling	Experimental	Counter-factual Analysis	Pure Theory	Legal or Ethical Analysis	Policy Analysis
All	15	58	1	< 1	< 1	3	4	17
US	23	56	2	1	< 1	2	3	11
UK	6	69	0	< 1	< 1	4	7	13
Can	6	71	<1	0	< 1	2	2	17
Aus	4	66	0	0	1	6	5	17
NZ	11	56	0	0	0	11	11	11
Ire	37	53	0	0	0	0	7	3
Fra	2	57	0	5	1	7	1	26
Den	2	75	0	0	0	2	5	16
Fin	14	86	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nor	28	53	5	0	0	3	3	10
Swe	7	77	0	0	0	4	2	11
Isr	23	62	0	0	0	0	4	12
Tur	9	43	2	0	0	3	4	40
HK	36	45	0	0	0	9	0	9
Sin	10	76	0	0	0	5	0	10
SA	12	64	4	0	0	4	0	16
Arg	0	67	3	0	0	0	3	27
Bra	8	44	2	2	< 1	4	3	36
Col	6	63	2	2	0	0	4	23
Mex	16	44	< 1	0	< 1	3	3	32

29: In your research, what other methods do you employ, not including your primary methods? Please check all that apply.

	Quantitative Analysis	Qualitative Analysis	Formal Modeling	Experimental	Counter-factual Analysis	Pure Theory	Legal or Ethical Analysis	Policy Analysis	None
All	22	27	7	5	13	16	15	43	8
US	23	30	9	6	16	14	15	41	7
UK	14	20	3	2	10	19	15	45	11
Can	23	17	5	3	18	18	17	43	7
Aus	25	22	2	2	9	20	19	49	9
NZ	17	28	6	0	11	22	28	50	6
Ire	12	42	23	4	15	15	0	23	12
Fra	17	20	5	6	10	20	12	54	7
Den	33	15	5	8	18	23	18	55	3
Fin	14	14	14	0	14	14	43	29	14
Nor	29	34	7	2	10	17	20	39	2
Swe	29	11	4	2	11	31	11	42	7
Isr	21	29	4	4	0	8	8	38	8
Tur	15	32	5	5	12	15	14	36	6
HK	9	45	18	0	0	9	9	55	0
Sin	15	15	0	0	10	15	10	50	15
SA	16	28	4	0	0	12	12	40	8
Arg	23	20	0	13	3	27	3	60	3
Bra	21	33	6	6	9	17	10	43	13
Col	37	33	9	7	2	15	13	39	11
Mex	34	34	8	10	7	12	13	44	9

30: Which of the following qualitative methods do you use? Please check all that apply.³¹

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Single Case Study	63	63	56	66	59	73	70	58	69	71	60	67	64	63	56	67	62	69	56	57	76
Comparative Case Study	79	87	69	78	76	80	74	70	82	57	89	69	77	62	89	83	71	88	61	77	77
Narrative Analysis	30	30	37	31	34	47	33	16	15	71	23	33	27	31	56	39	19	15	15	30	17
Discourse Analysis	32	22	45	42	45	33	33	49	36	86	29	46	32	36	22	33	19	19	39	43	43
Ethnography	12	11	15	14	19	13	4	30	10	43	6	13	0	9	11	22	10	4	7	11	11
Process Tracing	37	44	27	36	24	27	33	53	44	0	31	50	18	36	11	61	43	19	27	20	27
Thick Description	23	25	30	28	24	13	19	21	33	0	17	15	14	14	22	33	14	8	18	5	9
Analytic Induction	14	14	7	11	16	7	19	18	21	0	6	8	9	37	22	28	24	12	13	18	13
Critical Theory	20	13	33	28	34	33	15	12	18	29	14	17	5	26	22	6	24	27	20	32	29
Dialectical Research	4	3	4	4	3	0	0	4	0	0	3	2	0	6	0	0	0	4	7	9	13
Hermeneutics	8	5	9	7	8	27	0	5	26	29	0	6	9	20	0	6	0	8	8	27	11
Ethical Inquiry	8	10	9	6	14	27	0	5	8	43	6	4	5	1	0	6	5	0	2	5	7
Other	4	4	4	6	3	0	4	5	8	29	0	4	5	<1	0	0	5	4	4	0	5

³¹ Only those respondents who indicated that they used qualitative methods in the previous questions (“In your research, what methods do you primarily employ?” OR “In your research, what other methods do you employ, not including your primary methods? Please check all that apply.”) received this question. The number of respondents to this question represents 73.3% of the total sample (2504 out of 3464).

31: Does your research tend to be basic or applied? By basic research we mean research for the sake of knowledge, without any particular immediate policy application in mind. Conversely, applied research is done with specific policy applications in mind.³²

	Primarily basic	Both basic and applied, but more basic than applied	Both equally	Both basic and applied, but more applied than basic	Primarily applied
All	21	38	15	15	11
US	21	39	16	11	12
UK	28	41	13	12	7
Can	18	43	15	15	9
Aus	20	41	14	9	16
NZ	17	33	6	33	11
Ire	20	37	20	20	3
Fra	29	29	13	23	6
Den	18	44	13	16	9
Fin	71	29	0	0	0
Nor	21	46	5	23	5
Swe	23	48	13	13	4
Isr	17	46	21	8	8
Tur	7	25	18	38	13
HK	10	70	10	0	10
Sin	36	7	14	36	7
SA	14	32	18	18	18
Arg	7	40	20	23	10
Bra	25	30	13	18	15
Col	21	34	17	26	2
Mex	25	27	22	16	10

³² In surveys distributed to respondents who answered this question in 2008, we did not ask this question again. The 2008 data is included in these responses.

32: Which of the following best describes what motivates your research?

	Appeal to popular audience	Issue area	Methodology	Paradigm	Policy relevance/ current events	Region	Other
All	3	39	3	5	33	7	9
US	2	40	2	4	35	6	10
UK	3	42	2	4	26	8	16
Canada	5	46	1	2	31	3	12
Australia	< 1	41	2	6	38	5	7
New Zealand	0	29	0	6	35	6	24
Ireland	3	50	7	3	27	3	7
France	6	53	1	5	22	9	3
Denmark	0	34	2	9	43	5	7
Finland	0	57	14	0	14	14	0
Norway	0	38	5	0	41	5	10
Sweden	0	49	2	5	27	7	9
Israel	0	33	4	13	38	4	8
Turkey	< 1	22	5	22	32	14	4
Hong Kong	0	70	0	0	30	0	0
Singapore	6	22	0	6	39	11	17
South Africa	0	43	4	0	35	9	9
Argentina	3	41	3	10	28	7	7
Brazil	< 1	38	8	2	39	10	2
Colombia	9	41	2	2	33	9	4
Mexico	14	29	3	4	35	10	4

33: Which of the following best describes your positions generally on social issues?³³

	Very Left/ liberal	Left/ liberal	Slightly Left/ liberal	Middle of the Road	Slightly Right/ conservative	Right/ conservative	Very Right/ conservative
All	17	36	20	19	5	3	< 1
US	26	40	13	12	4	3	1
UK	13	40	25	15	5	2	< 1
Canada	15	40	--	41	--	4	0
Australia	8	45	23	14	7	3	0
New Zealand	12	24	24	35	0	6	0
Ireland	13	40	33	13	0	0	0
France	18	40	--	31	--	11	0
Denmark	10	36	21	21	10	2	0
Finland	0	0	67	33	0	0	0
Norway	3	42	19	22	11	3	0
Sweden	9	28	23	26	9	4	0
Israel	13	22	26	35	4	0	0
Turkey	2	22	34	26	14	2	0
Hong Kong	0	20	50	10	20	0	0
Singapore	5	37	26	26	5	0	0
South Africa	0	14	38	43	5	0	0
Argentina	0	17	48	28	7	0	0
Brazil	< 1	22	47	23	6	1	0
Colombia	0	16	42	18	22	2	0
Mexico	0	22	48	25	5	0	0

³³ The U.S. survey offered the responses “liberal” and “conservative.” All other surveys offered the responses “left” and “right.” Due to a technical error, the France and Canada surveys did not receive “Slightly Left/liberal” and “Slightly Right/conservative” response options.

34: Which of the following best describes your positions generally on economic issues?³⁴

	Very Left/ liberal	Left/ liberal	Slightly Left/ liberal	Middle of the Road	Slightly Right/ conservative	Right/ conservative	Very Right/ conservative
All	12	28	23	20	11	4	1
US	18	31	17	17	10	5	1
UK	11	37	24	15	10	2	< 1
Can	10	24	23	23	14	6	0
Australia	8	33	26	14	11	6	< 1
New Zealand	12	24	18	29	6	12	0
Ireland	7	27	33	13	10	7	3
France	18	24	17	19	19	3	0
Denmark	7	26	19	19	26	2	2
Finland	0	14	43	29	14	0	0
Norway	8	19	28	19	19	3	3
Sweden	8	15	30	30	13	4	0
Israel	9	17	22	35	9	9	0
Turkey	2	19	35	29	13	2	< 1
Hong Kong	0	10	30	40	10	10	0
Singapore	5	16	42	11	21	5	0
South Africa	0	19	29	38	14	0	0
Argentina	0	20	37	37	7	0	0
Brazil	2	21	39	30	6	1	1
Colombia	0	22	31	22	22	2	0
Mexico	0	24	41	25	10	1	0

³⁴ The U.S. survey offered the responses “liberal” and “conservative.” All other surveys offered the responses “left” and “right.”

35: What is your current status within your home department?³⁵

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Chaired Professor	4	7	--	--	3	0	--	--	4	14	0	7	13	9	10	0	4	--	--	--	--
Full Professor	25	27	23	28	12	6	3	25	13	29	36	9	13	10	40	10	22	48	15	30	75
Associate Professor	28	29	33	32	28	24	27	--	33	0	38	18	22	23	0	35	9	24	30	32	14
Assistant Professor	25	23	36	21	13	29	67	--	13	0	3	16	22	43	40	40	17	21	33	30	2
Instructor or Lecturer	6	4	< 1	9	28	29	--	--	2	29	3	16	17	10	0	0	39	0	1	2	0
Adjunct or Visiting Instructor/Professor	4	5	< 1	1	3	6	--	18	0	0	0	2	4	1	10	10	0	7	2	2	3
Emeritus	1	2	--	3	1	0	--	--	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Other	4	2	--	4	6	6	--	17	4	0	5	16	9	0	0	5	0	0	16	4	5
Associate Lecturer	< 1	< 1	--	--	1	0	--	--	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	--	--	--	--
Research Assistant/Fellow, Teaching Fellow, or Post-Doctoral Fellow	3	< 1	4	2	5	0	3	21	22	29	15	16	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Maître de Conférences³⁶	< 1	--	--	--	--	--	--	18	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Tutorial Fellow, Adjunct Instructor, or Professor Emeritus³⁷	< 1	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

³⁵ Because each survey was tailored to each individual country, some of the professorial titles vary across surveys. Some options were collapsed into the categories reported here. Not all response options were offered in every country. Those responses that were not offered in particular surveys are indicated by "--" in the report.

³⁶ "Maître de conférences" was only given as a response choice on the France survey. On the advice of our local partners in France, this response choice includes assistant professors and associate professors in France (depending on their CV) and also includes adjuncts in the case of respondents affiliated with the institution IEP de Paris. We acknowledge that this separate response choice may lower the results for the aforementioned categories.

³⁷ "Tutorial fellow, adjunct instructor or professor emeritus" was only given as a response choice on the UK survey. We acknowledge that this separate response choice may lower the results for other options with overlapping positions.

36: Other than your native language, how many foreign languages do you understand well enough to conduct scholarly research?

	None	One	Two	Three or more
All	22	37	26	14
US	30	39	22	9
UK	31	34	23	12
Canada	23	38	27	12
Australia	49	35	10	6
New Zealand	33	28	28	11
Ireland	24	38	34	3
France	0	39	37	24
Denmark	0	24	29	47
Finland	0	14	43	43
Norway	0	28	51	21
Sweden	0	39	39	21
Israel	4	54	25	17
Turkey	0	56	30	13
Hong Kong	0	50	40	10
Singapore	15	45	25	15
South Africa	26	35	30	9
Argentina	0	33	30	37
Brazil	0	4	46	50
Colombia	0	49	43	9
Mexico	1	32	45	22

37: How often do you rely on material not written in your native language to conduct scholarly research?

	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Regularly
All	14	20	19	46
US	20	28	24	27
UK	21	21	20	38
Canada	11	22	27	40
Australia	24	35	18	23
New Zealand	22	28	39	11
Ireland	20	17	27	37
France	0	1	5	93
Denmark	0	4	7	89
Finland	0	0	0	100
Norway	0	3	8	90
Sweden	2	2	7	89
Israel	0	4	13	83
Turkey	0	0	3	97
Hong Kong	0	10	0	90
Singapore	15	15	30	40
South Africa	13	35	13	39
Argentina	0	0	0	100
Brazil	< 1	5	11	84
Colombia	0	0	15	85
Mexico	0	0	6	94

38: Which of the following have you cited in your scholarship and/or used as a teaching/grading tool? Please check all that apply.³⁸

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Email Correspondence																					
Scholarship	35	31	36	45	38	50	28	80	25	43	36	32	25	36	38	56	30	31	42	33	29
Teaching	36	40	20	39	20	13	17	74	15	29	44	32	23	27	25	31	17	52	50	35	37
Blog Post																					
Scholarship	20	20	19	24	23	31	17	42	23	43	11	12	21	27	0	25	4	14	16	23	18
Teaching	32	39	30	30	28	44	45	22	33	43	6	14	19	14	0	19	22	21	21	42	22
Twitter Entry																					
Scholarship	3	2	3	2	2	0	3	7	0	0	3	4	5	0	0	6	4	0	6	0	1
Teaching	5	5	5	2	7	6	7	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	0	0	17	0	7	0	9
Facebook Content																					
Scholarship	4	3	5	3	2	0	10	16	0	29	8	6	6	0	0	6	0	0	5	0	5
Teaching	8	9	6	6	5	13	7	3	0	0	6	8	8	9	0	0	9	3	12	7	11
Wiki, such as Wikipedia																					
Scholarship	12	9	6	14	7	13	0	35	20	43	19	6	22	5	0	13	9	24	18	7	12
Teaching	29	36	19	31	25	38	14	35	28	71	42	18	24	5	38	31	13	28	18	12	15
Wikileaks Document																					
Scholarship	15	10	15	15	20	31	17	42	10	0	6	10	20	18	13	13	4	21	22	14	32
Teaching	21	21	19	24	21	38	28	12	15	14	11	14	17	18	38	13	17	28	25	19	25
Podcast																					
Scholarship	6	4	7	8	10	25	3	4	3	0	14	2	10	0	0	0	4	7	10	14	7
Teaching	22	24	29	22	34	44	48	1	8	0	25	10	13	9	25	19	26	3	11	12	8
Youtube Video																					
Scholarship	10	6	10	13	14	13	21	20	8	29	0	8	14	18	0	6	0	17	24	21	14
Teaching	57	63	59	57	70	81	69	38	33	86	31	48	34	41	75	56	43	48	55	47	46
Other Web Content																					
Scholarship	54	50	60	52	56	50	55	26	50	57	58	68	68	41	38	44	65	62	64	58	58
Teaching	60	62	66	53	65	69	69	26	48	43	56	66	58	59	50	56	83	55	62	60	48

³⁸ The results displayed represent the percentage of respondents who answered that a particular option is cited in their scholarship or used as a teaching/grading tool out of the total number of respondents who selected at least one option for scholarship and/or teaching/grading.

39: Where do you get your information on current events? Please rank your top three sources, using 1 to indicate the source of the greatest amount of information, 2 for the next greatest source, etc.³⁹

	Blogs	Cable Television	Newspapers	Network Television	Online News Aggregators	Podcasts	Radio News	Social Networking Sites	Twitter
All	24	31	92	24	58	5	42	7	4
US	28	30	91	17	57	4	49	5	4
UK	22	13	93	44	50	5	53	7	3
Can	24	29	94	24	61	7	37	5	4
Aus	22	13	96	42	53	11	47	3	5
NZ	33	6	78	28	78	0	50	11	6
Ire	28	7	100	45	52	3	45	7	10
Fra	37	36	98	19	27	2	47	12	3
Den	23	33	91	12	60	9	44	9	2
Fin	14	43	100	43	57	0	29	14	0
Nor	15	31	97	21	64	5	46	5	3
Swe	13	23	95	52	41	5	45	13	5
Isr	8	25	92	54	67	4	38	8	4
Tur	20	55	96	27	51	4	20	9	7
HK	0	60	100	0	70	20	10	10	10
Sin	5	21	100	21	84	5	26	32	0
SA	17	35	83	35	65	0	39	4	13
Arg	27	50	93	10	73	3	10	13	0
Bra	16	52	91	23	82	3	13	8	4
Col	20	53	82	16	80	2	18	11	2
Mex	11	47	88	13	78	3	38	13	2

³⁹ Results represent the percentage of respondents who listed each option as a part of their top three rankings.

40: Which of the following apply to your use of, or policy about technology? Please check all that apply.

	Permit use of laptops in class	Permit use of cell phones in class	Allow to cite Wikipedia entries in research papers	Have edited a Wikipedia entry in area of expertise	Have contributed to a blog	Regularly contribute to a blog
All	94	7	15	7	27	8
US	94	6	15	7	28	7
UK	96	8	10	6	32	6
Can	97	7	13	9	31	8
Aus	97	5	8	7	29	7
NZ	94	0	35	18	24	29
Ire	100	7	3	0	28	7
Fra	94	1	13	7	24	10
Den	93	9	26	9	37	12
Fin	100	14	29	0	29	14
Nor	92	17	25	17	36	3
Swe	98	9	23	9	23	4
Isr	100	0	38	8	8	0
Tur	81	16	27	7	14	13
HK	90	0	30	0	10	0
Sin	100	0	7	0	20	0
SA	95	10	15	0	20	5
Arg	97	3	21	7	24	7
Bra	95	10	12	7	20	14
Col	95	14	7	7	26	14
Mex	95	8	19	2	16	14

III. The International Relations Discipline

41: What percentage of IR literature do you estimate is devoted to each of these paradigms today?⁴⁰

	Constructivism	Realism	Liberalism	Marxism	Feminism	English School	Non-paradigmatic	Other
All	20	33	28	9	7	9	17	13
US	17	32	29	7	7	6	19	13
UK	23	31	26	9	9	11	16	9
Can	20	31	28	9	8	8	13	18
Aus	25	33	28	8	8	12	14	6
NZ	20	28	23	9	9	7	21	10
Ire	18	29	24	7	9	9	11	3
Fra	31	29	22	6	7	12	18	5
Den	21	33	27	6	6	9	21	13
Fin	20	18	13	5	7	9	18	3
Nor	19	30	28	8	5	8	19	8
Swe	22	25	26	7	9	9	10	3
Isr	31	39	23	8	8	9	22	29
Tur	22	43	28	13	7	12	14	16
HK	13	44	17	6	5	8	16	0
Sin	21	38	32	5	3	10	9	8
SA	23	39	35	18	10	15	18	5
Arg	27	37	29	14	8	19	16	3
Bra	24	36	31	14	7	17	16	25
Col	26	36	34	18	7	16	16	25
Mex	30	38	35	16	12	19	23	19

⁴⁰ Respondents were offered the following response options: 0-5%, 6-10%, 11-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, and 76-100%. To generate these averages, we identified the midpoint of each range and multiplied by the number of respondents; those responses were then averaged across each paradigm in order to compare the overall percent variation across paradigms. Rows add to more than 100 percent because respondents were asked to estimate a percentage for each paradigm. Finland (93 percent), Hong Kong (109 percent), and Ireland (110 percent) were closer to 100 percent, while scholars in Mexico (192 percent), Colombia (178 percent), and Brazil (170 percent) overestimated by larger amounts. The ranking of paradigms is likely the most relevant feature of this table, rather than the absolute amounts estimated.

42: List four scholars who have produced the best work in the field of IR in the past 20 years. Please provide both first and last names.⁴¹

Rank	Scholar	All	US	UK	Can
1	Alexander Wendt	24	21	30	28
2	Robert Keohane	21	21	20	22
3	John Mearsheimer	14	17	5	8
4	James Fearon	14	18	1	6
5	Joseph Nye	13	15	7	13
6	Robert Jervis	10	11	8	8
7	Martha Finnemore	9	10	9	5
8	Peter Katzenstein	9	9	8	6
9	Kenneth Waltz	8	8	8	13
10	John Ikenberry	8	8	6	5
11	David Lake	7	8	3	5
12	Stephen Walt	6	7	4	5
13	Bruce Bueno de Mesquita	5	7	1	3
14	Barry Buzan	5	3	14	11
15	Stephen Krasner	5	6	4	0
15	Samuel Huntington	5	6	0	6
15	Beth Simmons	5	6	2	2
18	Jack Snyder	5	6	2	0
19	John Ruggie	4	4	1	11
19	Michael Barnett	4	5	1	9

⁴¹ This question was asked of half the respondents in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada. The other half of respondents in these countries received question 43. Respondents were randomly assigned to one group or the other. The results displayed here represent the percentage of respondents who answered that a particular scholar belonged in the top four out of the total number of respondents who listed at least one scholar's name.

43: List four scholars who have had the greatest influence on the field of IR in the past 20 years. Please provide both first and last names.⁴²

Rank	Scholar	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
1	Alexander Wendt	47	45	53	57	48	64	36	58	43	100	33	50	35	51	50	88	50	43	33	57	31
2	Robert Keohane	39	41	36	36	22	27	23	28	57	50	40	63	18	31	20	75	19	62	51	47	44
3	Kenneth Waltz	26	26	22	19	30	36	27	12	57	0	40	42	18	36	33	50	13	38	26	17	23
4	Joseph Nye	20	19	20	21	14	9	14	21	13	50	40	13	24	29	33	0	32	5	31	27	23
5	John Mearsheimer	19	24	20	8	26	18	14	21	13	0	13	13	0	16	20	25	0	10	11	13	6
6	James Fearon	11	20	5	8	2	0	5	0	0	0	13	0	6	2	0	13	0	0	0	0	0
7	Samuel Huntington	10	10	9	4	11	18	0	7	13	0	13	13	24	24	0	0	19	5	6	20	6
8	Robert Cox	8	2	16	29	12	27	18	0	4	0	0	4	0	10	0	13	13	14	16	0	9
9	Barry Buzan	8	2	15	8	11	9	14	19	13	50	7	21	6	18	33	0	25	24	20	23	4
10	Peter Katzenstein	7	10	6	8	11	0	9	2	9	0	7	0	6	<1	20	13	0	5	0	0	4
11	Bruce Bueno de Mesquita	7	12	1	4	0	0	5	0	0	0	13	0	0	<1	20	0	0	0	<1	0	2
12	Robert Jervis	7	11	1	1	2	9	0	5	0	0	0	0	19	2	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
13	Stephen Walt	6	8	2	3	6	9	14	9	9	0	0	4	6	6	33	0	0	19	2	7	2
14	Stephen Krasner	5	5	5	8	9	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	5	20	13	0	5	8	7	2
15	Martha Finnemore	5	7	1	10	2	18	9	5	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	13	6	0	2	3	0
16	John Ikenberry	5	6	9	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	38	0	0	0	0	4
17	Bruce Russett	5	7	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	8	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	John Ruggie	4	3	9	11	7	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	3	8
19	Susan Strange	4	2	7	10	10	0	9	9	4	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	14	3	0	8
20	James Rosenau	4	2	3	6	1	0	0	19	0	0	0	4	12	7	0	0	6	5	4	3	4

⁴² This question was asked of all respondents in every country surveyed, except the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada. In these three countries, we randomly assigned half the respondents to receive question 42 and half to receive question 43. To calculate the “All” column in this table, we double-weighted responses in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada to accurately reflect the relative percentage of respondents in these countries who selected each response.

44: Aside from you, please list four scholars who have produced the most interesting scholarship in the past five years. Please provide both first and last names.⁴³

Rank	Scholar	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
1	Alexander Wendt	12	7	4	13	4	0	0	6	0	0	6	10	15	16	0	25	6	18	4	19	14
2	Joseph Nye	11	8	2	4	3	8	5	9	0	0	6	0	0	12	40	0	19	0	7	11	6
3	Martha Finnemore	10	8	2	4	4	17	11	3	5	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	6	5	4	0	2
4	John Mearsheimer	9	7	4	2	2	8	5	0	14	0	11	5	0	12	0	0	0	9	5	4	0
5	Peter Katzenstein	9	5	4	7	4	0	5	3	14	0	17	10	0	4	40	0	0	0	<1	7	4
6	Stephen Walt	8	5	3	3	2	8	0	0	10	0	11	5	0	11	0	0	0	14	<1	4	0
7	Michael Barnett	8	5	1	7	5	8	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	2	0	38	6	0	<1	0	2
8	John Ikenberry	7	6	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	2	0	25	0	23	<1	4	2
9	Kathryn Sikkink	7	6	4	<1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	1	0	13	13	0	0	0	4
10	Barry Buzan	7	2	8	3	3	0	0	6	0	0	6	10	0	22	20	0	0	23	10	19	4
11	James Fearon	7	5	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	<1	4	0
12	David Lake	6	5	<1	6	2	0	5	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	2
13	Beth Simmons	6	6	<1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
14	Robert Keohane	5	2	4	2	2	8	5	0	5	0	11	5	0	4	0	0	6	5	5	11	8
15	Daniel Drezner	5	4	2	2	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	Bruce Bueno de Mesquita	5	4	<1	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	2
17	Daniel Deudney	4	3	4	2	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	Patrick Jackson	4	3	4	2	0	8	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	Andrew Hurrell	4	<1	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	10	7	6
20	John Mueller	4	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	Robert Jervis	4	3	2	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

⁴³ The results displayed represent the percentage of respondents who answered that a particular scholar belonged in the top four out of the total number of respondents who listed at least one scholar's name.

45: Do you believe that a job candidate who completed his or her PhD in an American university is generally advantaged on the Country X job market compared to one who completed his or her PhD in a Country X university?⁴⁴

	Yes	No	Don't Know
All	50	35	16
US⁴⁵	84	7	10
UK	31	49	20
Canada	54	32	14
Australia	46	39	15
New Zealand	47	27	27
Ireland	65	19	15
France	24	52	24
Denmark	24	45	31
Finland	17	83	0
Norway	35	39	26
Sweden	21	48	31
Israel	60	25	15
Turkey	85	9	6
Hong Kong	88	13	0
Singapore	100	0	0
South Africa	53	26	21
Argentina	63	25	13
Brazil	45	41	14
Colombia	68	15	18
Mexico	69	23	8

⁴⁴ “Country X” represents the country name in which the respondent is located.

⁴⁵ The U.S. survey asked respondents if they believed that a job candidate who completed a PhD at a U.S. university is generally advantaged in the U.S. job market compared to another candidate who completed a PhD elsewhere.

Table 2: Worldwide Aggregate Journal Results⁴⁶

Rank the four journals that publish articles with the greatest influence on the way IR scholars think about international relations. (1 indicates the journal with the greatest influence, 2 indicates that with the next greatest influence, etc.) These can include IR journals, general political science journals and/or non-political science journals.

Rank	Journal	All
1	International Organization	65
2	International Studies Quarterly	42
3	International Security	39
4	Foreign Affairs	33
5	American Political Science Review	23
6	World Politics	23
7	European Journal of Int'l Relations	20
8	Journal of Conflict Resolution	15
9	Foreign Policy	13
10	Review of International Studies	11
11	Millennium: Journal of International Studies	10
12	American Journal of Political Science	9
13	International Affairs	9
14	Security Studies	8
15	Review of International Political Economy	6
16	Journal of Peace Research	5
17	International Studies Review	5
18	International Relations	4
19	Comparative Politics	4
20	Global Governance	4

⁴⁶ This table reports the aggregate results for questions 46 and 47. The results for response option "Other" from question 47 were not reported in this table because they have no comparable option on the open-ended question 46. The results displayed represent the percentage of respondents who listed a particular journal among the top four out of the total number of respondents who listed at least one journal. Results are presented this way to be comparable with data from 2008 and before.

46: Rank the four journals that publish articles with the greatest influence on the way IR scholars think about international relations. (1 indicates the journal with the greatest influence, 2 indicates that with the next greatest influence, etc.) These can include IR journals, general political science journals and/or non-political science journals.⁴⁷

Rank	Journal	All	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
1	International Organization	58	62	67	80	67	73	76	74	54	36	41
2	Foreign Affairs	38	10	31	15	0	13	16	58	43	54	57
3	International Security	27	10	39	25	33	20	20	63	26	18	22
4	International Studies Quarterly	24	38	14	15	67	47	44	16	18	18	26
5	World Politics	16	19	19	30	0	47	28	5	5	18	20
6	Foreign Policy	16	0	19	10	0	13	0	32	15	29	19
7	European Journal of International Relations	13	33	17	30	67	20	32	5	3	11	9
8	American Political Science Review	12	24	8	15	0	27	24	0	7	7	15
9	Review of International Studies	10	19	14	15	67	0	20	16	6	14	2
10	Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	0
11	International Affairs	8	19	6	0	0	13	4	11	9	7	4
12	Millenium: Journal of International Studies	8	5	3	15	67	0	4	16	12	11	6
12	Journal of Conflict Resolution	6	19	6	0	0	33	4	0	5	7	0
14	Contexto Internacional	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0
15	Le Monde Diplomatique	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	7	6
16	International Relations	4	0	6	5	33	7	8	5	2	4	2
17	Journal of Peace Research	3	0	3	0	0	20	8	11	0	7	2
18	Foro Internacional	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4	13
18	American Journal of Political Science	3	10	0	0	0	7	0	5	2	4	4
18	Relaciones Internacionales	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

⁴⁷ The wording of this question is identical to that in the following question. This table reports the results for Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, Mexico, Norway, and Sweden, where responses were open-ended. The results displayed represent the percentage of respondents who listed a particular journal among the top four out of the total number of respondents who listed at least one journal. Results are presented this way to be comparable with data from 2008 and before.

47: Rank the four journals that publish articles with the greatest influence on the way IR scholars think about international relations. (1 indicates the journal with the greatest influence, 2 indicates that with the next greatest influence, etc.) These can include IR journals, general political science journals and/or non-political science journals.⁴⁸

Rank	Journal	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA
1	International Organization	66	71	66	69	58	45	55	40	67	91	38
2	International Studies Quarterly	46	52	36	47	39	82	55	21	33	36	13
3	International Security	42	45	37	38	47	0	45	29	83	73	13
4	Foreign Affairs	32	32	17	26	33	27	25	55	50	9	63
5	American Political Science Review	26	32	14	21	7	9	40	17	17	9	19
6	World Politics	25	28	15	26	17	9	5	20	17	36	19
7	European Journal of Int'l Relations	21	12	52	27	35	45	25	24	0	27	0
8	Journal of Conflict Resolution	16	22	6	8	4	0	30	12	0	9	13
9	Foreign Policy	12	13	3	8	15	0	0	21	0	0	38
10	Review of International Studies	12	4	37	21	19	45	10	10	0	9	13
11	American Journal of Political Science	11	13	6	6	4	0	15	10	17	18	6
12	Millennium	10	4	19	19	19	9	0	25	0	9	25
13	International Affairs	10	4	18	6	20	18	5	31	33	0	19
14	Security Studies	9	10	5	8	7	0	30	5	0	18	13
15	Other	7	5	12	10	7	9	15	8	0	0	0
16	Review of International Political Economy	7	5	13	14	10	18	5	2	0	9	13
17	Journal of Peace Research	6	6	5	3	2	9	20	6	0	0	0
18	International Studies Review	5	6	2	3	7	27	5	5	17	9	25
19	Comparative Politics	4	5	2	4	3	0	5	5	33	0	0
20	Global Governance	4	3	6	8	5	0	0	2	0	0	0
20	International Relations	4	2	6	5	8	9	0	10	0	0	6
20	Survival	4	2	5	3	11	0	0	9	0	9	13

⁴⁸ The wording of this question is identical to that in the previous question. This table reports the 2011 results for all countries surveyed in 2008 (excluding Ireland). On the advice of our local partners in Turkey, respondents in Turkey also received this question. The 2008 responses were used to generate the responses that were offered to respondents in 2011. Unlike question 45, which was provided to nine new countries and Ireland, the ten countries that received this question were offered closed response options, although they were able to list additional or alternate journals. The results displayed represent the percentage of respondents who listed a particular journal among the top four out of the total number of respondents who listed at least one journal. Results are presented this way to be comparable with data from 2008 and before.

Table 3: Worldwide Aggregate Press Results⁴⁹

Rank the four presses that publish books with the greatest influence on the way IR scholars think about international relations. (1 indicates the press with the greatest influence, 2 indicates that with the next greatest influence, etc.)

Rank	Journal	All
1	Cambridge University Press	82
2	Oxford University Press	56
3	Princeton University Press	46
4	Cornell University Press	38
5	Routledge	32
6	Palgrave Macmillan	20
7	Columbia University Press	16
8	Lynne Rienner	15
9	Harvard University Press	12
10	MIT Press	10
11	University of Michigan Press	8
12	SAGE Publications	7
12	Stanford University Press	7
14	University of Chicago Press	7
15	Yale University Press	6
16	Polity	5
17	University of California Press	4
18	Editora Universidade de Brasilia	1
19	Presses de Science Po	< 1
20	Editora Saraiva	< 1

⁴⁹ This table reports the aggregate results for questions 48 and 49. The results for response option “Other” from question 49 were not reported in this table because they have no comparable option on the open-ended question 48. The results displayed represent the percentage of respondents who listed a particular press among the top four out of the total number of respondents who listed at least one press. Results are presented this way to be comparable with data from 2008 and before.

48: Rank the four presses that publish books with the greatest influence on the way IR scholars think about international relations. (1 indicates the press with the greatest influence, 2 indicates that with the next greatest influence, etc.)⁵⁰

Rank	Press	Percentage
1	Cambridge University Press	68
2	Oxford University Press	52
3	Routledge	40
4	Princeton University Press	27
5	Palgrave Macmillan	23
6	Cornell University Press	11
7	Editora Universidade de Brasilia	9
8	Columbia University Press	7
9	Harvard University Press	7
10	MIT Press	6
10	SAGE Publications	6
12	Polity	6
13	Presses de Science Po	5
14	Editora Saraiva	5
14	Lynne Rienner	5
16	Ashgate	4
17	Editora UNESP	3
17	University of Chicago Press	3
19	Pearson Longman	3
19	Stanford University Press	3
19	Juruá Editora	3

⁵⁰ The wording of this question is identical to that in the following question. This table reports the results for Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, Mexico, Norway, and Sweden, where responses were open-ended. The results displayed represent the percentage of respondents who listed a particular press among the top four out of the total number of respondents who listed at least one press. Results are presented this way to be comparable with data from 2008 and before.

49: Rank the four presses that publish books with the greatest influence on the way IR scholars think about international relations. (1 indicates the press with the greatest influence, 2 indicates that with the next greatest influence, etc.)⁵¹

Rank	Press	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA
1	Cambridge University Press	84	84	87	88	85	83	79	76	83	83	67
2	Oxford University Press	57	54	65	61	55	67	47	65	33	50	67
3	Princeton University Press	48	56	34	43	28	17	32	38	50	75	13
4	Cornell University Press	42	52	29	37	31	25	21	11	67	67	0
5	Routledge	32	21	42	45	47	50	37	62	17	17	67
6	Palgrave MacMillan	19	11	31	22	32	58	26	41	33	8	67
7	Columbia University Press	18	17	16	21	20	33	11	18	50	17	13
8	Lynne Rienner	16	16	16	23	21	8	11	5	0	0	27
9	Harvard University Press	12	10	15	12	18	17	21	18	0	8	27
10	MIT Press	10	13	5	7	10	8	11	4	0	8	0
11	University of Michigan Press	8	12	4	2	2	0	16	2	0	0	0
12	Stanford University Press	8	8	4	5	9	0	21	8	33	17	0
13	SAGE Publications	7	6	4	8	10	8	16	17	0	0	27
14	University of Chicago Press	7	8	6	3	4	8	21	8	17	0	0
15	Yale University Press	7	7	11	1	4	0	11	4	0	0	7
16	Polity	5	2	15	5	14	17	0	2	0	0	7
17	Other	4	4	5	5	0	0	5	8	0	0	0
18	University of California Press	4	5	3	3	4	0	5	2	0	0	0

⁵¹ The wording of this question is identical to that in the previous question. This table reports the 2011 results for all countries surveyed in 2008. On the advice of our local partners in Turkey, respondents in Turkey also received this question. The 2008 responses were used to generate the responses that were offered to respondents in 2011. Unlike question 48, which was provided to the nine new countries and Ireland, the ten countries that received this question were offered closed response options, although they were able to list additional or alternate presses. The results displayed represent the percentage of respondents who listed a particular press among the top four out of the total number of respondents who listed at least one press. Results are presented this way to be comparable with data from 2008 and before.

50: Rank the three kinds of research outputs that it is most important for you to publish in order to advance your academic career.⁵²

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Book: SA, UP	86	90	94	96	90	100	96	87	93	80	74	95	89	66	86	100	63	92	56	53	71
Book: SA, CP	27	22	39	30	48	54	19	5	22	40	9	16	21	38	14	36	26	21	24	27	27
Book: CA, UP	19	19	19	21	18	15	4	32	19	20	22	22	47	13	29	14	5	17	13	20	31
Book: CA, CP	2	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	11	4	3	13	5
Book: E, UP	11	10	7	11	6	8	4	39	7	0	4	19	11	17	0	7	16	17	11	7	18
Book: E, CP	2	<1	<1	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	11	0	6	17	5
Book Chapter: UP	11	11	5	10	13	0	4	11	19	20	0	3	0	10	14	0	16	25	26	13	18
Book Chapter: CP	2	1	1	1	<1	0	0	0	0	20	4	3	0	4	0	0	11	4	7	3	10
Journal Article: SA, PR	88	89	93	87	86	100	96	74	93	100	100	95	84	88	100	93	89	79	83	80	69
Journal Article: SA, NPR	3	3	1	1	<1	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	13	3
Journal Article: CA, PR	37	41	30	31	23	15	65	29	37	20	70	46	32	33	43	36	37	13	48	33	29
Journal Article: CA, NPR	<1	<1	0	2	0	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	<1	7	0
Own Blog Post	<1	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Other Blog Post	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newspaper Article	1	1	<1	<1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	0	0
Policy Report	1	<1	2	1	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	<0	0	7	5	0	<1	3	2
Conference Paper	4	4	<1	2	2	0	0	13	4	0	9	3	5	4	0	0	5	8	8	3	8
Other	<1	1	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

⁵² Index of Abbreviations: SA = self-authored; CA = co-authored; UP = university press; CP = commercial press; E = edited; PR = peer-reviewed; NPR = not peer-reviewed

51: In the past two years, have you consulted or worked in a paid capacity for any of the following? Please check all that apply.

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Foreign Gov't	7	7	12	6	8	15	9	7	11	0	0	3	5	2	13	18	11	8	6	16	16
Interest Groups	3	2	3	3	2	0	4	0	11	0	4	5	0	2	0	0	6	0	8	3	6
Int'l Orgs.	11	7	17	11	9	23	26	23	18	0	13	0	0	7	0	18	22	29	15	16	14
NGOs	12	13	9	9	8	23	22	7	14	20	13	14	16	15	13	0	17	21	15	19	14
Defense Contractor	4	5	2	1	5	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	6	4	2	3	0
Private Sector	10	10	10	8	6	0	9	11	7	20	13	5	0	8	25	9	22	21	11	19	14
Think Tanks	15	15	13	13	16	8	4	23	25	0	8	8	16	24	0	55	28	29	13	19	14
Country X Gov't⁵³	20	20	10	23	24	31	17	25	21	20	42	19	16	11	0	27	17	38	31	25	33
Other	7	7	6	7	9	0	4	0	18	20	17	5	16	5	0	27	22	13	6	9	13
None	53	55	54	55	53	62	48	41	54	20	42	59	63	60	63	45	28	25	43	31	40

⁵³ "Country X" denotes the country in which respondents were surveyed.

52: In the past two years, have you consulted or worked in an unpaid capacity for any of the following?

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Foreign Gov't	8	8	9	8	9	0	9	5	7	0	10	0	6	3	50	0	6	6	8	4	10
Interest Groups	9	9	8	12	14	15	9	3	15	20	25	15	6	5	13	9	11	12	7	0	13
Int'l Orgs.	9	8	10	11	8	15	5	20	22	0	30	3	17	11	13	18	6	24	9	8	10
NGOs	23	23	18	25	30	54	23	20	33	60	35	21	33	24	38	18	22	12	19	15	20
Defense Contractor	< 1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0
Private Sector	5	5	5	8	< 1	0	5	5	7	0	5	0	11	5	25	0	0	0	4	0	5
Think Tanks	16	11	18	21	19	15	14	28	19	20	5	15	44	34	38	36	22	24	18	12	10
Country X Gov't⁵⁴	16	13	14	24	18	15	23	28	33	20	25	15	28	15	13	27	28	12	18	12	20
Other	7	6	7	8	10	8	5	3	19	20	5	3	0	3	0	18	6	18	11	8	5
None	50	56	49	41	43	38	45	38	33	40	30	59	33	46	38	36	33	29	50	54	45

⁵⁴ "Country X" denotes the country in which respondents were surveyed.

53: What are the five best PhD programs in the world for a student who wants to pursue an academic career in international relations?⁵⁵

Rank	Institution	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
1	Harvard University	65	67	64	68	62	78	58	58	69	0	63	50	67	63	100	67	15	67	57	50	54
2	Princeton University	50	59	38	48	43	0	32	38	54	0	50	42	50	46	40	89	15	60	32	29	22
3	Stanford University	39	52	20	35	22	44	21	8	23	0	50	17	58	34	40	33	31	40	15	17	22
4	Columbia University	37	42	29	34	26	22	47	54	38	0	25	8	58	34	80	56	23	60	26	29	28
5	London School of Economics and Political Science	24	9	54	32	35	33	42	54	38	0	13	33	8	36	40	33	46	40	59	42	26
6	Yale University	23	26	19	24	15	22	16	17	8	0	38	25	17	34	0	22	38	13	15	29	9
7	Oxford University	23	12	41	31	46	33	37	25	8	0	25	8	0	42	0	33	54	20	36	46	33
8	University of Chicago	20	26	15	12	19	11	16	0	8	0	13	8	8	18	0	22	15	27	6	17	4
9	University of California--Berkeley	15	19	4	18	7	11	5	13	15	0	13	17	25	13	20	11	8	0	11	13	11
10	University of Cambridge	14	6	21	21	26	11	21	25	23	0	25	0	17	27	0	11	69	20	24	25	13
11	University of California--San Diego	12	20	3	9	4	11	16	0	0	0	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	2
12	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	11	17	3	5	7	11	0	0	23	0	13	0	0	6	20	22	0	7	4	4	0
13	University of Michigan--Ann Arbor	10	17	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	17	3	0	11	8	0	0	0	0
14	Cornell University	10	11	7	16	26	22	11	0	8	0	13	0	8	6	20	11	0	0	5	0	11
15	Georgetown University	10	9	7	8	6	0	0	13	8	0	0	0	25	11	0	0	23	33	18	13	17
16	Johns Hopkins University	8	7	5	8	9	11	5	13	8	0	0	0	17	8	20	0	15	27	10	25	22
17	Aberystwyth University	7	2	25	12	24	33	26	8	15	0	0	17	0	7	0	0	23	7	3	8	0
18	George Washington University	5	7	1	3	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	2
19	Ohio State University	4	6	3	3	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	8	17	3	0	11	0	0	1	0	0
20	New York University	4	4	3	3	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	0	0	7	7	4	2

⁵⁵ Responses from all countries were counted and averaged to obtain the displayed results. We display the top twenty institutions sorted by the percent of all respondents who answered the question with that institution. Lists for individual countries were too cumbersome to include in the report.

54: What are the five best masters programs in the world for a student who wants to pursue a policy career in international relations?⁵⁶

Rank	Institution	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
1	Harvard University	53	54	60	58	52	33	38	48	58	0	80	9	40	54	75	43	25	50	52	43	29
2	Georgetown University	50	66	26	35	30	33	44	29	33	0	20	18	80	27	0	57	25	64	25	35	27
3	Johns Hopkins University	44	58	22	35	34	50	25	24	8	0	40	18	70	21	50	86	33	36	20	26	32
4	Columbia University	35	39	22	43	18	17	38	38	8	0	40	27	50	32	75	43	33	64	24	26	24
5	Princeton University	34	42	23	22	34	33	13	19	33	0	60	18	10	33	75	43	17	43	19	9	15
6	London School of Economics and Political Science	27	11	69	41	34	33	63	43	67	0	40	36	10	46	25	29	50	21	44	39	32
7	Tufts University	27	39	12	19	9	17	0	10	8	0	20	9	40	11	25	43	8	14	11	22	15
8	George Washington University	23	36	3	22	13	33	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	4	0	29	0	7	4	4	5
9	Oxford University	16	5	42	13	32	17	38	19	8	0	20	0	0	39	0	29	58	14	31	48	22
10	American University	12	19	2	9	4	17	0	0	8	0	0	0	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	7
11	University of Cambridge	10	2	16	8	27	0	31	24	8	0	40	9	0	29	0	0	67	21	19	22	12
12	Stanford University	9	6	9	14	11	17	0	5	17	0	0	9	0	24	50	0	17	7	10	17	10
13	Yale University	9	5	16	10	11	17	19	14	8	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	17	7	10	17	7
14	University of Chicago	6	8	<1	3	4	17	13	0	0	0	0	9	0	9	0	14	17	0	4	0	2
15	IEP de Paris	4	1	4	3	7	0	6	33	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	17	20
16	University of California--Berkeley	4	2	0	3	7	0	0	0	17	0	20	9	10	11	25	0	0	0	6	9	7
17	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	3	4	<1	2	2	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	4	25	0	0	0	6	4	0
18	Syracuse University	3	5	<1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	10	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
19	University of California--San Diego	3	4	0	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	25	0	0	0	2	0	7
20	King's College London	3	<1	16	0	11	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	10	4	0	0	8	0	0	0	0

⁵⁶ Responses from all countries were counted and averaged to obtain the displayed results. We display the top twenty institutions sorted by the percent of all respondents who answered the question with that institution. Lists for individual countries were too cumbersome to include in the report.

55: What are the five best colleges or universities in Country X for undergraduate students to study international relations?⁵⁷

Rank	Institution	Percentage
1	Harvard University	25
2	Princeton University	22
3	Stanford University	16
4	Columbia University	15
5	Georgetown University	14
6	Yale University	12
7	London School of Economics and Political Science	10
8	University of Chicago	9
9	Aberystwyth University	7
9	University of Toronto	7
11	Oxford University	6
12	Dartmouth College	6
12	University of British Columbia	6
14	Middle East Technical University	6
15	George Washington University	6
16	Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro	5
17	Bilkent Üniversitesi	5
18	Universidade de São Paulo	5
19	Australian National University	5
20	American University	5
20	McGill University	5
20	University of California--Berkeley	5
20	Boğaziçi Üniversitesi	5

⁵⁷ “Country X” denotes the country in which respondents were surveyed. Because this question asked respondents to name the best colleges or universities in their own countries, the aggregate data reported here does not reflect an accurate ranking of world institutions for undergraduate study. Rather, it largely reflects the effects of individual country sample sizes.

56: To what extent do you think that a blog devoted to international relations should count in the professional evaluation of colleagues in each of the following categories? (Please check all that apply.)

	Service		Research	
	Should Count	Should Not Count	Should Count	Should Not Count
All	66	34	29	71
US	66	34	25	75
UK	58	42	24	76
Canada	66	34	27	73
Australia	67	33	25	75
New Zealand	64	36	14	86
Ireland	69	31	12	88
France	76	24	36	64
Denmark	62	38	23	77
Finland	25	75	20	80
Norway	61	39	26	74
Sweden	57	43	33	67
Israel	84	16	32	68
Turkey	67	33	64	36
Hong Kong	38	63	0	100
Singapore	70	30	30	70
South Africa	65	35	22	78
Argentina	70	30	41	59
Brazil	67	33	37	63
Colombia	81	19	43	57
Mexico	59	41	34	66

57: How useful are the following kinds of IR research to policy makers?⁵⁸

	Area Studies	Contemporary Case Studies	Formal Models	Historical Case studies	Policy Analysis	Quantitative Analysis	Theoretical Analysis
All	2.54	2.48	1.09	2.04	2.50	1.81	1.54
US	2.52	2.44	1.03	2.07	2.47	1.8	1.51
UK	2.52	2.46	1.14	2.05	2.43	1.79	1.45
Canada	2.5	2.51	0.79	1.91	2.46	1.69	1.3
Australia	2.56	2.55	1.13	2.09	2.63	1.69	1.62
New Zealand	2.75	2.75	1	2.45	2.58	1.75	1.92
Ireland	2.42	2.61	1.26	1.83	2.54	2.04	1.82
France	2.53	2.55	1.02	1.7	2.52	1.81	1.07
Denmark	2.32	2.32	0.83	1.87	2.36	1.5	1.26
Finland	2.25	2	1	1.75	2	1.5	1
Norway	2.47	2.47	0.63	1.63	2.53	1.94	1.69
Sweden	2.48	2.33	0.94	1.88	2.45	1.76	1.53
Israel	2.32	2.16	0.94	1.47	2.21	1.32	1.11
Turkey	2.64	2.52	1.46	2.07	2.55	1.86	1.68
Hong Kong	2.83	2.83	0.83	1.83	3	1.33	1.67
Singapore	2.55	2.36	1.2	2.18	2.45	1.5	1.5
South Africa	2.59	2.56	1.35	1.94	2.76	1.69	1.65
Argentina	2.55	2.48	0.81	1.81	2.48	1.73	1.64
Brazil	2.59	2.67	1.44	2.16	2.67	2.19	1.96
Colombia	2.63	2.57	1.34	2.03	2.59	1.89	1.59
Mexico	2.71	2.72	1.69	2.19	2.83	2.28	1.97

⁵⁸ Very useful = 3, Somewhat useful = 2, Not very useful = 1, Not useful at all = 0, Don't know = not included

58: What statement comes closest to representing your views on the relationship between the kind of research IR scholars produce and the kind of research that the policy community finds most useful?

	The gap is growing.	The gap, whatever its size, is about as wide as it was 20-30 years ago.	The gap between IR scholars and policy practitioners is shrinking.	There is no gap.
All	37	39	23	2
US	42	43	14	< 1
UK	36	46	18	< 1
Canada	38	47	15	< 1
Australia	34	38	25	4
New Zealand	36	36	21	7
Ireland	46	42	13	0
France	28	43	30	0
Denmark	42	42	17	0
Finland	40	60	0	0
Norway	26	42	32	0
Sweden	26	50	24	0
Israel	35	35	30	0
Turkey	18	23	59	< 1
Hong Kong	38	25	25	13
Singapore	50	33	17	0
South Africa	44	33	22	0
Argentina	25	38	38	0
Brazil	24	11	53	13
Colombia	19	39	42	0
Mexico	30	25	44	2

59: Which statement comes closest to representing your views on the ideal relationship between the academy and the policy community?

	There should be a higher wall of separation between the academic and policy communities.	There should be a larger number of links between the academic and policy communities.
All	10	90
US	8	92
UK	21	79
Canada	14	86
Australia	15	85
New Zealand	17	83
Ireland	17	83
France	17	83
Denmark	14	86
Finland	20	80
Norway	18	82
Sweden	11	89
Israel	5	95
Turkey	7	93
Hong Kong	13	88
Singapore	8	92
South Africa	6	94
Argentina	5	95
Brazil	7	93
Colombia	3	97
Mexico	9	91

60: Which of the following best describes what you believe should primarily motivate research in the discipline?

	Appeal to popular audience	Issue area of problem	Methodology	Paradigm	Policy relevance/ current events	Region	Other
All	3	51	2	4	29	2	10
US	2	54	1	3	29	1	9
UK	3	57	1	2	17	2	18
Canada	3	55	2	2	25	< 1	12
Australia	< 1	62	< 1	2	27	0	8
New Zealand	0	50	0	14	21	0	14
Ireland	4	31	12	0	38	0	15
France	7	69	0	7	11	4	2
Denmark	4	39	4	0	39	0	14
Finland	0	60	0	0	0	0	40
Norway	0	70	0	0	17	0	13
Sweden	0	53	0	3	23	0	23
Israel	0	50	0	10	40	0	0
Turkey	5	29	8	22	29	5	3
Hong Kong	0	75	13	0	13	0	0
Singapore	0	42	0	0	33	0	25
South Africa	0	65	0	6	29	0	0
Argentina	13	33	0	4	38	4	8
Brazil	< 1	35	7	3	47	< 1	7
Colombia	10	29	3	6	35	10	6
Mexico	11	26	5	5	40	5	8

61: Which of the following changes to current academic norms would have a beneficial impact on foreign policy and/or on the academic discipline of IR?⁵⁹

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Departments assign greater value in personnel decisions to publications in policy journals																					
Policy Impact	53	57	54	49	48	67	53	50	39	67	33	45	49	58	57	82	36	20	49	32	31
Impact on the Discipline	54	57	43	51	53	33	24	50	52	67	58	50	38	32	57	82	57	65	57	75	69
Universities increase support for “Diplomat in Residence” or “Professor of Practice” positions⁶⁰																					
Policy Impact	29	33	24	31	32	31	34	30	25	14	19	16	25	45	50	38	17	41	--	56	33
Impact on the Discipline	33	39	25	37	35	19	24	32	18	14	14	28	33	41	63	25	39	17	--	37	26
Universities support policy-relevant education and training opportunities for faculty																					
Policy Impact	36	42	25	31	38	38	45	14	35	14	8	26	27	45	63	50	39	48	38	40	23
Impact on the Discipline	39	44	29	31	28	25	31	35	33	29	17	24	45	32	75	31	39	34	49	44	33
Government agencies and inter-governmental organizations support more systematic training of policy-makers in IR academic research																					
Policy Impact	47	52	39	39	51	50	31	46	48	29	19	30	47	59	75	38	39	52	48	51	42
Impact on the Discipline	31	34	25	24	29	25	28	35	20	14	8	18	28	32	50	50	43	24	46	37	25
Departments encourage academics/faculty members to accept consulting or part-time policy-making assignments																					
Policy Impact	52	56	44	45	56	44	52	48	43	43	28	36	57	73	75	69	48	45	55	63	40
Impact on the Discipline	32	35	27	28	39	19	28	22	25	29	11	20	27	32	25	56	30	34	40	19	29
Departments stop the tenure clock for faculty who accept full-time policy making assignments																					
Policy Impact	36	47	22	29	25	25	28	28	23	0	3	10	31	50	63	44	22	21	32	33	22
Impact on the Discipline	35	46	19	25	28	19	28	35	30	14	14	28	24	41	38	38	26	10	27	35	22
Departments provide stronger incentives for academic/faculty members to write op-eds, contribute to blogs, and engage popular media outlets																					
Policy Impact	45	51	35	42	48	38	45	32	43	43	25	34	45	59	75	50	35	41	43	56	21
Impact on the Discipline	26	29	22	26	23	13	28	20	25	14	17	12	16	18	25	44	26	41	30	19	29

⁵⁹ The results displayed represent the percentage of respondents who answered that a particular option would have a beneficial impact on foreign policy and/or on the academic discipline of IR out of the total number of respondents who selected at least one option for a beneficial impact on foreign policy and/or on the academic discipline of IR.

⁶⁰ Due to a technical error, Brazil was not given this response choice.

IV. Foreign Policy Views

62: Which area of the world do you consider to be of greatest strategic importance to Country X today?⁶¹

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Central Asia	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Asia	34	46	21	20	76	38	4	4	11	17	30	29	5	3	88	57	39	17	20	23	13
Eastern Europe	< 1	< 1	< 1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Latin America	7	2	< 1	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	60	58	20
M. E. and N. Africa	23	30	17	4	< 1	0	8	44	11	0	5	3	79	60	0	0	0	4	2	3	2
North America	10	2	10	63	4	15	8	4	0	0	10	0	16	3	0	14	0	4	12	13	58
Oceania	< 1	< 1	0	0	3	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia/Soviet Union	2	< 1	1	< 1	0	0	0	0	4	33	10	26	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
South Asia	5	7	6	2	< 1	0	0	0	7	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	0
Southeast Asia	2	< 1	2	0	15	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	6	0	2	3	0
Sub-Saharan Africa	1	< 1	1	1	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	0	2	0	0
Western Europe	14	9	40	4	< 1	0	75	38	67	50	45	40	0	20	0	0	11	0	0	0	6

⁶¹ "Country X" denotes the country in which respondents were surveyed.

63: Which area of the world do you believe will be of the greatest strategic importance to Country X in 20 years?⁶²

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Central Asia	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	<1	0	2
East Asia	58	72	40	46	79	69	25	41	33	17	53	41	5	21	100	77	59	57	45	42	43
Eastern Europe	<1	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Latin America	6	4	0	5	<1	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	35	32	35	14
M. E. and N. Africa	9	8	11	0	<1	0	0	20	11	0	0	3	79	43	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
North America	7	2	5	41	2	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	8	0	0	6	6	37
Oceania	<1	<1	0	<1	3	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia/Soviet Union	2	1	3	<1	0	0	4	2	0	33	5	24	0	7	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
South Asia	3	3	5	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	6	0	2	3	0
Southeast Asia	2	<1	3	<1	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	15	6	9	2	13	2
Sub-Saharan Africa	3	3	3	2	<1	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	24	0	7	0	0
Western Europe	9	4	30	1	0	0	67	22	44	50	37	29	11	11	0	0	6	0	0	0	3

⁶² “Country X” denotes the country in which respondents were surveyed.

64: In general, do you think that multilateral trade arrangements (like the EU, NAFTA, and WTO) have been good or bad for Country X?⁶³

	Very Good	Good	Neither Good nor Bad	Bad	Very Bad
All ⁶⁴	--	--	--	--	--
US ⁶⁵	20	61	13	6	1
UK ⁶⁶	32	53	10	4	1
Canada ⁶⁵	15	55	17	8	5
Australia ⁶⁶	10	53	27	10	0
New Zealand ⁶⁶	14	64	18	5	0
Ireland	44	44	12	0	0
France ⁶⁷	--	--	--	--	--
Denmark	40	40	20	0	0
Finland	33	67	0	0	0
Norway	32	58	11	0	0
Sweden	26	58	11	5	0
Israel ⁶⁶	38	50	13	0	0
Turkey	19	50	21	10	1
Hong Kong ⁶⁶	36	57	7	0	0
Singapore ⁶⁶	64	29	0	7	0
South Africa ⁶⁶	0	40	30	30	0
Argentina	9	23	55	14	0
Brazil	6	59	21	14	0
Colombia	6	35	42	13	3
Mexico	9	52	23	13	4

⁶³ “Country X” denotes the country in which respondents were surveyed.

⁶⁴ We do not calculate an “All” category for this question because the data come from three different surveys in 2006, 2008, and 2011.

⁶⁵ Based on the 2006 survey data. Respondents in Canada did not receive a French version of the survey in 2006.

⁶⁶ Based on the 2008 survey data.

⁶⁷ Due to a technical error, France was not asked this question.

65: In general, do you think that multilateral trade arrangements (like the EU, NAFTA, and WTO) have been good or bad for developing countries?

	Very Good	Good	Neither Good nor Bad	Bad	Very Bad
All ⁶⁸	--	--	--	--	--
US ⁶⁹	2	34	21	31	12
UK ⁷⁰	2	26	17	41	14
Canada ⁶⁹	2	34	21	31	12
Australia ⁷⁰	1	25	21	47	5
New Zealand ⁷⁰	0	32	27	32	9
Ireland	4	24	20	44	8
France	6	30	34	28	2
Denmark	0	38	27	23	12
Finland	0	50	0	50	0
Norway	5	42	21	32	0
Sweden	3	36	18	38	5
Israel ⁷⁰	12	41	29	18	0
Turkey	8	47	23	22	1
Hong Kong ⁷⁰	14	50	36	0	0
Singapore ⁷⁰	14	43	21	21	0
South Africa ⁷⁰	0	20	20	60	0
Argentina	0	32	27	41	0
Brazil	3	47	18	30	2
Colombia	13	34	31	19	3
Mexico	4	54	16	20	7

⁶⁸ We do not calculate an “All” category for this question because the data come from three different surveys in 2006, 2008, and 2011.

⁶⁹ Based on the 2006 survey data. Respondents in Canada did not receive a French version of the survey in 2006.

⁷⁰ Based on the 2008 survey data.

66: Do you prefer that your country give economic aid directly to a country or give aid to an international organization (such as the World Bank), which then disburses aid to countries?

	Give aid directly	Give aid to an international organization	Don't know
All	39	40	21
US	33	44	22
UK	44	36	20
Canada	24	48	28
Australia	44	31	25
New Zealand	53	27	20
Ireland	50	31	19
France	23	45	32
Denmark	41	41	17
Finland	33	17	50
Norway	40	55	5
Sweden	38	30	33
Israel	47	37	16
Turkey	62	29	10
Hong Kong	50	50	0
Singapore	33	27	40
South Africa	32	47	21
Argentina	70	17	13
Brazil	63	26	11
Colombia	47	47	6
Mexico	54	34	11

67: What is your best guess as to whether you prefer that your country give economic aid directly to a country or to an international organization (such as the World Bank), which then disburses aid to countries?⁷¹

	Give aid directly	Give aid to an international organization
All	51	49
US	51	49
UK	54	46
Canada	49	51
Australia	54	46
New Zealand	33	67
Ireland	80	20
France	14	86
Denmark	50	50
Finland	50	50
Norway	0	0
Sweden	58	42
Israel	100	0
Turkey	77	23
Singapore	40	60
South Africa	33	67
Argentina	100	0
Brazil	55	45
Colombia	100	0
Mexico	43	57

⁷¹ This question was asked only of those respondents who answered “Don’t Know” to the previous question (“Do you prefer that your country give economic aid directly to a country or give aid to an international organization [such as the World Bank], which then disburses aid to countries?”).

68: What are the top two reasons that you prefer that your country give economic aid directly to another country? (Enter a 1 for your top choice and a 2 for your second choice.)⁷²

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
This means that your country controls the economic aid and that other countries cannot influence how it is used.	47	46	44	45	41	78	63	56	23	0	71	62	42	46	50	80	50	41	49	53	61
This gives your country the most flexibility.	56	60	48	58	59	33	56	56	54	33	29	43	83	56	75	40	50	65	51	53	52
This sends a message to countries receiving aid from your country that your country has strong convictions.	26	25	26	29	27	11	13	11	23	33	0	19	17	36	0	0	17	24	29	33	21
This sends a message to other countries - countries not receiving aid that your country does not have good relations with - that you country is more serious/determined to achieve its goals.	12	12	7	5	0	0	6	11	15	0	0	14	8	28	0	0	33	18	21	0	6
It is harder for multilateral aid agencies to be monitored by your country.	37	34	52	25	34	67	56	56	31	33	43	38	17	25	75	80	33	47	34	53	42
Other	15	17	14	22	27	0	6	11	31	67	43	5	17	5	0	0	17	0	5	7	12

⁷² This question was only asked to those respondents who answered “give aid directly” to questions 66 or 67.

69: What are the top two reasons that you prefer that your country give aid to an international organization? (Enter a 1 for your top choice and a 2 for your second choice.)⁷³

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
This involves sharing the costs of economic aid with partner countries.	27	27	26	22	15	33	11	40	7	100	0	23	14	33	0	57	50	50	44	29	45
This locks your country into its international commitments more solidly and reassures other countries about your country's good intentions.	49	46	55	47	63	67	44	56	71	0	45	23	29	68	25	43	60	75	42	64	45
This sends a message to country receiving aid that your country's motives are shared widely	26	32	15	15	13	0	22	24	29	0	9	23	29	20	25	29	20	25	31	43	23
This sends a message to other countries who do not receive aid that your country and its partners are more serious about achieving their goals.	7	7	5	4	10	0	11	12	7	0	0	0	0	10	25	14	0	25	11	14	9
Multilateral aid agencies are monitored by more organizations around the world.	29	26	35	28	45	50	44	24	7	100	55	46	57	28	50	14	30	0	28	50	41
Multilateral aid agencies prevent your country's government from using aid for things other than economic development.	50	51	58	63	55	50	44	36	57	0	55	54	57	40	50	43	30	25	36	0	27
Other	7	6	4	16	0	0	11	0	21	0	27	23	0	0	25	0	10	0	3	0	9

⁷³ This question was asked only to those respondents who chose “give aid to international organization” in questions 66 or 67.

70: In your opinion, will Europe be able to maintain the current membership of the Eurozone?

	Yes	No	Don't know
All	43	37	20
US	43	38	19
UK	33	47	20
Canada	42	35	23
Australia	29	45	26
New Zealand	33	33	33
Ireland	46	27	27
France	49	20	31
Denmark	46	21	32
Finland	33	33	33
Norway	32	47	21
Sweden	39	24	37
Israel	68	11	21
Turkey	45	41	15
Hong Kong	63	25	13
Singapore	33	25	42
South Africa	61	22	17
Argentina	41	18	41
Brazil	43	36	21
Colombia	47	47	7
Mexico	68	17	15

71: In your opinion, which of the following is best able to take effective actions against the effects of the financial and economic crisis?

	The EU	Country X Gov't⁷⁴	The G20	The IMF	The US	Other	None	Don't know
All	17	3	31	9	13	5	14	9
US	14	--	29	11	19	4	16	9
UK	21	2	31	7	9	5	16	8
Canada	13	10	36	7	9	6	12	8
Australia	5	10	36	4	5	7	18	15
New Zealand	17	0	33	0	8	17	17	8
Ireland	42	0	8	15	4	4	12	15
France	46	2	22	7	2	9	7	7
Denmark	38	3	21	10	7	14	0	7
Finland	60	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Norway	32	26	21	11	0	5	5	0
Sweden	36	8	22	8	3	6	3	14
Israel	22	6	28	22	11	6	0	6
Turkey	13	5	41	3	10	2	17	8
Hong Kong	13	13	50	13	0	0	13	0
Singapore	17	0	50	0	0	0	25	8
South Africa	29	0	41	6	0	6	12	6
Argentina	5	9	32	0	18	5	23	9
Brazil	7	3	42	12	12	6	8	10
Colombia	23	0	40	3	13	0	20	0
Mexico	32	3	18	7	15	8	13	3

⁷⁴ "Country X" denotes the country in which respondents were surveyed. Respondents in the United States did not receive this option because the United States was already an option.

72: In your opinion, which of the following is best placed to regulate and reform global financial markets?

	The EU	Country X Gov't ⁷⁵	The G20	The IMF	The US	Other	None	Don't know
All	8	< 1	41	14	10	4	14	8
US	6	--	39	15	13	3	15	9
UK	11	< 1	40	15	7	4	15	8
Canada	8	0	43	15	5	7	14	7
Australia	4	0	48	5	10	4	17	13
New Zealand	0	0	58	0	0	17	8	17
Ireland	23	0	27	19	8	8	4	12
France	11	0	48	17	2	9	7	7
Denmark	28	0	34	14	3	10	3	7
Finland	17	0	17	0	17	17	17	17
Norway	21	0	42	11	11	11	0	5
Sweden	11	6	37	20	0	0	6	20
Israel	5	5	53	16	11	0	5	5
Turkey	7	2	44	6	13	2	17	7
Hong Kong	0	0	63	13	13	0	13	0
Singapore	8	0	42	17	8	0	17	8
South Africa	12	0	47	12	6	6	6	12
Argentina	5	5	55	0	5	5	23	5
Brazil	3	0	50	20	7	3	10	7
Colombia	14	0	43	7	14	7	14	0
Mexico	19	0	24	20	14	5	15	3

⁷⁵ "Country X" denotes the country in which respondents were surveyed. Respondents in the US did not receive this option because the US was already an option.

73: What are the three most important foreign policy issues facing Country X today?

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Arab Spring	28	33	31	13	5	0	12	60	27	0	22	19	74	68	0	8	18	0	<1	0	7
Collapse of the Doha round of trade negotiations	5	3	2	4	2	17	0	4	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	19	32	7	0
Collapse of the Euro	25	20	53	23	9	8	81	78	46	67	39	53	5	23	38	23	18	10	12	10	10
Conflict in the Middle East	15	19	14	7	4	0	8	7	12	0	11	8	58	42	0	0	0	5	<1	0	2
Cyber-security	5	8	4	5	6	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	11	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	3
Decline of the U.S. dollar as a reserve currency	10	11	4	13	10	8	8	0	4	0	0	6	11	3	38	31	12	19	18	10	17
Epidemic disease	<1	<1	2	1	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	6	0	0	0	0
Ethnic conflict	3	2	<1	1	2	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	31	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
Failed states	8	12	3	4	8	8	0	9	12	0	11	6	16	2	0	0	12	5	2	3	2
Global climate change	26	25	27	48	51	42	23	9	54	83	28	53	0	6	13	31	29	5	20	10	8
Global debt crisis	30	28	36	41	39	42	65	33	19	50	17	33	11	22	50	46	12	14	22	13	15
Global financial regulation	21	16	26	31	17	25	42	29	27	33	17	11	0	8	38	31	12	38	43	13	32
Global population growth	2	2	4	2	4	8	4	0	4	0	6	0	0	<1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Global poverty	13	12	16	15	21	17	4	4	8	33	17	25	0	3	0	0	24	19	12	23	14
Global reliance on oil	9	12	8	8	6	8	12	4	8	0	6	11	11	7	0	0	0	5	6	10	7
Immigration	4	2	3	2	11	17	0	2	0	0	6	0	0	3	0	31	24	0	0	10	37
International organized crime	6	2	4	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	19	0	3	0	0	12	19	18	70	68
International terrorism	10	12	6	7	4	8	4	0	4	0	17	8	11	29	0	8	12	0	<1	10	5
Persistence of the U.S. trade deficit	6	6	2	14	7	0	4	0	4	0	6	6	5	<1	13	8	0	0	<1	13	12
Reform of the UN	3	1	1	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	<1	0	8	6	5	24	0	2
Regional integration	7	<1	4	7	6	17	8	4	12	33	22	6	0	12	0	8	29	81	42	47	15
Resource scarcity	5	5	5	4	8	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	5	5	0	8	0	14	3	3	7
Rogue states	<1	2	<1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	6	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russian resurgence	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	5	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
Rising power of China	27	32	13	25	57	58	12	20	19	0	11	17	0	5	50	62	29	24	28	20	8
War in Afghanistan	10	14	15	6	7	0	0	4	4	0	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
War in Iraq	2	2	2	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WMD Proliferation	8	11	4	6	6	8	0	2	12	0	0	0	42	5	0	0	6	0	3	3	2
Other	4	3	4	5	4	8	4	2	4	0	11	3	21	2	0	0	12	4	3	10	8

74: What are the three most important foreign policy issues Country X will face over the next 10 years?

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Bra	Col	Mex
Arab Spring	9	10	11	7	<1	0	4	12	4	0	0	3	26	24	0	0	0	5	<1	0	2
Collapse of the Doha round of trade negotiations	4	3	4	4	3	8	0	0	4	0	6	0	0	<1	0	0	0	23	16	11	2
Collapse of the Euro	9	6	20	4	4	0	46	10	19	17	28	18	5	11	0	0	0	9	8	7	4
Conflict in the Middle East	18	22	15	8	2	8	13	17	19	0	17	9	79	46	0	0	6	9	3	0	5
Cyber-security	10	12	8	8	11	17	0	7	4	0	0	6	21	7	0	8	0	5	5	0	7
Decline of the U.S. dollar as a reserve currency	14	18	9	11	7	17	4	5	12	0	11	3	0	4	57	25	6	14	23	7	25
Epidemic disease	2	3	2	3	4	0	0	0	4	0	6	9	0	<1	0	8	0	0	2	0	2
Ethnic conflict	5	4	2	3	2	8	4	2	0	0	0	6	5	39	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
Failed states	10	14	5	8	7	0	4	7	12	0	11	9	21	7	0	0	6	5	2	7	9
Global climate change	40	38	50	62	58	25	38	46	58	50	39	44	0	17	0	50	53	18	36	39	30
Global debt crisis	18	17	23	25	27	42	42	17	12	17	17	24	5	13	29	17	6	5	11	11	9
Global financial regulation	19	14	25	28	19	17	42	39	31	83	17	15	5	11	43	25	18	45	38	21	19
Global population growth	4	4	5	6	10	0	0	10	8	17	0	6	0	3	0	17	6	0	3	0	4
Global poverty	16	16	21	18	19	25	13	15	23	17	22	35	0	3	0	0	47	14	10	29	23
Global reliance on oil	15	15	16	16	17	0	21	20	15	17	0	9	5	12	0	8	12	9	10	25	18
Immigration	5	3	3	4	10	17	4	7	0	0	11	3	5	10	14	8	18	0	3	11	26
International organized crime	5	2	3	2	2	0	0	5	4	0	6	15	0	4	0	0	12	36	14	36	46
International terrorism	8	9	7	8	5	0	8	5	0	0	17	3	16	21	0	17	6	0	2	7	2
Persistence of the U.S. trade deficit	6	8	2	8	5	8	8	2	0	0	6	3	5	<1	0	8	0	5	6	4	9
Reform of the UN	2	2	2	3	<1	0	0	5	4	17	11	6	0	0	0	0	18	0	10	4	0
Regional integration	7	<1	5	7	5	8	8	10	12	33	17	12	0	17	14	25	29	50	31	36	12
Resource scarcity	10	11	12	8	11	25	4	5	12	0	0	6	11	6	0	17	6	9	12	7	9
Rogue states	1	2	<1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russian resurgence	3	3	1	4	<1	0	0	2	0	17	6	9	0	9	0	0	6	0	<1	0	0
Rising power of China	37	43	29	32	55	67	17	27	15	0	33	29	0	14	86	67	18	32	38	32	19
War in Afghanistan	2	3	1	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0
War in Iraq	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WMD Proliferation	10	13	7	5	6	0	0	12	23	17	0	9	58	8	0	0	6	9	3	0	0
Other	4	3	4	8	4	8	8	2	8	0	11	6	5	<1	0	0	6	0	4	4	9

75: In March 2011, did you support the use of force against Libyan government forces?

	Yes	No
All	57	43
US	60	40
UK	54	46
Canada	64	36
Australia	69	31
New Zealand	64	36
Ireland	61	39
France	57	43
Denmark	65	35
Finland	0	100
Norway	67	33
Sweden	85	15
Israel	84	16
Turkey	40	60
Hong Kong	63	38
Singapore	58	42
South Africa	53	47
Argentina	18	82
Brazil	45	55
Colombia	35	65
Mexico	44	56

76: On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 indicating the greatest likelihood, how likely is war between the United States and China over the next decade?⁷⁶

	Ranking
All	1.33
US	1.34
UK	1.14
Canada	1.16
Australia	1.56
New Zealand	1.64
Ireland	1.23
France	1.35
Denmark	1.36
Finland	0.80
Norway	1.28
Sweden	0.94
Israel	1.21
Turkey	1.38
Hong Kong	1.38
Singapore	0.69
South Africa	1.73
Argentina	1.21
Brazil	1.58
Colombia	1.48
Mexico	1.63

⁷⁶ Due to a coding error, respondents received options on a scale of 0 to 10, rather than 1-10 as suggested by the question. We report the actual results that we received them. Some respondents did select “0” as their answer. All numerical responses were averaged to obtain the displayed results.

77: On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 indicating the greatest likelihood, how likely is war between the United States and China over the next 30 years?⁷⁷

	Ranking
All	2.28
US	2.27
UK	1.89
Canada	2.07
Australia	2.83
New Zealand	3.00
Ireland	1.74
France	2.38
Denmark	2.26
Finland	2.00
Norway	2.28
Sweden	2.09
Israel	2.18
Turkey	2.36
Hong Kong	2.00
Singapore	1.50
South Africa	2.64
Argentina	2.53
Brazil	2.56
Colombia	2.61
Mexico	2.62

⁷⁷ Due to a coding error, respondents received options on a scale of 0 to 10, rather than 1-10 as suggested by the question. We report the actual results that we received them. Some respondents did select “0” as their answer. All numerical responses were averaged to obtain the displayed results.

78: On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 indicating the greatest influence, how much influence does the United States have in the world today?⁷⁸

	Ranking
All	6.63
US	6.80
UK	6.27
Canada	6.50
Australia	6.58
New Zealand	6.25
Ireland	5.82
France	6.79
Denmark	5.81
Finland	6.20
Norway	6.44
Sweden	6.32
Israel	6.79
Turkey	6.18
Hong Kong	6.75
Singapore	6.42
South Africa	6.13
Argentina	6.27
Brazil	7.17
Colombia	6.43
Mexico	6.51

⁷⁸ Due to a coding error, respondents received options on a scale of 0 to 10, rather than 1-10 as suggested by the question. We report the actual results that we received them. Some respondents did select “0” as their answer. All numerical responses were averaged to obtain the displayed results.

79: On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 indicating the greatest influence, how much influence does China have in the world today?⁷⁹

	Ranking
All	4.34
US	4.51
UK	4.10
Canada	4.11
Australia	3.86
New Zealand	4.08
Ireland	4.27
France	4.77
Denmark	3.63
Finland	3.60
Norway	3.50
Sweden	4.03
Israel	4.68
Turkey	3.54
Hong Kong	3.63
Singapore	3.25
South Africa	4.93
Argentina	3.59
Brazil	5.09
Colombia	4.63
Mexico	4.66

⁷⁹ Due to a coding error, respondents received options on a scale of 0 to 10, rather than 1-10 as suggested by the question. We report the actual results that we received them. Some respondents did select “0” as their answer. All numerical responses were averaged to obtain the displayed results.

80: On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 indicating the greatest influence, how much influence will the United States have in the world in 2020?⁸⁰

	Ranking
All	5.68
US	5.97
UK	5.33
Canada	5.58
Australia	5.56
New Zealand	4.36
Ireland	4.73
France	5.74
Denmark	4.52
Finland	5.00
Norway	5.28
Sweden	4.89
Israel	6.05
Turkey	4.94
Hong Kong	5.88
Singapore	5.67
South Africa	4.73
Argentina	4.95
Brazil	6.25
Colombia	5.13
Mexico	5.24

⁸⁰ Due to a coding error, respondents received options on a scale of 0 to 10, rather than 1-10 as suggested by the question. We report the actual results that we received them. Some respondents did select “0” as their answer. All numerical responses were averaged to obtain the displayed results.

81: On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 indicating the greatest influence, how much influence will the China have in the world in 2020?⁸¹

	Ranking
All	5.28
US	5.33
UK	5.03
Canada	5.21
Australia	5.00
New Zealand	5.25
Ireland	5.18
France	5.48
Denmark	4.27
Finland	4.40
Norway	4.50
Sweden	5.00
Israel	5.89
Turkey	4.71
Hong Kong	4.88
Singapore	4.00
South Africa	5.73
Argentina	5.00
Brazil	6.12
Colombia	6.10
Mexico	5.86

⁸¹ Due to a coding error, respondents received options on a scale of 0 to 10, rather than 1-10 as suggested by the question. We report the actual results that we received them. Some respondents did select “0” as their answer. All numerical responses were averaged to obtain the displayed results.

82: Would you approve or disapprove of the use of U.S. military forces in the following situations?

	All	US	UK	Can	Aus	NZ	Ire	Fra	Den	Fin	Nor	Swe	Isr	Tur	HK	Sin	SA	Arg	Col	Mex
War between North and South Sudan																				
Approve	20	15	27	23	23	0	29	15	31	20	28	50	47	26	50	42	12	5	10	10
Disapprove	81	85	73	77	77	100	71	85	69	80	72	50	53	74	50	58	88	95	90	90
If Iran produced a nuclear weapon																				
Approve	21	20	22	20	17	18	10	20	23	20	22	27	63	18	38	33	35	9	24	19
Disapprove	80	80	78	80	83	82	90	80	77	80	78	73	37	82	63	67	65	91	76	81
If extremists were poised to take over Pakistan																				
Approve	34	37	29	32	41	20	14	48	38	20	33	27	78	27	25	25	24	14	10	15
Disapprove	66	63	71	68	59	80	86	53	62	80	67	73	22	74	75	75	76	86	90	85
Support democratic transition in Syria																				
Approve	23	21	26	27	30	11	29	33	42	20	24	26	33	17	50	33	12	5	10	8
Disapprove	77	79	74	73	70	89	71	68	58	80	76	74	67	83	50	67	88	95	90	92
To support democratic transition in Yemen																				
Approve	18	16	23	23	24	11	33	15	31	20	22	23	35	19	38	33	12	5	7	10
Disapprove	82	84	77	77	76	89	67	85	69	80	78	77	65	81	63	67	88	95	93	90

83: Changes in the Middle East associated with the "Arab Spring" will be:

	Good for Country X	Bad for Country X	Will not have much effect	Don't Know	Other
All	41	9	22	20	8
US	42	13	11	25	10
UK	41	4	26	23	7
Canada	42	5	29	16	7
Australia	25	3	50	19	3
New Zealand	25	8	33	17	17
Ireland	35	0	61	0	4
France	28	5	19	42	7
Denmark	63	4	11	11	11
Finland	50	0	33	0	17
Norway	41	0	29	18	12
Sweden	59	0	15	24	3
Israel	16	37	5	32	11
Turkey	59	9	17	7	9
Hong Kong	38	0	63	0	0
Singapore	50	0	33	17	0
South Asia	24	0	59	18	0
Argentina	41	0	36	18	5
Brazil	44	2	42	7	5
Colombia	17	3	66	10	3
Mexico	22	2	64	9	3

84: Will changes in the Middle East associated with the "Arab Spring" lead to lasting improvements for people in the region?

	Yes	No	Will not have much effect	Don't Know	Other
All	47	9	15	22	7
US	50	9	12	23	6
UK	49	5	17	22	8
Canada	46	6	17	24	7
Australia	42	6	16	28	8
New Zealand	25	25	0	25	25
Ireland	48	0	35	17	0
France	32	2	20	34	11
Denmark	54	4	19	12	12
Finland	33	0	0	50	17
Norway	39	6	28	28	0
Sweden	53	0	9	26	12
Israel	26	32	16	21	5
Turkey	53	15	19	5	8
Hong Kong	63	0	25	13	0
Singapore	36	9	27	18	9
South Africa	24	12	29	18	18
Argentina	50	5	18	27	0
Brazil	35	13	21	24	7
Colombia	46	21	7	21	4
Mexico	33	16	22	28	2

85: It has been more than 20 years since the end of the Cold War. In your opinion, is the world now:

	More dangerous for Country X	Less dangerous for Country X	About as dangerous as 20 years ago	No Answer
All	25	44	27	5
US	31	45	21	3
UK	21	42	31	6
Canada	14	51	28	7
Australia	11	37	41	11
New Zealand	17	25	42	17
Ireland	14	24	48	14
France	9	27	51	13
Denmark	15	44	33	7
Finland	17	83	0	0
Norway	12	71	18	0
Sweden	6	63	23	9
Israel	37	32	32	0
Turkey	26	41	29	4
Hong Kong	25	38	38	0
Singapore	17	42	42	0
South Africa	13	56	25	6
Argentina	14	36	45	5
Brazil	14	52	25	9
Colombia	25	25	50	0
Mexico	50	16	34	0

86: What is the most important military innovation in recent years?

	Drones and other unmanned technologies	Cyber warfare	Improvised explosive devices	Precision weapons	Stealth technology	Suicide terrorism	Other
All	47	27	4	8	3	7	4
US	53	24	4	8	3	5	3
UK	41	22	8	9	4	6	9
Can	46	26	4	10	3	8	4
Aus	32	34	6	5	6	10	6
NZ	42	33	0	8	0	8	8
Ire	33	38	0	5	0	14	10
Fra	59	18	0	7	5	9	2
Den	52	16	4	0	0	12	16
Fin	20	60	20	0	0	0	0
Nor	61	28	0	6	0	0	6
Swe	35	27	0	19	0	15	4
Isr	42	42	0	16	0	0	0
Tur	48	31	2	3	6	9	1
HK	29	29	0	29	0	14	0
Sin	42	50	0	0	0	8	0
SA	41	18	0	0	0	35	6
Arg	33	29	5	5	5	5	19
Bra	25	46	3	9	5	6	6
Col	36	39	7	11	0	4	4
Mex	30	30	4	18	11	7	2

87: If the Country X government had an additional one billion dollars to spend in the next fiscal year on an international problem or initiative in one of the following areas, to which of the following areas should it devote these resources?

	Greenhouse gas emissions and climate change	Economic development assistance	Global health initiatives
All	43	34	23
US	45	30	25
UK	48	28	25
Can	55	20	25
Aus	48	24	28
NZ	57	21	21
Ire	48	29	24
Fra	37	42	21
Den	63	22	15
Fin	50	17	33
Nor	28	17	56
Swe	56	21	24
Isr	16	79	5
Tur	29	55	16
HK	38	50	13
Sin	67	8	25
SA	35	59	6
Arg	18	73	9
Bra	21	64	14
Col	21	71	7
Mex	27	56	17