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ABSTRACT

On the occasion of the Review of International Political Economy’s 20th anniversary, this paper systematically assesses RIPE’s claim to represent an alternative to the ‘mainstream’ study of international political economy (IPE) with several new sources of evidence. The first is the IPE component of a 20-country survey of international relations (IR) faculty, the second a database of books in the field. The third, and most important, is derived from coding 326 RIPE articles published 2000–10 to discover key cleavages and trends. These results are compared with those from prior studies of the 12 IR journals identified as the ‘leading’ journals by the Teaching, Research and International Politics (TRIP) project. The article concentrates on five key issues: paradigmatic orientation, epistemology, methodology, policy orientation, and demography. The results provide ground for scepticism that the ‘American School’ of IPE does or will define the mainstream. The findings further tend to confirm that RIPE has stayed relatively true to its founders’ intentions in representing diversity in the global study of IPE.
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When the Review of International Political Economy (RIPE) was established in 1994, its founders’ intent was to create a journal that would reflect the richness of international political economy (IPE) work felt to be missing at that time from the leading international relations (IR) journals. This goal was re-affirmed in the journal’s 10th anniversary edition in 2004 and in subsequent meetings of the journal’s editorial teams and international
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advisory boards. At this moment of RIPE’s 20th anniversary, it is thus fitting to reflect on how well the journal has met these goals. More provocatively, in the context of recent robust debates over the state of IPE and a perceived transatlantic divide, it is important to examine how RIPE is situated within the broader field and how it compares to other leading outlets for IPE scholarship.

By providing several sources of original new data derived from global surveys, books and journal articles over the past 10 years, we seek here first to describe the contemporary character of the IPE discipline. By greatly expanding the sources of data, we depict a more comprehensive picture of global IPE scholarship today than that offered in contending studies that either stem from impressionistic accounts or coding exercises that base their findings on data derived from a select set of IR journals, without due attention to dedicated IPE journals as well as books.2 As such, we demonstrate how different the field of IPE looks from the prevailing conventional wisdom when we expand our scope of empirical inquiry. Furthermore, we explore whether RIPE appears to more closely reflect a newly revealed ‘missing middle’ or ‘mainstream’ with respect to what IPE scholars themselves report as their values and approaches to their scholarship, as opposed to what we see published in selected peer-reviewed journals.

To this end, in our analysis, we draw upon the pioneering work of the Teaching, Research and International Policy (TRIP) project.3 The article uses data from the 2011 TRIP global survey of 3464 IR scholars in 20 countries, of whom 735 respondents reported IPE to be their primary or secondary field of research,4 to establish some important axes of differentiation in the study of IPE.5 We also tap into the TRIP data on the coded content of the top 12 international relations journals (hereafter, the ‘TRIP 12’) in analysing 181 of 1330 articles coded as IPE.6 This TRIP dataset is augmented by newly coded data from a sample of 500 IR books from the top five book presses between 2000 and 2010, of which 46 were identified as IPE.7 Finally, we coded all articles in RIPE between 2000 and 2010 according to the TRIP methodology, in which 326 articles from 375 articles were coded as IPE.8

These new data enable a broader and more robust analysis of the field of IPE. Specifically, it is possible to compare the IPE research in the TRIP 12 against both survey data and other key outlets for IPE work, including RIPE and leading book presses. The TRIP 12, characterized as the mainstream, appear to be highly unrepresentative of IPE at large. By placing RIPE articles in comparative context, it is also possible to assess prevailing perceptions about RIPE’s allegiance to the so-called ‘British school of IPE’ (Murphy and Nelson, 2001: 397) and its perceived distance from what might pass for IPE orthodoxy. Finally, placing the results of the coding analysis against survey results, we can venture a tentative
assessment as to whether RIPE has succeeded in representing global diversity in IPE.

In taking such a data-driven approach to describing the world of IPE and RIPE’s place in it, we aim to ground and complement the more thematic contributions to this anniversary issue. Here we address (if not resolve) some of the persistent concerns about trends in IPE that recent surveys of the field have revealed. In particular, we note several disconnects between what IR and IPE academics say they are doing in surveys and what is actually published in leading mainstream journals. These puzzling disconnects centre on questions about methodology, paradigmatic orientation, epistemology, and policy relevance. On each of these, the article and survey data present sharply different pictures. Using data on articles published in RIPE, books and newly disaggregated survey data reveal where such disconnects continue to exist as well as partially dispel some myths about the perceived quantitative, paradigmatic and positivist turn in IPE.

A few key conclusions are foreshadowed here. First, over the past decade, RIPE has remained relatively faithful to the aims of its original editors. It has provided, if not quite Susan Strange’s ‘open range’, a forum for broad and diverse writings about the interaction of politics and economics. Since 2000, articles in RIPE reveal an epistemological and paradigmatic diversity that more closely aligns with what we see in survey and book data compared with the journals in the TRIP database such as International Organization, International Studies Quarterly and World Politics. RIPE is also notably more international in the make-up of its contributors, whereas the TRIP 12 are dominated by authors based in American institutions.

RIPE has not made any discernible movement towards the quantitative turn that many perceive in IPE. RIPE in fact exhibits a strong qualitative and descriptive bias, publishing fewer quantitatively oriented articles than we might expect, given survey responses and the striking shift towards quantitative work in the TRIP 12. Moreover, despite survey evidence suggesting that IPE scholars value bridging the academic–policy divide, RIPE seems to suffer the same distance from policymakers as these other journals in neglecting to engage policy analysis or make explicit policy prescriptions.

To structure the discussion, we first recount the rise of the American School of IPE. This school has often been conflated with the mainstream of IPE because of its prominence in the pages of the leading IR journals and the tendency of ‘state of the discipline’ studies to over-rely on interpretive or quantitative content analyses of leading journals to understand the field. We question this conventional wisdom by constructing a larger dataset drawing from a variety of sources that better reflect the range of outlets in which we might find IPE work. Further evidence is taken from extensive survey material on what self-identified IPE scholars across the globe say they do in their research. Specifically, we investigate what the field of IPE as a whole looks like along the categorical dimensions used in the TRIP
project, and discern where RIPE mirrors or distinguishes itself from trends apparent from other sources. We parse out this discussion by examining the results of our data analysis in five areas: (1) paradigms, (2) epistemology, (3) methodology, (4) policy orientation and (5) demography. We conclude with both some analytical and normative thoughts regarding the future of IPE and RIPE’s role as a leading journal in the discipline.

**THE IPE MAINSTREAM: AN AMERICAN SCHOOL?**

In a 2006 address to the International Political Economy Society, which later became a RIPE article and book (2008), Benjamin Cohen proposed the notion of an American School of IPE. Like other observers (for example, Smith, 2000), Cohen asserted that the American School is characterized by specific and distinctive features, in particular its commitments to positivism and quantitative methods. Though challenged at the time and since (Higgott and Watson, 2008; Ravenhill, 2008), data on journal publications amassed and analysed within the TRIP project seem to broadly support Cohen’s main thesis and rebut many of the objections of his critics (Maliniak and Tierney, 2009). Recapping many of the findings about the American School is important for our inquiry here because, in many ways, it constitutes the perceived mainstream against which RIPE at least in part defined itself since its launch in 1994. If work published in this American School is little different from that published in RIPE, then the journal may have lost much of its raison d’être to reflect the broader world of IPE scholarship.

In 2009, in RIPE’s special issue on the American School of IPE, Daniel Maliniak and Michael Tierney used the TRIP data project to test prevailing impressionistic claims about the state of IPE. They based their study on the coding of all articles in the top 12 IR journals and a 2006 survey of IR scholars in the United States and Canada (30 per cent of whom reported working in IPE). One of the most provocative findings was that IPE seemed to reflect an extreme version of American IR in general. Most prominently, their study revealed that IPE in the US academy exhibited a distinctive turn away from a dominance of qualitative work in the 1980s towards quantitative methods and (to a lesser extent) formal modelling after the turn of the century. Not only was this change notable over time, but also relative to IR as a whole. By 2006, an astonishing 90 per cent of IPE articles in the TRIP 12 were employing quantitative methods. In comparison, in the same year, 55 per cent of IR articles were coded as using this method. Over the period from 1993 to 2003, the proportion of IPE articles using quantitative methods increased from 21 per cent to 70 per cent, while qualitative methods fell from 71 per cent to 30 per cent. Maliniak and Tierney also found an increase in the use of formal modelling in the TRIP 12, which, since 2000, averaged around 20 per cent of IPE articles, as opposed to 12 per cent in IR more broadly (2009: 21).
Not surprisingly, given the methodological results, Maliniak and Tierney further found that nearly 100 per cent of IPE articles in the TRIP 12 adhered to a positivist epistemology, despite survey results that revealed that only 70 per cent and 48 per cent of IR scholars in the US and Canada, respectively, self-reported their work as positivist (Maliniak et al., 2007). These results, they speculated, may reflect a generational shift. Of those US IPE respondents in the 2006 survey who had received their doctorate in the 1980s, 18 per cent chose quantitative methods as their primary method, jumping to 27 per cent for those graduating in the 1990s, and 36 per cent of those graduating after 2000 (Maliniak and Tierney, 2009: 22). The same trend was evident in IR survey respondents more generally, but to a lesser degree. In the 2008 TRIP survey of US scholars, 50 per cent of those under 30 reported that their primary method was quantitative versus only 8 per cent of those over 60 who said the same (Maliniak et al., 2011: 453–4).

Somewhat less clear-cut, but still noticeable from Maliniak and Tierney’s analysis of the IPE articles in the TRIP 12 is the apparent commitment to theoretical and paradigmatic research, especially in contrast to international relations in general. While 45 per cent of IR articles are classified as realist, liberal, constructivist or Marxist (the four key paradigmatic categories offered within the TRIP coding system), fully 73 per cent of the IPE articles in their study are oriented around one of these paradigmatic approaches (Maliniak and Tierney, 2009: 14). To put it differently, whereas US IR in general is becoming less concerned with paradigms (for example, non-paradigmatic work was 30 per cent in 1980, but 50 per cent in 2006), IPE in the TRIP 12 is bucking the trend by becoming more oriented around paradigms. Moreover, this paradigmatic orientation is narrowing to a focus on liberalism to the neglect of alternative approaches. The period since the 1980s saw Marxist and atheoretic articles decline to the point of extinction in the TRIP 12, and constructivist work is also relatively under-represented in the TRIP 12, showing up in only around 5 per cent of articles in any given year. While the terminal decline of Marxism was replicated in IR, the complete absence of atheoretic articles was specific to IPE, perhaps representing the absence of a journal such as International Security and Security Studies, which publish policy and historical accounts.

The key punchline of Maliniak and Tierney’s seminal study, as well as the more qualitative studies that preceded it (Cohen, 2008), seems to be that the IPE mainstream is moving clearly and quickly in a quantitative, paradigmatic and positivist direction. To some, these trends reveal that IPE has entered a brave new world of scientific methods, representing the vanguard of IPE and where the field is—or should be—headed (Lake, 2006; Frieden and Martin, 2002). Others lament the narrowing of the field (McNamara, 2009; Katzenstein, 2009; Blyth, 2009). While resolving this debate is well beyond the scope and objectives of our study here, we do think it is worthwhile to investigate the underlying assumption that IPE
articles in the TRIP 12 and surveys drawn primarily from the US academic world accurately reflect the global field of IPE today. It is with this in mind that we now broaden the lens of inquiry to our larger dataset and put to the test some of these claims about IPE today.

RETHINKING IPE: A BROADER VIEW OF THE STATE OF THE DISCIPLINE

This section delves into the expanded data collected to re-examine what arguably has become the conventional wisdom regarding ‘mainstream’ IPE, at least in the United States. This ambitious data project was a product of some scepticism about the conclusions of prior studies. Would the trends revealed in previous journal coding and survey exercises be replicated in survey data from a larger set of countries around the world and in publication data on books and dedicated IPE journals such as RIPE? In 2011, the TRIP team expanded their survey to include IR scholars from 20 countries,11 which provided a valuable opportunity to re-analyse the results of the Maliniak and Tierney study on the American School (which drew from the 2006 survey that only included US and Canadian IR scholars). Moreover, in 2010, the authors were invited by the TRIP team to include a pilot project on the coding of books. By 2012, this yielded new data based upon a sampling of 500 IR books between 2000 and 2010 selected from the top five book presses in IR (Sharman and Weaver, 2013). In 2012, in preparation for this special issue, we also began coding all articles in RIPE during 2000–10. While we recognize the limitations of sticking to the TRIP coding methodology (with its distinctly American view of defining and categorizing the fields of IR and IPE), we do so for the sake of generating comparable data.

Comparing what is published in prominent IPE and IR journals against what scholars say they are doing in surveys reveals some striking mismatches. Methodologically, this relates above all to the hugely disproportionate share of quantitative work in mainstream IPE journals relative to the consistent majority of IR and IPE scholars who favour qualitative methods, both internationally and in the United States. Paradigmatically, realists, constructivists and especially Marxists are under-represented in the TRIP journals, raising questions as to whether these groups are just publishing less or publishing in different places like books and/or non-mainstream journals such as RIPE. A further puzzle is that scholars consistently express the importance of policy concerns for their work, yet there is very little connection with the policy world in the top journals, even less in IPE than in IR more generally. Finally, we note that authors from US institutions (unsurprisingly) dominate the TRIP 12 journals and poorly represent the number of scholars worldwide who report studying IPE.
Table 1 Paradigms in IPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>2011 Survey n = 735</th>
<th>TRIP 12 n = 181</th>
<th>RIPE n = 326</th>
<th>IPE books n = 46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realism</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivism</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marxism</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-paradigmatic/other*</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheoretic/none</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *The 2011 Survey included responses on feminism and the English School. For comparison’s sake, we have aggregated these into the ‘non-paradigmatic’ category, which (as explained in the text) includes all paradigmatic work that does not fall into one of the four main paradigmatic approaches listed here (realism, liberalism, constructivism and Marxism). We recognize the severe limitations of this approach, but are constrained by the TRIP codebook. Also, the survey allows for no response. Around 1% of survey respondents did not answer this question, which is why the percentages do not add up to 100.

To what extent does looking at RIPE and books in the field give a more cosmopolitan complexion to the field?

Paradigms in IPE: The (not so) liberal turn?

Comparing the 2011 TRIP survey responses for the IPE sub-sample with overall IR results, we find some notable differences. According to scholars’ self-identified paradigmatic leanings, IPE is less constructivist than IR in general (17 per cent versus 22 per cent), less realist (11 per cent versus 15 per cent), but more liberal (21 per cent versus 15 per cent) and significantly more Marxist (9 per cent compared with 4 per cent). In the IPE sample, 20.1 per cent of respondents report that they use ‘other paradigms’ and 21.5 per cent report that they use no paradigms or are atheoretic in their work (see Table 1).

The more interesting differences appear when we compare the IPE survey results with the TRIP 12 coding results. In the TRIP 12, 54.1 per cent of the articles are coded as liberal—a startling divergence from survey results. Likewise, despite survey results that suggest a fair measure of realism, constructivism and Marxism in IPE, as well as a large portion of non-paradigmatic or atheoretical analysis, these alternative approaches are conspicuously under-represented in the TRIP 12. As Table 1 shows, constructivism shows up in less than 4 per cent of IPE articles in the TRIP 12, realism in just around 2 per cent and Marxism skates in last at 1.7 per cent. Given these results, where is the non-liberal paradigmatic work showing up?

An analysis of books and RIPE provides some clues, but not complete answers. As shown in Table 1, both books and RIPE arguably come the
closest to mirroring the 2011 survey results with respect to the ‘missing Marxism’ and constructivism, although not perfectly. Books best capture the balance of non-paradigmatic (meaning ‘other paradigms’) work that authors self-report. RIPE, on the other hand, appears to quite dramatically over-represent this catchall category, while coming very close in reflecting the proportion of liberalism seen in survey results. Realism appears to be the most conspicuously under-represented in all of the published IPE work we examined, for reasons unknown.

As a result, it is difficult to provide a clear conclusion from these descriptive results or offer causal explanations, with two partial exceptions. First, the perceived turn towards liberalism in the American School is probably overblown; much more variety appears to exist across the paradigmatic spectrum even if this balance is weakly represented in the TRIP 12. Second, prior studies of IPE are affirmed on one key point: published IPE is becoming more paradigmatically oriented when compared against survey data that indicate a much higher rate of atheoretical work.

It is important to acknowledge here that this analysis is limited by the rules of the TRIP coding system. While the 2011 TRIP survey enables respondents to self-identify across a larger range of theoretical or paradigmatic approaches, including feminism and the English School, the TRIP coding interface limits the options to realism, liberalism, constructivism, Marxism, and two broadly defined categories of ‘non-paradigmatic’ and ‘atheoretical/none’. ‘Non-paradigmatic’ here does not in fact refer to the absence of paradigmatic or theoretical framing, but rather ‘captures articles that do advance or test a coherent theory, but do not fit comfortably within one of the four major paradigms [realism, liberalism, constructivism or Marxism]’. This became a rather acute challenge in coding RIPE articles, many of which displayed a great diversity in theoretical approaches—including critical theory—but fell by default into the same ‘non-paradigmatic’ camp. The raw results thus tend to obscure the diversity in the theoretical and paradigmatic approaches of the articles published in RIPE. Further analysis of the field of IPE, particularly when including a broader array of interdisciplinary journals that are highly relevant in the IPE field outside of the US, where IPE is not seen as a mere subfield of IR, may need to address how to better identify and categorize theoretical and paradigmatic differences to provide a more refined analysis along these lines. 12

**Epistemologies of IPE: A positivist world?**

Unlike our inquiry into the paradigmatic features of IPE, our examination of epistemological differences between our various data groups yields far greater clarity. While previous accounts have asserted a strong and
unambiguous trend towards positivist work in IPE, our data indicate that conclusions drawn from the TRIP 12 grossly exaggerate this trend.

As shown in Figure 1, approximately half of all IPE scholars in the 2011 global survey reported their epistemology to be either non-positivist or post-positivist. *RIPE* comes closest to reflecting this balance, with 37.4 per cent of all articles coded as non- or post-positivist. Books and TRIP 12 articles, on the other hand, are heavily skewed towards positivism, with articles in the TRIP 12 showing a near extinction of non- and post-positivist work between 2000 and 2010.

A decisive causal analysis for this strong divergence is well beyond the scope of this descriptive data exercise. However, in addressing the issue of observed differences between TRIP 12 articles, books and other journal articles, we might offer two explanations: a simple division of labour and a substitution effect. The first is that there is a group of IPE scholars leaning away from positivism who favour publishing their research in journals such as *RIPE*, rather than more mainstream journals and books. The second is the notion that changes in the character of journal article publications simply reflect an offset: that is, scholars who find it harder and harder to get published in journals such as *International Organization*, *International Studies Quarterly* and the like will self-select in their submissions to other journals such as *RIPE*, where they perceive more epistemological tolerance. This relates to Maliniak et al.’s observation that judging from the journal data, in the future, ‘the considerable minority of IR scholars who self-identify as non-positivists or post-positivists may experience increasing challenges publishing their work [in the TRIP 12]’ (2011: 461). It is difficult
to know if this claim is true without including other non-US-centric IPE journals such as *New Political Economy*. If such a trend in publications is a result of journal bias, via editorial or peer-reviewer gatekeeping, or author (mis)perception and self-selection, any definite judgement may depend on an in-depth comparative study of submissions (which is probably impossible due to lack of data collected and reported by the journals and the blind review processes) or off-the-record conversations with journal editors. That said, the rather remarkable statistics raise an intriguing question: besides *RIPE*, where does all the non- and post-positivist IPE work get published?

### Methodologies of IPE: The persistence of diversity

As noted earlier, perhaps the strongest disconnect between survey and publication data relates to methodology in IR and IPE. In the report summarizing the results of the 2008 TRIP survey of IR scholars in 10 countries, Jordan *et al.* (2009: 5) found that ‘the percentage of articles using quantitative methods is vastly disproportionate to the actual number of scholars who identify statistical techniques as their primary methodology’. The 2011 TRIP survey reinforces this earlier conclusion (see Table 2). Across the 20 countries, 58 per cent of all IR scholars (around 2000 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>2011 Survey* primary method n = 735</th>
<th>2011 Survey secondary methods n = 735</th>
<th>TRIP 12 n = 181</th>
<th>Ripe n = 326</th>
<th>Books n = 46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal modelling</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical/non-formal/pure theory</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>(no option in survey)</td>
<td>(no option in survey)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterfactual analysis</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy analysis</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: *In the 2011 Survey, there were two questions on methodology meant to capture respondents’ primary and other methods use in research. The survey offered options slightly different from the journal and book coding interface, including legal or ethical analysis and pure theory. ‘Pure theory’ in the survey responses is equated in Table 2 with Analytical/non-formal.
reported that they use qualitative methods as their primary methodology, versus 15 per cent who reported using quantitative methods as their primary tool (Maliniak, Peterdon and Tierney 2012). For the 735 IPE scholars in the survey, the results reflect a somewhat greater quantitative orientation than the general 20-country IR pool, with 54 per cent qualitative and 25 per cent quantitative. Yet, the overall picture remains the same. Even among the 396 IPE respondents from the United States, qualitative responses out-ranked quantitative, with 51 per cent versus 34 per cent, respectively.

Although there is some variation, any way the data are sliced, the survey responses give a radically different portrayal of the field than do the TRIP 12 article results, which infer that at no point during 2000–10 did quantitative work drop below 50 per cent. In fact, in 2006, 100 per cent of all TRIP 12 articles were coded as quantitative. This is a far cry from the methodological patterns revealed by other data sources. According to all the TRIP surveys (2004, 2006, 2008, 2011), there is a consistent majority of IPE scholars using qualitative methods, including in the United States. In this sense, the American School of IPE, as captured in the TRIP 12, begins to look like a chimera, or at least a misnomer. Furthermore, in comparing the survey with the journal article results, we also find that work based on formal modelling is even more disproportionately represented in the TRIP 12. Is it that the qualitatively-inclined majority are less research active, have self-selected or been pushed into books, or that they publish instead in non-mainstream journals such as RIPE?

Taking the RIPE results first, there is definite evidence that qualitative work is well received by the journal, evidence perhaps of John Ravenhill’s ‘missing middle’ (2008). In fact, RIPE may be over-representing qualitative work. A 10-year rolling average indicates that only 6 per cent of articles in RIPE over the past 10 years employed quantitative analysis, compared with close to 63 per cent that used qualitative methods. As indicated in Table 2, books likewise contrast what we see in the TRIP 12 and more closely align with survey and RIPE results.13

Also noteworthy are the differences in other methods employed. For example, we observe a marked increase in the use of formal modelling in the TRIP 12 articles, averaging 13 per cent of all IPE work published during 2000–10. By contrast, formal models are only used in 2 per cent of IPE books, only 1 per cent in RIPE articles, and are reported as the primary methodology or second methodology by 1 per cent of IPE survey respondents. Likewise, while descriptive methods are used very rarely in the TRIP 12 (2 per cent on average between 2000 and 2010), they are more common in books (14 per cent) and in RIPE (8 per cent).14 Where books, RIPE articles and the TRIP 12 do converge is in their common lack of policy analysis (a point discussed below).

These findings call into question the oft-asserted claim that IR scholarship as a whole, and IPE in particular, is becoming more quantitative...
SHARMAN AND WEAVER: RIPE

(Maliniak et al., 2007: 22). This is certainly the case within the TRIP 12. But it does not seem to hold for IPE in general. There does seem to be a growing bifurcation between quantitative and qualitative work. As the pages of the TRIP 12 are increasingly occupied by quantitative work, at least in IPE, it may be that qualitatively-inclined scholars are simply choosing book outlets or journals such as RIPE. One unfortunate result may be a growing quantitative/qualitative divide, and a dialogue of the deaf.

The paucity of policy

One of our earliest observations of the results produced through the TRIP project was the remarkable disconnect between survey respondents’ expressed interest and involvement in policy work and the dearth of policy engagement in published articles and book. Indeed, IPE scholars on numerous fronts seem to think that more bridges should be built between the policy and academic worlds, and many scholars are in fact doing just this in their own work outside the ivory tower. According to the 2011 TRIP survey of scholars in 20 countries, 64 per cent of respondents indicate that they believe there should be a larger number of links between the academic and policy communities. On average across the 20 countries, 64 per cent also report that they have consulted or worked in an unpaid capacity in the past two years for non-academic institutions, including think-tanks, governments and international governmental and non-governmental organizations. In addition, 40 per cent of IPE scholars report that they use policy analysis as their primary or one of their secondary methods (see Table 2).15 Some 29 per cent of IPE scholars report that policy relevance or current events motivate their research and 21 per cent believe that policy relevance or current events should motivate research in the discipline as a whole.

However, this interest in policy-relevant scholarship and outreach is not evident when we examine all of the data from published sources. There is very little work being published anywhere that either employs policy analysis as a method or makes explicit policy recommendations. The most policy analysis we observed was in RIPE (4 per cent of articles) and books (3 per cent). No policy analysis was used as a methodology by any of the TRIP 12 IPE articles in this study. Likewise, in only 2.2 per cent of the TRIP 12 and 4.6 per cent of RIPE articles were policy prescriptions offered. Books appear more likely to provide explicit policy prescriptions, at 24 per cent in our sample. However, because the IPE book sample is so small, no strong conclusions are possible.

Why the scarcity of policy engagement in the IPE publication outputs considered here? Reasonable hypotheses may be linked to professional training or incentive structures that diminish the value of policy analysis or policy work. In all probability, the results are biased by the neglect of
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more policy-oriented journals. Most probably, authors may be publishing more policy-oriented work, just not in the journals and books coded here. They may save such work for more popular media geared to lay audiences and for forums such as blogs, op-ed articles or formal policy reports published by think-tanks. Such self-selection effects are quite likely.

If the survey results are to be believed, a strong majority of IPE scholars think that there should be more policy-relevant work in the field. How might a stronger policy orientation emerge in IPE academic outlets (and, more critically, should it)? How can, or should, peer review, hiring and promotion, and PhD training change to make this possible? One anecdotal observation is that the increasing emphasis that grant agencies put on ‘impact’, usually defined in policy terms, in the research projects that they fund might serve to at least partially redress this imbalance in future.\textsuperscript{16}

A global IPE? The demographics of publications

A final point of discussion relates to how faithfully current publication outlets, at least in the English-speaking world, reflect the geographical and gender diversity of IPE scholars today. The results of analyses of the TRIP 12 reveal a clear dominance of American authors as measured by authors’ institutional affiliation, who author 80 per cent of all IPE articles) (see Table 3).\textsuperscript{17} The results will tip towards a higher proportion of US-based authors simply because of the sheer number of US IR academics relative to others in the world. The breakdown of nationalities among IPE scholars shows that 396 out of 735 (53 per cent) are based in the United States, with the second-largest population being the 77 scholars (10.5 per cent) based in the United Kingdom (see Table 3). Even taking this difference into account, however, US scholars are still heavily over-represented in the TRIP 12. This begs the questions of where non-US IPE scholars publish their work. Are RIPE and books any better in reflecting geographical and gender diversity?

RIPE and books do in fact exhibit more geographical diversity, though not perfectly proportional to the percentages suggested by survey results. For example, RIPE may actually under-represent Americans and over-represent British, Canadian and Australian authors. This is perhaps not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>TRIP Survey</th>
<th>TRIP 12</th>
<th>RIPE</th>
<th>Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
entirely surprising given its British origins and the explicit intent of RIPE’s past editors to balance more US-centric journals. Nonetheless, RIPE comes a great deal closer to capturing the global diversity of IPE scholars with 24 per cent in the ‘other category’. It seems that RIPE still adheres to its British identity, but it is also discernibly a more global IPE journal than its TRIP 12 peers.

On gender diversity, the good news is that almost all publication outlets seem to more or less accurately capture the balance of women and men in the field of IPE. The bad news is only 21.3 per cent of IPE scholars in the 20-countries survey are women. This contrasts with the overall survey pool, wherein 31 per cent scholars in the IR field as a whole are women (Maliniak, Peterton and Tierney 2012).

### CONCLUSION

Before summing up our findings, we briefly consider two possible challenges or caveats to the argument so far. The first is that the TRIP 12 journals were selected by the TRIP founders not because they were seen to be the most representative of the field, but because they are the most influential, and thus that many of the criticisms made here are wide of the mark. As noted, the list of 12 journals was decided by impact derived from citations, which in turn function as a proxy for readership, influence and prestige. In this sense, the TRIP journals are deliberately unrepresentative, in the same way as the five book presses coded. Looking at the TRIP survey data on which journals are identified as the most influential confirms the fact that *International Organization, International Studies Quarterly* and *World Politics* are considered to be the leading journals in IR, both in terms of the individual country results and aggregated totals (Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012, 52–4). As unpalatable as it may be for individual and institutional egos, especially outside the United States, the TRIP journals may be not so much different from as just better than their peers. Even if this somewhat indelicate conclusion is true, however, it does not obviate the point that the TRIP 12 journals provide a very poor basis for understanding IPE in general, either globally, or even just in the United States.
A more serious challenge that goes to the core of the data presented here attacks the strong implicit presumption that IPE is a sub-field of international relations (which, for US scholars, is in turn taken to be a sub-field of political science). All aspects of the TRIP project, from the journal coding to the survey to the extension to consider books, seek to discern the nature of IPE by breaking out a sub-sample of an IR database. Those researching and writing about core IPE topics from sociology, geography, economics, anthropology and other fields are excluded from our view by the disciplinary premises that structure the data collection exercise. Given the multidisciplinary aims and scope of RIPE and the inherently IR-bound nature of the TRIP data, there is thus a significant problem of incommensurability.19

It would be all too easy to infer from studies to date that the field of IPE is rapidly changing to conform to the template of the American School. However, we find the results of previous studies to be inconclusive at best, and misleading at worst, because of the skewed nature of the data sources used to draw these conclusions. We have asserted here that to get a more complete and accurate picture of IPE today, we have to expand the scope of inquiry, and in future studies, to alter the mode of inquiry. While our study presented here does not pretend to provide a comprehensive review of all IPE scholars in the world and all possible outlets for their work, and we realize the limits of keeping to the TRIP template in coding this world of IPE, we do believe that the inclusion of survey data from more countries, from books, and specifically from dedicated IPE journals outside of the TRIP 12 gets us closer to this analytical goal.

This returns us to the questions most relevant to this special issue in honour of RIPE’s 20th anniversary: how does RIPE reflect the field of IPE today? Does it live up to its espoused goals to represent a truly global IPE, journal that encompasses the vast diversity of theoretical, methodological and epistemological approaches to the study of IPE, as well as serve as a forum for perspectives from around the world? In summary, despite RIPE’s British origins and its greater inclusion of British and Commonwealth authors, we find little evidence to suggest that RIPE is today the epitome of ‘British IPE’, as featured in recent debates for its orientation around non- and post-positivism, normative inquiry and paradigmatic sympathy for Marxist and critical theory.20 At the same time, we do find definitive evidence that articles published in RIPE do not adhere to the tenets of the American School of IPE, which is characterized by a prevailing positivism, quantitative methodology and liberal paradigm. In fact, the more sources of data we consult, the stranger and more atypical the American and British Schools begin to look, and the more typical RIPE appears in its apparent theoretical and epistemological eclecticism or, perhaps more accurately, its agnosticism.
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NOTES

1 RIPE (2004). The lead editorial team of RIPE today consists of six editors who are chosen to represent IPE’s diversity across geographical, disciplinary, gender, substantive expertise, methodological and ideological perspectives. Over the past 10 years, the editors have come from fields such as economics, geography, political science and sociology; worked in institutions based in the United Kingdom, Denmark, France, Canada, the United States, the Netherlands, the Philippines and Singapore; and have contributed expertise covering traditional IPE fields such as trade, finance and development as well regional areas including Latin America, Europe, the former Soviet Union, Africa, Australasia, East and South Asia, North America, and the broader issues embedded in global economic governance. In addition, RIPE has an international advisory board that is comprised of members reflecting this same diversity and who are active in reviewing article submissions.


3 Here we gratefully acknowledge the help of Daniel Maliniak, Sue Peterson and Michael Tierney in allowing us access to this data.

4 Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney (2012). These results correspond to questions 22 and 23 in the 2011 TRIP survey, which asks the respondents to identify their primary and secondary fields of research.

5 For more information on the TRIP project, see http://irtheoryandpractice.wm.edu/projects/trip/.

6 The 12 journals are: European Journal of International Relations, International Organization, International Security, International Studies Quarterly, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Journal of Peace Research, Security Studies and World Politics, as well as articles coded as international relations from American Journal of Political Science, American Political Science Review, British Journal of Political Science and Journal of Politics. See the TRIP website and reports for a full explanation of how these journals were selected. Notably, of the 181 articles coded as IPE, a
majority of these were in three journals: *International Organization* (37 per cent), *International Studies Quarterly* (22 per cent) and *World Politics* (10 per cent).

As with the article coding exercise, rather than seeking to sample the whole universe of publications, we sought to survey the ‘commanding heights’ in book publications. We relied on reputation as measured by the TRIP survey for selecting presses. Question 44 of the 2008 TRIP survey asked respondents to list the four book presses that have the greatest influence on the way IR scholars think about international relations. The top five results in descending order are Cambridge (listed by 79 per cent of respondents worldwide), Princeton (58 per cent), Cornell (51 per cent), Oxford (51 per cent) and Routledge (21 per cent).

For more details on the book coding exercise, see Sharman and Weaver (2013).

The remaining 49 articles in *RIPE* were coded as something other than IPE as the primary issue area, according to the TRIP coding rules, usually comparative/domestic politics or international security.

The TRIP 12 were chosen according to Garand and Giles’ analysis of impact factor scores (2003). *RIPE* was just outside this top 12 and hence not included.

It is important to remember that these methods are not mutually exclusive as each article can be coded in the TRIP interface as using both methods. Furthermore, they later found that quantitative articles are more likely to be cited than qualitative articles (Maliniak et al., 2011: 451). Compared to the IR articles published in the general political science journals in the sample (*American Political Science Review, American Journal of Political Science, British Journal of Political Science* and *Journal of Politics*), however, IPE looks more typical in its strong commitment to quantitative methods (Maliniak et al., 2011: 455).

The 20 countries/provinces include: the United States, Great Britain, Brazil, Canada, Australia, Turkey, Mexico, France, French Canada, South Africa, Norway, Denmark, Colombia, Sweden, Argentina, Ireland, Singapore, New Zealand, Israel and Hong Kong.

However, we should warn that more options here also complicate the coding process, insofar as it requires the coders to be able to make more nuanced distinctions between paradigms. This is very difficult to pull off if coders (usually students, with senior arbitrators) have not been exposed to advanced theoretical training in IR. Thus, we do not criticize the TRIP architects for this choice to limit the number of options, the rationale for which is well explained in the TRIP codebook.

Here the small sample size (46) mandates caution, but nevertheless the same pattern seems to emerge. There are 36 books using qualitative methods and eight relying on descriptive methods, compared with 10 using quantitative methods and only one with a formal model. Notably, like articles, books may employ more than one method. All books coded as quantitative were also coded as qualitative with one exception, revealing the tendency of books to employ mixed methods.

The TRIP survey does not offer ‘descriptive methodology’ as an option, therefore limiting our comparison here.

By comparison, in the 2011 survey, 17 per cent of all IR scholars across the 20 countries reported that policy analysis is their primary method (more than quantitative methods) and 11 per cent in the United States (TRIP, 2011: 34). In addition, 43 per cent reported that policy analysis is one of their secondary methods (41 per cent in the US) (TRIP, 2011: 35).

We thank Eric Helleiner and Len Seabrooke for this observation.
We were unable to gather robust data on author passport nationality, birthplace or educational degree, so we use institutional affiliation at the time of publication as the best proxy for author nationality.

We thank an anonymous reviewer for this point.

We thank Andrew Baker and Eric Helleiner for this point.
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