TRIP 2017 U.S. Faculty Survey Report

1 Introduction

The Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) Project at the College of William & Mary explores the teaching and research practices of the international relations (IR) discipline to better understand help bridge the gap between theory and practice. The TRIP Faculty Survey, issued every 2-3 years, is one part of this larger project. The survey began in 2004 by sampling only scholars in the United States. The 2017 version, which is the sixth wave of the survey, expands the sample to more than 30 countries.

The TRIP Project was established in 2003 to gather data and publish analysis on the relationships between teaching, research and foreign policy. The discipline of international relations has expanded data collection efforts to capture important features of a wide array of international political problems. TRIP's original goal was to collect data on the academic discipline of international politics to gain a clear understanding of how scholars teach and research international relations, and in turn, how they influence policy.

As the TRIP Project has progressed, we have focused more on the perceived gap between the theory and practice of international relations. Our current research agenda focuses on trying to understand the relationships between IR scholarship and teaching, IR as practiced by policymakers, IR knowledge as reported in the media, and views on IR held by the public.

Our goal for data collection with the faculty survey is to compare scholarship and pedagogy to see whether or not scholars teach the same paradigms, methods, issue areas and regions that they employ and examine in their own research. We use these data to ask similar questions about the impact (or lack of impact) on the thinking of practitioners, and how IR experts can better communicate knowledge via the media to inform policymaking.

The report that follows includes both survey questions that we have included in TRIP surveys since the project's inception, such as questions about research method, paradigmatic and epistemological approach, and teaching style, as well as questions unique to the 2017 survey that gauge scholarly opinion on foreign policy issues. We first describe the method we used to collect our sample, and then we present the survey results.

2 Methods

For our U.S. faculty survey, we identified IR professors at schools by combining the schools from U.S. News & World Report's 2017 college rankings with U.S. military academies, Claremont Graduate University, and Middlebury Institute for International Studies at Monterey (which are not included in the rankings but do have political science faculty doing research and/or teaching courses on IR). We then identified IR professors at these schools through a systematic series of web searches, emails, and communications with departments and individual scholars.

In order to be considered for inclusion in the sample, scholars must meet one of the following conditions:

1. Individual is affiliated with a political science unit at a university, such as a department of government.

2. Individual is affiliated with a professional or policy school (e.g. Kennedy School of Government).

3. Individual is affiliated with a research institute at a university (e.g. Hoover Institution).

Interdisciplinary programs (e.g. Departments of Social Science) in which scholars teach or research international relations are considered. We identified all political science units within the institutions included in the sample. From there, we identified scholars with either teaching experience or research interests in IR. Research subjects are considered IR if either the independent or dependent variables cross an international border. Scholars are excluded if their teaching and research only list comparative political economy, area studies, or comparative politics. Similarly, professors who hold trans-national interests but only focus on a particular region (e.g. Latin American Politics) do not qualify.

The following principles are used to identify whether a scholar's teaching or research qualified as IR:

- *Teaching:* International relations is the primary theme of the course (i.e. The Politics of Global Governance would qualify as IR; a course on international law with a short discussion of global governance would not count).

- *Research:* The scholar must list at least one IR topic as a research interest; if no list is available, the scholar must exhibit some sustained interest in IR topics, even if those topics do not make up the majority of his/her work.

We identified a total of 4,849 individuals in the United States who met the TRIP criteria for inclusion. Of these individuals, 1,541 people answered at least one question on our survey. This gave us a response rate of 31.71%. The survey was in the field October to November 2017.

3 Demographics

Question 1: Gender

	Gender	n	Percentage
1	Male	1134	69.49
2	Female	479	29.35
3	Prefer not to answer	3	0.18

Question 2: Academic Rank in 2017

	rank 2017	n	Percentage
1	Full Professor	513	31.40
2	Associate Professor	415	25.40
3	Assistant Professor	400	24.50
4	Instructor	93	5.70
5	Adjunct	69	4.20
6	Emeritus	64	3.90
7	Visiting Instructor/Visiting Assistant Professor	42	2.60
8	Other	34	2.10
9	Post-Doctoral Fellow	2	0.10

Question 3: Are you a parent?

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	No, I am not a parent.	411	28.04
2	Yes, I become a parent before receiving my Ph.D.	412	28.10
3	Yes, I became a parent after receiving my Ph.D. but before beginning a tenure-track job.	137	9.35
4	Yes, I became a parent after beginning a tenure-track job but before I received tenure.	374	25.51
5	Yes, I became a parent after I received tenure.	132	9.00

Question 4: What is your country of origin?

	Country	n	Percentage
1	United States	1164	79.10
2	Other	280	19.00
3	United Kingdom	27	1.80

Question 5: What is your country of origin? - Other

	Country	n	Percentage
1	Canada	23	10.40
2	Germany	21	9.50
3	India	18	8.10
4	China	9	4.10
5	Israel	8	3.60
6	Japan	7	3.20
7	Turkey	6	2.70
8	Colombia	4	1.80
9	Iran	4	1.80
10	Netherlands	4	1.80
11	Poland	4	1.80
12	Romania	4	1.80
13	Argentina	3	1.40
14	Armenia	3	1.40
15	Greece	3	1.40

Question 6: In the past two years, have you consulted or worked in a paid or unpaid capacity for any of the following? Please select all that apply.

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	None	609	46.17
2	The U.S. government	338	25.63
3	Non-governmental organization	293	22.21
4	Think tank/private foundation	285	21.61
5	Private sector	141	10.69
6	International organization	131	9.93
7	Foreign government	104	7.88
8	Other	70	5.31
9	Interest group	52	3.94

Question 7: Which of the following best describes your positions generally on social issues? Economic Issues?

Ideology	Social issues	Economic issues
Very conservative	2.00	1.80
Somewhat conservative	5.10	9.00
Middle of the road	9.30	24.30
Somewhat liberal	31.80	41.90
Very liberal	51.70	23.00

4 Research Interests

Question 8: What is your primary subfield within politics or political science, or are you not a political scientist?

	Subfield	n	Percentage
1	International Relations/Global Politics	870	56.80
2	Comparative Politics	246	16.10
3	International Political Economy	101	6.60
4	Other	82	5.40
5	Area studies/Regional Studies (including European studies)	73	4.80
6	I study International Relations, but not within the discipline of politics or political science.	38	2.50
7	Political Philosophy/Political Theory	24	1.60
8	Development Studies	23	1.50
9	Public Policy/Public Administration	16	1.00
10	U.S. Politics	16	1.00
11	Political Sociology	11	0.70
12	Methods	4	0.30
13	I am not a scholar of politics or political science.	28	1.80

Question 9: What is your main area of research within IR?

	Area of research	n	Percentage
1	International/Global Security	356	23.30
2	International/Global Political Economy	172	11.30
3	Other	154	10.10
4	U.S. Foreign Policy	122	8.00
5	Human Rights	70	4.60
6	International Relations Theory	69	4.50
7	Development Studies	67	4.40
8	International Relations of a particular region/country	66	4.30
9	International Organization(s)	64	4.20
10	European Studies/European Integration	59	3.90
11	Comparative Foreign Policy	52	3.40
12	International/Global Environmental Politics	49	3.20
13	International Law	40	2.60
14	Human Security	27	1.80
15	Gender in IR	17	1.10
16	International/Global History	14	0.90
17	International/Global Ethics	12	0.80
18	Religion in IR	12	0.80
19	Global Civil Society	11	0.70
20	International/Global Health	10	0.70
21	History of the international relations discipline	5	0.30
22	I am not an IR scholar	80	5.20

Question 10: What are your secondary areas of research within IR? Please select all that apply.

	Response option	Percentage
1	U.S. Foreign Policy	19.52
2	International Relations Theory	16.47
3	International/Global Security	15.61
4	International Organization(s)	14.12
5	International Relations of a particular region/country	12.35
6	International/Global Political Economy	12.35
7	Human Rights	10.50
8	Development Studies	10.36
9	Comparative Foreign Policy	10.08
10	Other	9.51
11	International Law	7.95
12	Human Security	7.59
13	International/Global History	6.03
14	European Studies/European Integration	5.25
15	Global Civil Society	4.68
16	International/Global Environmental Politics	4.26
17	Gender in IR	3.83
18	International/Global Ethics	3.41
19	History of the international relations discipline	2.56
20	Religion in IR	2.41
21	International/Global Health	1.35
22	I am not an IR scholar	1.56

Question 11: In your research, what is the **main** region of the world that you study, if any?

	Primary Region	n	Percentage
1	Global/Use cross-regional data	248	16.50
2	None	204	13.50
3	Middle East and North Africa (including Turkey)	156	10.40
4	East Asia (including China)	138	9.20
5	Western Europe	136	9.00
6	Latin America (including Mexico and the Caribbean)	128	8.50
7	Transnational Actors/International Organizations/International NGOs	127	8.40
8	Sub-Saharan Africa	83	5.50
9	North America (not including Mexico)	79	5.20
10	Russia/Former Soviet Union (excluding Baltic states)	75	5.00
11	Central and Eastern Europe (including the Baltic states)	51	3.40
12	South Asia (including Afghanistan)	43	2.90
13	Southeast Asia	33	2.20
14	Arctic	3	0.20
15	Central Asia (not including Afghanistan)	2	0.10
16	Oceania	1	0.10

Question 12: In your research, what **other** regions of the world do you study, if any?

	Secondary Region	Percentage
1	Western Europe	19.73
2	Middle East and North Africa (including Turkey)	18.79
3	Transnational Actors/International Organizations/International NGOs	18.57
4	Global/Use cross-regional data	18.42
5	North America (not including Mexico)	17.34
6	East Asia (including China)	16.18
7	Latin America (including Mexico and the Caribbean)	13.37
8	Central and Eastern Europe (including the Baltic states)	12.79
9	Russia/Former Soviet Union (excluding Baltic states)	12.79
10	None	10.12
11	Sub-Saharan Africa	9.90
12	South Asia (including Afghanistan)	9.61
13	Southeast Asia	9.03
14	Central Asia (not including Afghanistan)	6.36
15	Arctic	2.02
16	Oceania	1.45
17	Antarctic	0.43

Question 13: Which of the following statements best characterizes your work? Choose the closest option if none of them is an exact fit.

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	I employ a rational choice framework	107	7.20
2	My work is broadly rationalist	428	28.90
3	My work draws on both rationalist approaches and alternative approaches that do not assume rationality	571	38.60
4	My work does not assume the rationality of actors	375	25.30

Question 14: Does your research tend to be basic or applied? By basic research, we mean research for the sake of knowledge, without any specific policy applications in mind. Conversely, applied research is done with specific policy applications in mind.

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Primarily basic	248	16.70
2	Both, but more basic than applied	405	27.20
3	Both about equally	307	20.60
4	Both, but more applied than basic	319	21.40
5	Primarily applied	210	14.10

Question 15: How would you characterize your work in epistemological terms?

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Positivist	949	66.80
2	Non-positivist	238	16.70
3	Post-positivist	234	16.50

Question 16: Which of the following best describes your approach to the study of IR?

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	I do not use paradigmatic analysis	494	33.40
2	Constructivism	288	19.40
3	Realism	279	18.80
4	Liberalism	218	14.70
5	Other	95	6.40
6	English school	40	2.70
7	Marxism	40	2.70
8	Feminism	27	1.80

Question 17: Within the constructivist paradigm, please specify your main theoretical approach.

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Norm-based/sociological institutionalism	175	60.80
2	Critical constructivism	67	23.30
3	Other	46	16.00

Question 18: Within the liberal paradigm, please specify your main theoretical approach.

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Neoliberal/rational choice institutionalism	83	39.30
2	Domestic politics, including democratic peace	75	35.50
3	Historical and/or sociological institutionalism	44	20.90
4	Other	9	4.30

Question 19: Within the Marxist paradigm, please specify your main theoretical approach.

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Marxist historical materialism	16	41.00
2	Other critical theory	13	33.30
3	Neo-Gramscianism	10	25.60

Question 20: In your research, what method do you primarily employ?

	Method	n	Percentage
1	Qualitative analysis	846	56.00
2	Quantitative analysis	392	26.00
3	Policy analysis	137	9.10
4	Other	39	2.60
5	Legal or ethical analysis	31	2.10
6	Experimental	22	1.50
7	Formal modeling	21	1.40
8	Pure theory	12	0.80
9	Counterfactual analysis	10	0.70

Question 21: In your research, what other methods do you employ, not including your primary methodology?

	Secondary Method	Percentage
1	Policy analysis	36.31
2	Qualitative analysis	30.54
3	Quantitative analysis	25.40
4	Counterfactual analysis	13.37
5	Legal or ethical analysis	13.37
6	Pure theory	11.47
7	Experimental	10.70
8	Formal modeling	9.01
9	Other	6.40

Question 22: Which type of IR colleagues have the most important influence on your work? My work is most influenced by IR colleagues who: ...

	Response option	Percentage in top 3
1	Study the same issue area that I do	75.29
2	Employ the same theoretical approach that I do	33.73
3	Speak the same language that I do	29.25
4	Apply the same methodology that I do	25.80
5	Employ the same epistemology that I do	19.14
6	Employ the same ontology that I do	12.39
7	Other:	7.22
8	Come from the same generation that I do	6.51
9	Have an affiliation at a university in the same region that I do (e.g. Latin America)	6.27
10	Come from the same country or region that I do	5.65

5 Journals, Presses, and Rankings

- Before answering the questions in this section, respondents were randomly divided into three treatment groups that varied the order in which the following questions were presented

- The control group was immediately asked to "List four scholars whose work has had the greatest influence on the field of IR in the past 20 years" before answering any questions on citation policies.

- The gender treatment group viewed the following statement first
  "A number of recent studies have highlighted the possible under-representation of female scholars in international relations, as reflected in article citations and graduate syllabi, and as a share of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Several prominent journals report taking steps to ensure that scholars receive appropriate intellectual acknowledgment regardless of their gender. To this end, these journal editors ask authors to pay particular attention to this issue by citing overlooked authors and literatures."
  Respondents in this group were then asked a series of questions about this type of gender citation policy. They were then asked to "List four scholars whose work has had the greatest influence on the field of IR in the past 20 years."

- The Non-U.S. treatment group viewed the following statement first
  "A number of recent studies have highlighted the possible under-representation of scholars based outside the United States, as reflected in article citations and graduate syllabi, and as a share of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Several prominent journals report taking steps to ensure that scholars receive appropriate intellectual acknowledgment regardless of their race, nationality, or university location. To this end, some journal editors have asked authors to pay particular attention to this issue by citing overlooked authors and literatures."
  Respondents in this group were then asked a series of questions about this type of Non-U.S. citation policy. They were then asked to "List four scholars whose work has had the greatest influence on the field of IR in the past 20 years."

- The responses from the three treatment groups are broken out by treatment below.

- Table 26 combines all responses to get an overall top 25 ranking.

Question 23: List four scholars whose work has had the greatest influence on the field of IR in the past 20 years. Control treatment

Rank	Treatment	Name	n	Percentage in top 4
1	rank_control	Alexander Wendt	122	30.58
2	rank_control	Robert O. Keohane	115	28.82
3	rank_control	John Mearsheimer	82	20.55
4	rank_control	James Fearon	75	18.80
5	rank_control	Kenneth Waltz	67	16.79
6	rank_control	Joseph S. Nye Jr.	59	14.79
7	rank_control	Martha Finnemore	56	14.04
8	rank_control	Robert Jervis	42	10.53
9	rank_control	Stephen M. Walt	37	9.27
10	rank_control	David A. Lake	35	8.77
11	rank_control	Samuel P. Huntington	29	7.27
12	rank_control	Bruce Bueno de Mesquita	28	7.02
13	rank_control	Helen V. Milner	27	6.77
14	rank_control	Beth A. Simmons	26	6.52
15	rank_control	G. John Ikenberry	26	6.52
16	rank_control	Kathryn A. Sikkink	23	5.76
17	rank_control	J. Ann Tickner	16	4.01
18	rank_control	Peter J. Katzenstein	14	3.51
19	rank_control	Bruce Martin Russett	13	3.26
20	rank_control	Hans Morgenthau	13	3.26
21	rank_control	Barry Buzan	12	3.01
22	rank_control	Erica Chenoweth	12	3.01
23	rank_control	Francis Fukuyama	12	3.01
24	rank_control	Michael N. Barnett	11	2.76
25	rank_control	Robert Gilpin	11	2.76

Question 24: List four scholars whose work has had the greatest influence on the field of IR in the past 20 years. Gender treatment

Rank	Treatment	Name	n	Percentage in top 4
1	rank_gender	Alexander Wendt	115	30.18
2	rank_gender	Robert O. Keohane	97	25.46
3	rank_gender	John Mearsheimer	86	22.57
4	rank_gender	James Fearon	83	21.78
5	rank_gender	Joseph S. Nye Jr.	59	15.49
6	rank_gender	Martha Finnemore	58	15.22
7	rank_gender	Kenneth Waltz	50	13.12
8	rank_gender	Robert Jervis	47	12.34
9	rank_gender	Kathryn A. Sikkink	40	10.50
10	rank_gender	Stephen M. Walt	31	8.14
11	rank_gender	Helen V. Milner	30	7.87
12	rank_gender	Peter J. Katzenstein	30	7.87
13	rank_gender	Beth A. Simmons	26	6.82
14	rank_gender	J. Ann Tickner	26	6.82
15	rank_gender	G. John Ikenberry	25	6.56
16	rank_gender	Bruce Bueno de Mesquita	24	6.30
17	rank_gender	David A. Lake	23	6.04
18	rank_gender	Samuel P. Huntington	21	5.51
19	rank_gender	Cynthia Enloe	16	4.20
20	rank_gender	Francis Fukuyama	11	2.89
21	rank_gender	Bruce Martin Russett	10	2.62
22	rank_gender	Michael N. Barnett	10	2.62
23	rank_gender	Anne-Marie Slaughter	9	2.36
24	rank_gender	Stephen D. Krasner	9	2.36
25	rank_gender	Nicholas G. Onuf	8	2.10

Question 25: List four scholars whose work has had the greatest influence on the field of IR in the past 20 years. Scholars outside the U.S. treatment

Rank	Treatment	Name	n	Percentage in top 4
1	rank_outsideUS	Alexander Wendt	112	29.55
2	rank_outsideUS	Robert O. Keohane	98	25.86
3	rank_outsideUS	John Mearsheimer	89	23.48
4	rank_outsideUS	James Fearon	75	19.79
5	rank_outsideUS	Kenneth Waltz	65	17.15
6	rank_outsideUS	Martha Finnemore	46	12.14
7	rank_outsideUS	Joseph S. Nye Jr.	40	10.55
8	rank_outsideUS	Stephen M. Walt	35	9.23
9	rank_outsideUS	Robert Jervis	30	7.92
10	rank_outsideUS	Kathryn A. Sikkink	29	7.65
11	rank_outsideUS	G. John Ikenberry	29	7.65
12	rank_outsideUS	Beth A. Simmons	26	6.86
13	rank_outsideUS	David A. Lake	24	6.33
14	rank_outsideUS	Samuel P. Huntington	24	6.33
15	rank_outsideUS	Helen V. Milner	23	6.07
16	rank_outsideUS	J. Ann Tickner	21	5.54
17	rank_outsideUS	Bruce Bueno de Mesquita	18	4.75
18	rank_outsideUS	Peter J. Katzenstein	18	4.75
19	rank_outsideUS	Cynthia Enloe	14	3.69
20	rank_outsideUS	Michael N. Barnett	13	3.43
21	rank_outsideUS	Robert Gilpin	10	2.64
22	rank_outsideUS	Barry Buzan	9	2.37
23	rank_outsideUS	Michael W. Doyle	9	2.37
24	rank_outsideUS	Nicholas G. Onuf	9	2.37
25	rank_outsideUS	Patrick T. Jackson	9	2.37

Question 26: List four scholars whose work has had the greatest influence on the field of IR in the past 20 years. All responses Combined

Rank	Name	N	Percentage in top 4
1	Alexander Wendt	349	30.11
2	Robert O. Keohane	310	26.75
3	John Mearsheimer	257	22.17
4	James Fearon	233	20.10
5	Kenneth Waltz	182	15.70
6	Martha Finnemore	160	13.81
7	Joseph S. Nye Jr.	158	13.63
8	Robert Jervis	119	10.27
9	Stephen M. Walt	103	8.89
10	Kathryn A. Sikkink	92	7.94
11	David A. Lake	82	7.08
12	Helen V. Milner	80	6.90
13	G. John Ikenberry	80	6.90
14	Beth A. Simmons	78	6.73
15	Samuel P. Huntington	74	6.38
16	Bruce Bueno de Mesquita	70	6.04
17	J. Ann Tickner	63	5.44
18	Peter J. Katzenstein	62	5.35
19	Cynthia Enloe	38	3.28
20	Michael N. Barnett	34	2.93
21	Bruce Martin Russett	29	2.50
22	Francis Fukuyama	28	2.42
23	Hans Morgenthau	28	2.42
24	Barry Buzan	27	2.33
25	Stephen D. Krasner	27	2.33

Question 27: A number of recent studies have highlighted the possible under-representation of female scholars in international relations, as reflected in article citations and graduate syllabi, and as a share of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Several prominent journals report taking steps to ensure that scholars receive appropriate intellectual acknowledgment regardless of their gender. To this end, these journal editors ask authors to pay particular attention to this issue by citing overlooked authors and literatures. **Do you approve of this gender citation policy?**

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Approve	920	63.49
2	Don't know	271	18.70
3	Disapprove	258	17.80

Question 28: If you received such a reminder about gender from a journal editor in the review process this would:

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Change my behavior by causing me to cite more women	569	40.00
2	Have no impact on my behavior because I already make a special effort to cite underrepresented individuals	456	32.06
3	Have no impact on my behavior even though I currently do not make a special effort to cite underrepresented individuals	371	27.5
4	Change my behavior by causing me to cite fewer women	6	0.42

Question 29: A number of recent studies have highlighted the possible under-representation of scholars based outside the United States, as reflected in article citations and graduate syllabi, and as a share of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Several prominent journals report taking steps to ensure that scholars receive appropriate intellectual acknowledgment regardless of their race, nationality, or university location. To this end, some journal editors have asked authors to pay particular attention to this issue by citing overlooked authors and literatures. **Do you approve of this Non-US scholar citation policy?**

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Approve	833	57.88
2	Don't know	321	22.30
3	Disapprove	285	19.80

Question 30: If you received such a reminder from a journal editor in the review process this would:

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Change my behavior by causing me to cite more scholars based outside the United States	567	40.53
2	Have no impact on my behavior even though I currently do not make a special effort to cite underrepresented individuals	424	30.30
3	Have no impact on my behavior because I currently make a special effort to cite underrepresented individuals	401	28.66
4	Change my behavior by causing me to cite fewer scholars based outside the United States	7	0.50

Question 31: Please select the four journals that publish articles with the greatest influence on the way IR scholars think about international relations. These can include IR journals, general political science journals and/or non-political science journals.

	Journal	n	Percentage in top 4
1	International Organization	797	60.33
2	International Studies Quarterly	621	47.01
3	International Security	533	40.35
4	Foreign Affairs	405	30.66
5	American Political Science Review	319	24.15
6	World Politics	309	23.39
7	Journal of Conflict Resolution	290	21.95
8	Foreign Policy	185	14.00
9	European Journal of International Relations	176	13.32
10	American Journal of Political Science	167	12.64
11	Security Studies	166	12.57
12	Other	157	11.88
13	Journal of Peace Research	148	11.20
14	International Studies Review	104	7.87
15	Review of International Political Economy	79	5.98
16	Millennium	77	5.83
17	International Affairs	69	5.22
18	Comparative Politics	60	4.54
19	Review of International Studies	60	4.54
20	Journal of Politics	49	3.71
21	Survival	49	3.71
22	Global Governance	48	3.63
23	National Interest	47	3.56
24	Political Science Quarterly	45	3.41
25	International Studies Perspective	41	3.10
26	Foreign Policy Analysis	40	3.03
27	International Theory	36	2.73
28	Review of International Organizations	34	2.57
29	International Interactions	24	1.82
30	International Relations	22	1.67

Question 32: Please select the four presses that publish books with the greatest influence on the way IR scholars think about international relations.

	Response option	Percentage in top 4
1	Cambridge University Press	80.87
2	Oxford University Press	65.12
3	Princeton University Press	51.73
4	Cornell University Press	46.14
5	Routledge	24.65
6	Lynne Rienner	14.72
7	Columbia University Press	14.49
8	Palgrave MacMillan	12.68
9	MIT Press	11.81
10	Stanford University Press	11.34
11	Harvard University Press	10.24
12	University of Michigan Press	8.35
13	SAGE	6.77
14	University of Chicago Press	6.77
15	Yale University Press	6.14
16	Other	5.51
17	University of California Press	3.15
18	Polity	2.83

Question 33: What are the five best Ph.D. programs in the world for a student who wants to pursue an academic career in IR?

	Question	Rank	Institution name	n	N	Percentage in top 5
1	PhD	1	Harvard University	575	844	68.13
2	PhD	2	Princeton University	513	844	60.78
3	PhD	3	Stanford University	484	844	57.35
4	PhD	4	Columbia University	333	844	39.45
5	PhD	5	University of Chicago	233	844	27.61
6	PhD	6	Yale University	218	844	25.83
7	PhD	7	University of California–San Diego	181	844	21.45
8	PhD	8	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	162	844	19.19
9	PhD	9	University of Michigan–Ann Arbor	122	844	14.45
10	PhD	10	University of California–Berkeley	121	844	14.34
11	PhD	11	Georgetown University	90	844	10.66
12	PhD	12	University of Oxford	89	844	10.55
13	PhD	13	Cornell University	66	844	7.82
14	PhD	14	London School of Economics and Political Science	64	844	7.58
15	PhD	15	Ohio State University	59	844	6.99
16	PhD	16	Johns Hopkins University	48	844	5.69
17	PhD	17	George Washington University	43	844	5.09
18	PhD	18	University of Cambridge	42	844	4.98
19	PhD	19	American University	38	844	4.50
20	PhD	20	Duke University	33	844	3.91
21	PhD	21	New York University	28	844	3.32
22	PhD	22	Tufts University	25	844	2.96
23	PhD	23	University of Minnesota–Twin Cities	25	844	2.96
24	PhD	24	University of Wisconsin–Madison	24	844	2.84
25	PhD	25	University of California–Los Angeles	22	844	2.61

Question 34: What are the five best masters programs in the world for a student who wants to pursue a policy career in IR?

	Question	Rank	Institution name	n	N	Percentage in top 5
1	Masters	1	Georgetown University	480	793	60.53
2	Masters	2	Harvard University	392	793	49.43
3	Masters	3	Johns Hopkins University	383	793	48.30
4	Masters	4	Princeton University	298	793	37.58
5	Masters	5	Columbia University	297	793	37.45
6	Masters	6	Tufts University	245	793	30.90
7	Masters	7	George Washington University	233	793	29.38
8	Masters	8	American University	167	793	21.06
9	Masters	9	London School of Economics and Political Science	144	793	18.16
10	Masters	10	University of Chicago	109	793	13.75
11	Masters	11	Stanford University	72	793	9.08
12	Masters	12	University of Oxford	64	793	8.07
13	Masters	13	Yale University	62	793	7.82
14	Masters	14	University of Denver	58	793	7.31
15	Masters	15	University of California–San Diego	43	793	5.42
16	Masters	16	Syracuse University	37	793	4.67
17	Masters	17	University of Cambridge	30	793	3.78
18	Masters	18	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	26	793	3.28
19	Masters	19	University of Michigan–Ann Arbor	26	793	3.28
20	Masters	20	University of California–Berkeley	19	793	2.40
21	Masters	21	University of Pittsburgh	19	793	2.40
22	Masters	22	New York University	17	793	2.14
23	Masters	23	Sciences Po–Paris	17	793	2.14
24	Masters	24	Duke University	14	793	1.77
25	Masters	25	School of Oriental and African Studies	12	793	1.51

Question 35: What are the five best colleges and universities in the United States for undergraduate students to study IR?

	Question	Rank	Institution name	n	N	Percentage in top 5
1	Undergrad	1	Harvard University	417	816	51.10
2	Undergrad	2	Princeton University	401	816	49.14
3	Undergrad	3	Stanford University	340	816	41.67
4	Undergrad	4	Georgetown University	322	816	39.46
5	Undergrad	5	Columbia University	269	816	32.97
6	Undergrad	6	Yale University	172	816	21.08
7	Undergrad	7	University of Chicago	171	816	20.96
8	Undergrad	8	George Washington University	142	816	17.40
9	Undergrad	9	American University	124	816	15.20
10	Undergrad	10	University of California–Berkeley	95	816	11.64
11	Undergrad	11	University of California–San Diego	79	816	9.68
12	Undergrad	12	Dartmouth College	78	816	9.56
13	Undergrad	13	Tufts University	74	816	9.07
14	Undergrad	14	University of Michigan–Ann Arbor	70	816	8.58
15	Undergrad	15	Johns Hopkins University	59	816	7.23
16	Undergrad	16	College of William & Mary	56	816	6.86
17	Undergrad	17	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	52	816	6.37
18	Undergrad	18	Cornell University	47	816	5.76
19	Undergrad	19	University of Pennsylvania	37	816	4.53
20	Undergrad	20	Ohio State University	37	816	4.53
21	Undergrad	21	Williams College	30	816	3.68
22	Undergrad	22	Brown University	27	816	3.31
23	Undergrad	23	University of Virginia	26	816	3.19
24	Undergrad	24	Swarthmore College	25	816	3.06
25	Undergrad	25	University of California–Los Angeles	25	816	3.06

6 Teaching

Question 36: At the Ph.D. level should international relations programs:

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Be taught as a subfield within the discipline of political science	857	58.10
2	Become stand-alone IR departments or degree programs	314	21.30
3	Don't know	172	11.70
4	Merge with area studies departments or programs	65	4.40
5	Merge with international history departments or programs	55	3.70
6	Merge with economics departments or programs	12	0.80

Question 37: Are your IR course(s) for undergraduates 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?

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Both, but primarily prepare students to be informed about foreign policy and international issues	507	34.60
2	Both about equally	401	27.40
3	Both, but primarily introduce students to scholarship in the IR discipline	318	21.70
4	Prepare students to be informed about foreign policy and international issues	173	11.80
5	Introduce students to scholarship in the IR discipline	67	4.60

Question 38: In the past five years, have you responded to any major world event by increasing or decreasing your research in an issue area related to that event?

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Yes	943	70.50
2	No	359	26.90
3	Don't know	35	2.60

Question 39: In the past five years, have you responded to any major world event by seeking to make your research more relevant to policy practitioners?

	Response option	n	Percentage
1	Yes	898	67.10
2	No	389	29.10
3	Don't know	52	3.90

7 Foreign Policy

Question 40: Potential Threats to the U.S.

	Threat	Response	n	Percentage
1	China's Power and influence	Major threat	251	38.90
2	China's Power and influence	Minor threat	317	49.10
3	China's Power and influence	Not a threat	77	11.90
4	Russia's Power and influence	Major threat	275	42.20
5	Russia's Power and influence	Minor threat	339	52.00
6	Russia's Power and influence	Not a threat	38	5.80
7	Climate Change	Major threat	517	79.80
8	Climate Change	Minor threat	104	16.00
9	Climate Change	Not a threat	27	4.20
10	ISIS	Major threat	93	14.30
11	ISIS	Minor threat	442	67.80
12	ISIS	Not a threat	117	17.90
13	Cyberattacks	Major threat	336	51.90
14	Cyberattacks	Minor threat	296	45.70
15	Cyberattacks	Not a threat	15	2.30
16	Refugee Floods	Major threat	45	6.90
17	Refugee Floods	Minor threat	278	42.60
18	Refugee Floods	Not a threat	329	50.50
19	Condition of the global Economy	Major threat	253	39.30
20	Condition of the global Economy	Minor threat	295	45.90
21	Condition of the global Economy	Not a threat	95	14.80

Question 41: Approve of Trump's Policies

	Policy	Response	n	Percentage
1	Withdraw U.S. support for intl climate agreements	Approve	50	3.90
2	Withdraw U.S. support for intl climate agreements	Disapprove	1211	94.10
3	Withdraw U.S. support for intl climate agreements	Don't know	26	2.00
4	Building a wall on Mexican border	Approve	51	4.00
5	Building a wall on Mexican border	Disapprove	1203	93.50
6	Building a wall on Mexican border	Don't know	32	2.50
7	Withdraw U.S. from JCPOA	Approve	46	3.60
8	Withdraw U.S. from JCPOA	Disapprove	1212	94.00
9	Withdraw U.S. from JCPOA	Don't know	32	2.50
10	Withdraw US. support from trade agreements	Approve	49	3.80
11	Withdraw US. support from trade agreements	Disapprove	1204	93.50
12	Withdraw US. support from trade agreements	Don't know	35	2.70
13	Tighter restrictions on immigrants from majority Muslim countries	Approve	92	7.20
14	Tighter restrictions on immigrants from majority Muslim countries	Disapprove	1146	89.20
15	Tighter restrictions on immigrants from majority Muslim countries	Don't know	47	3.70

Question 42: How much confidence do you have in each of the following leaders to do the right thing regarding world affairs

Leader	Response	n	Percentage
Donald Trump	No confidence at all	1067	82.80
Donald Trump	Not too much confidence	154	12.00
Donald Trump	Some confidence	48	3.70
Donald Trump	A lot of confidence	11	0.90
Donald Trump	Don't know	8	0.60
Xi Jinping	No confidence at all	112	8.70
Xi Jinping	Not too much confidence	519	40.50
Xi Jinping	Some confidence	573	44.70
Xi Jinping	A lot of confidence	27	2.10
Xi Jinping	Don't know	50	3.90
Vladimir Putin	No confidence at all	844	65.80
Vladimir Putin	Not too much confidence	352	27.40
Vladimir Putin	Some confidence	66	5.10
Vladimir Putin	A lot of confidence	10	0.80
Vladimir Putin	Don't know	11	0.90
Angela Merkel	No confidence at all	19	1.50
Angela Merkel	Not too much confidence	73	5.70
Angela Merkel	Some confidence	554	43.10
Angela Merkel	A lot of confidence	631	49.10
Angela Merkel	Don't know	7	0.50
Emmanuel Macron	No confidence at all	29	2.30
Emmanuel Macron	Not too much confidence	200	15.60
Emmanuel Macron	Some confidence	780	60.70
Emmanuel Macron	A lot of confidence	203	15.80
Emmanuel Macron	Don't know	72	5.60
Justin Trudeau	No confidence at all	52	4.00
Justin Trudeau	Not too much confidence	119	9.30
Justin Trudeau	Some confidence	620	48.20
Justin Trudeau	A lot of confidence	461	35.80
Justin Trudeau	Don't know	34	2.60
Theresa May	No confidence at all	205	16.00
Theresa May	Not too much confidence	644	50.20
Theresa May	Some confidence	371	28.90
Theresa May	A lot of confidence	41	3.20
Theresa May	Don't know	23	1.80

Question 43: What are the three most important foreign policy issues facing the U.S. today? in 10 years?

	Response	PercentageToday	Percentage10Years
1	Global climate change	57.12	62.43
2	Rising power of China	40.80	49.96
3	U.S. domestic political instability	40.06	30.13
4	Cybersecurity	36.80	46.13
5	Russian resurgence	24.93	18.18
6	WMD proliferation	21.51	18.48
7	International terrorism	19.29	16.60
8	International migration	16.47	14.88
9	Trade	12.61	11.87
10	Other	7.42	7.21
11	Ethnic conflict	6.53	7.21
12	Regional dis-integration	6.23	8.49
13	War in Syria	4.30	1.43
14	War in Afghanistan	2.52	1.80

Question 44: How confident are you that a state that has an assured second strike capability can achieve the following?

	Question	Response	n	Percentage
1	Deter nuclear attacks by another state	Confident/Somewhat Confident	1106	86.30
2	Deter nuclear attacks by another state	Not confident	126	9.80
3	Deter nuclear attacks by another state	Don't know	49	3.80
4	Coerce states that have nuclear weapons to change their behavior	Confident/Somewhat Confident	302	23.60
5	Coerce states that have nuclear weapons to change their behavior	Not confident	928	72.70
6	Coerce states that have nuclear weapons to change their behavior	Don't know	47	3.70
7	Deter conventional attacks by another nuclear armed state	Confident/Somewhat Confident	821	64.50
8	Deter conventional attacks by another nuclear armed state	Not confident	403	31.70
9	Deter conventional attacks by another nuclear armed state	Don't know	49	3.80
10	Coerce states without nuclear weapons to change their behavior	Confident/Somewhat Confident	457	36.00
11	Coerce states without nuclear weapons to change their behavior	Not confident	766	60.30
12	Coerce states without nuclear weapons to change their behavior	Don't know	48	3.80
13	Deter conventional attacks by a state without nuclear weapons	Confident/Somewhat Confident	797	62.90
14	Deter conventional attacks by a state without nuclear weapons	Not confident	420	33.10
15	Deter conventional attacks by a state without nuclear weapons	Don't know	50	3.90

Question 45: Should the U.S. have long-term military bases in the following countries? - Percentage Answering Yes

	Country	Response	n	Percentage
1	Australia	Yes	425	56.30
2	Japan	Yes	571	74.70
3	Jordan	Yes	225	30.90
4	Republic of Korea	Yes	568	77.90
5	Norway	Yes	223	31.00
6	Philippines	Yes	360	50.10
7	Poland	Yes	403	53.60
8	Turkey	Yes	322	42.60
9	United Kingdom	Yes	376	52.70
10	Canada	Yes	166	22.60
11	Colombia	Yes	92	13.10
12	Denmark	Yes	141	20.00
13	Germany	Yes	499	68.70
14	Hong Kong	Yes	86	11.90
15	Ireland	Yes	83	11.40
16	Israel	Yes	132	17.50
17	Italy	Yes	331	45.40

Question 46: How effective are the following approaches to achieving the foreign policy goals of the U.S.?

	Approach	Response	n	Percentage
1	Maintaining U.S. military superiority	Very effective	339	26.80
2	Maintaining U.S. military superiority	Somewhat effective	712	56.20
3	Maintaining U.S. military superiority	Not very effective	167	13.20
4	Maintaining U.S. military superiority	Not effective at all	37	2.90
5	Maintaining U.S. military superiority	Don't know	12	0.90
6	Placing sanctions on other countries	Very effective	31	2.40
7	Placing sanctions on other countries	Somewhat effective	573	45.20
8	Placing sanctions on other countries	Not very effective	538	42.50
9	Placing sanctions on other countries	Not effective at all	113	8.90
10	Placing sanctions on other countries	Don't know	12	0.90
11	Signing free trade agreements	Very effective	430	33.90
12	Signing free trade agreements	Somewhat effective	703	55.40
13	Signing free trade agreements	Not very effective	92	7.30
14	Signing free trade agreements	Not effective at all	22	1.70
15	Signing free trade agreements	Don't know	21	1.70
16	Maintaining existing alliances	Very effective	758	59.70
17	Maintaining existing alliances	Somewhat effective	459	36.20
18	Maintaining existing alliances	Not very effective	32	2.50
19	Maintaining existing alliances	Not effective at all	9	0.70
20	Maintaining existing alliances	Don't know	11	0.90
21	Building new alliances	Very effective	536	42.30
22	Building new alliances	Somewhat effective	564	44.50
23	Building new alliances	Not very effective	105	8.30
24	Building new alliances	Not effective at all	18	1.40
25	Building new alliances	Don't know	44	3.50
26	International agreements	Very effective	462	36.50
27	International agreements	Somewhat effective	662	52.30
28	International agreements	Not very effective	106	8.40
29	International agreements	Not effective at all	16	1.30
30	International agreements	Don't know	20	1.60
31	Military intervention	Very effective	17	1.30
32	Military intervention	Somewhat effective	227	17.90
33	Military intervention	Not very effective	658	52.00
34	Military intervention	Not effective at all	346	27.30
35	Military intervention	Don't know	18	1.40
36	Participating in international organizations	Very effective	525	41.50
37	Participating in international organizations	Somewhat effective	642	50.70
38	Participating in international organizations	Not very effective	74	5.80
39	Participating in international organizations	Not effective at all	17	1.30
40	Participating in international organizations	Don't know	8	0.60

Question 47: Do you support or oppose the deployment of a THAAD antimissile system on the Korean Peninsula?

	Response	n	Percentage
1	Strongly support	235	18.60
2	Support	481	38.10
3	Neither support nor oppose	331	26.20
4	Oppose	145	11.50
5	Strongly oppose	70	5.50

Question 48: In your view what is the principal purpose of the deployment of a THAAD antimissile system on the Korean Peninsula?

	Response	n	Percentage
1	To deter North Korea's use of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles	515	40.80
2	To defend South Korea against a North Korean missile attack	340	27.00
3	To defend U.S. forces stationed in and near South Korea against a North Korean missile attack	136	10.80
4	To check the rise of China	81	6.40
5	Don't know	113	9.00
6	Other	76	6.00

Question 49: How confident are you that the nuclear taboo constrains countries from using nuclear weapons in a first strike?

	Response	n	Percentage
1	Very confident	368	28.60
2	Somewhat confident	588	45.80
3	Not very confident	219	17.00
4	Not very confident at all	88	6.80
5	Don't know	22	1.70

Question 50: Which three U.S. Presidents have been most effective in the area of foreign policy in the past 100 years?

	President	n	Percentage in top 3
1	Franklin Roosevelt	836	68.36
2	George H. W. Bush	415	33.93
3	Harry Truman	374	30.58
4	Barack Obama	355	29.03
5	Dwight Eisenhower	270	22.08
6	Ronald Reagan	265	21.67
7	Richard Nixon	254	20.77
8	Bill Clinton	196	16.03
9	John F. Kennedy	159	13.00
10	Woodrow Wilson	158	12.92
11	Theodore Roosevelt	136	11.12
12	Jimmy Carter	68	5.56
13	George W. Bush	20	1.64
14	Lyndon Johnson	7	0.57
15	Donald J. Trump	5	0.41
16	Calvin Coolidge	4	0.33
17	Gerald Ford	4	0.33
18	Herbert Hoover	3	0.25
19	William Taft	3	0.25
20	Warren Harding	2	0.16

Question 51: Do you think the U.S. is now spending ... on the following

	Type	Response	n	Percentage
1	Health	Too much	32	2.50
2	Health	About the right amount	200	15.60
3	Health	Too little	1048	81.90
1	Foreign Aid	Too much	46	3.60
2	Foreign Aid	About the right amount	185	14.50
3	Foreign Aid	Too little	1049	82.00

Question 52: Average Estimated likelihood of war over the next decade (1-10)

	Country	Mean Estimate
1	China	2.20
2	Russia	2.76
3	North Korea	4.69

Question 53: Do you think the decision to withdraw all U.S. troops from Iraq by the end of 2011 was the right thing to do or the wrong thing to do?

	Response	n	Percentage
1	Right thing	759	58.70
2	Wrong thing	341	26.40
3	Don't know	192	14.90

Question 54: In general are free trade agreements good or bad for the U.S.?

	Response	n	Percentage
1	Bad thing	69	5.40
2	Good thing	1202	94.60