

IS FRENCH IR EMERGING?

French IR scholars in the 2011 trip survey

Jérémie Cornut et Dario Battistella

Presses de Sciences Po | *Revue française de science politique (English)*

2013/2 - Vol. 63
pages 97 à 128

ISSN 2263-7494

Article disponible en ligne à l'adresse:

<http://www.cairn.info/revue-francaise-de-science-politique-english-2013-2-page-97.htm>

Pour citer cet article :

Cornut Jérémie et Battistella Dario, « Is French ir emerging? » French IR scholars in the 2011 trip survey, *Revue française de science politique (English)*, 2013/2 Vol. 63, p. 97-128. DOI : 10.3917/rfspe.632.0097

Distribution électronique Cairn.info pour Presses de Sciences Po.

© Presses de Sciences Po. Tous droits réservés pour tous pays.

La reproduction ou représentation de cet article, notamment par photocopie, n'est autorisée que dans les limites des conditions générales d'utilisation du site ou, le cas échéant, des conditions générales de la licence souscrite par votre établissement. Toute autre reproduction ou représentation, en tout ou partie, sous quelque forme et de quelque manière que ce soit, est interdite sauf accord préalable et écrit de l'éditeur, en dehors des cas prévus par la législation en vigueur en France. Il est précisé que son stockage dans une base de données est également interdit.

IS FRENCH IR

EMERGING?

FRENCH IR SCHOLARS
IN THE 2011 TRIP SURVEY

Jérémie Cornut and Dario Battistella
Translated from French by Michael O'Mahony

On the sidelines,¹ demonstrating a “self-chosen isolation” likely to become “incessantuous”;² “confined”;³ “largely self-contained” and “self-sufficient”;⁴ “disconnected”, “very France-specific” and “lacking openness to the outside”;⁵ “on the periphery” and “marginal”.⁶ To read the findings made by both French and foreign observers over the past 25 years on the state of the international relations (IR) discipline⁷ in France, the situation French IR scholars find themselves in seems hardly enviable: wallowing in their “subdiscipline”,⁸ spending most of their time lamenting “the paucity of resources, the absence of prospects and the immaturity of the discipline”,⁹ French IR scholars are considered “remarkably idiosyncratic”.¹⁰ Certainly, the same authors note that in recent years, French IR has gone through “a period of metamorphosis” synonymous with “a revolution in both the quantity and the quality of the French contribution to IR discourse at the international level”.¹¹ As such, Marie-Claude Smouts talks of a “considerable change” which happened during the 1990s;¹² similarly, for Jörg Friedrichs, “after two generations of self-chosen

1. Marie-Claude Smouts, “The study of international relations in France”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 16(2), 1987, 281-6 (283).

2. Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 4(2), 2001, 118-37 (121).

3. François Constantin, “Les relations internationales dans le champ scientifique français ou les pesanteurs d'une lourde hérédité”, *Revue internationale et stratégique*, 3(47), 2002, 90-9 (90). Where there is no published English translation of a work, all quotations from it here are translated by Michael O'Mahony.

4. John Groom, “International relations in France: a view from across the Channel”, *European Political Science*, 4, 2005, 164-74 (165).

5. Marie-Claude Smouts, “Entretien. Les relations internationales en France: regard sur une discipline”, *Revue internationale et stratégique*, 3(47), 2002, 83-9 (84).

6. Jean-Jacques Roche, “L'enseignement des relations internationales en France: les aléas d'une ‘discipline-carrefour’”, *Revue internationale et stratégique*, 3(47), 2002, 100-7 (105).

7. The term “discipline” is used here to designate all French IR scholars, without assuming that an IR discipline exists in France, in the sense that there would be a strong sense of belonging among French IR scholars, and an institutional recognition of their specificities. One of the aims of this article is precisely to re-examine this issue.

8. Klaus-Gerd Giesen, “French Cancan zwischen Positivismus, Enzyklopädismus und Historismus. Zur Struktur und Geschichte der vorherrschenden französischsprachigen Ansatzforschung”, *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen*, 2(1), 1995, 141-70 (143).

9. Jean-Jacques Roche, “L'enseignement des relations internationales en France”, 100-7 (101).

10. Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (119).

11. John Groom, “International relations in France: a view from across the Channel”, 164-74 (166-72).

12. Marie-Claude Smouts, “Entretien. Les relations internationales en France: regard sur une discipline”, 83-9 (84).

isolation, French IR is finally beginning to become connected to the international debate”;¹ lastly, Jean-Jacques Roche welcomes the fact that today in France, “international relations is no longer considered as the refuge for failed teachers, but rather as an innovative sector at the cutting edge of research”.² However, when we know that as early as 1956 Alfred Grosser had highlighted that “over the past few years, the study of international relations has begun to develop in France”,³ how can we not wonder whether this cautious optimism is not more a case of not wanting to sow discouragement, rather than firmly believing that significant progress is being made in French IR?

In any event, do these findings correspond to the actual French IR reality experienced by French IR scholars themselves? What about the “self-reliance”⁴ that it is claimed they have chosen?⁵ Do they agree with the idea that “French IR is at a greater distance from the Anglo-American mainstream than any other continental [European] IR community”?⁶ How do they view their relationship with IR theory, defined as “the fabric of competing approaches that try to represent in abstract terms the organisational principles of political interaction beyond national territories”?⁷ Is it true to say that French IR scholars “do not conceive of [their] central research practice – as would be the case for any aspiring assistant professor on the US job market – to participate in and help to shape the central theoretical debates of the day”?⁸

With the aim of reviewing the “temptation to exist” of French IR scholars (to borrow the title of a special issue of the journal *La Revue internationale et stratégique* published in 2002 which was devoted to French IR),⁹ this article intends to study the situation of French IR scholars by using data collected in the course of the fourth survey in the TRIP (Teaching, Research, and International Policy) research project, conducted by a team of investigators at the Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations, part of the College of William & Mary, located in Williamsburg, in the US state of Virginia.

1. Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (132).

2. Jean-Jacques Roche, “L’enseignement des relations internationales en France”, 100-7 (105).

3. Alfred Grosser, “L’étude des relations internationales, spécialité américaine?”, *Revue française de science politique*, 6(3), 1956, 634-51 (650).

4. Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (119).

5. It should be noted that, for all commentators, Raymond Aron is the exception that proves the rule, and several leading American IR scholars cite his works (Dario Battistella, *Théories des relations internationales* (Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 4th edn, 2012), 697-8). There is, however, no agreement on the reasons for this success when his theoretical contribution to the discipline is considered small (John Groom, “International relations in France: a view from across the Channel”, 164-74 (167)). In Friedrichs’ opinion, Stanley Hoffmann, a Franco-American disciple of Aron, played a fundamental role in Aron’s success (Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (118)), while, according to Giesen, Aron legitimised American realism by showing that it was not necessarily an American theory (Klaus-Gerd Giesen, “French Cancan zwischen Positivismus, Enzyklopädismus und Historismus”, 141-70). In any event, if the real international impact of Aron is debated, and if it is undeniable that he brought the American debates over to France (see Jean-Jacques Roche, “L’enseignement des relations internationales en France”, 100-7 (102)), his success has however remained limited since his successors have not pursued his attempts to internationalise IR in France and make it a discipline (Dario Battistella, *Théories des relations internationales*, 697-8).

6. Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (118).

7. Jörg Friedrichs, 118-37 (120).

8. Henrik Breitenbauch, *Cartesian Limbo. A Formal Approach to the Study of Social Sciences: International Relations in France* (Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, Department of Political Science, 2008), 34.

9. Nadège Ragaru, “L’état des relations internationales en France”, *Revue internationale et stratégique*, 3(47), 2002, 77-81.

Our initial postulate is that this survey paints a detailed picture of contemporary French IR,¹ for never has so much data on so many subjects been available, allowing comparisons with such a large number of other countries. This allows us to determine whether French IR scholars fit in with the global theoretical trends, what their degree of access to American journals is, how they perceive their discipline's place in France and also its evolution over the past twenty years, where they studied for their PhD, whether they collaborate with English-speaking IR scholars and are members of international associations, whether they think that French universities and French scholars are recognised internationally, etc.

Our analysis brings together the responses obtained on different themes whilst also comparing them to those obtained in other countries. Specifically, this article will look at, successively, the place that IR occupies in French academe, the issue of the possible existence of a French style of IR, the positioning of French IR scholars in relation to current global IR trends, their attitude towards IR practitioners, and lastly the issue of the French language in a global discipline of Anglo-American origin and expression. More generally, the analysis of the results obtained revolves around two issues: how do French IR scholars perceive themselves? How open is French IR to global IR?

The place of international relations within French academe

To read the findings made on the state of IR in France suggests that French IR is in bad shape, apparently not independent and likely to remain structurally disadvantaged in relation to other disciplines better established in French universities. The “poor relation of political science”², IR appears to suffer from a “chronic deficit [...] occupy[ing] a modest, if not marginal place” in social sciences and humanities in France.³ It also appears to be absorbed by other disciplines: some commentators highlight for example the low proportion of IR scholars acknowledged by the National Universities Council of France (CNU) or employed by France's National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS); the small number of IR scholars who are *agrégés* (who have passed the highly demanding national competitive examination to become a full professor) or who are members of the committee awarding the aforementioned qualification (*jury d'agrégation*); and the tendency to fill positions indicated as being in IR with candidates who are not really IR scholars. It is claimed that this lack of professional opportunities, in research as well as in teaching, pushes new scholars in political science to prefer to work in areas other than IR. There are thus not enough French IR scholars, and they have not reached the “critical mass” that would ensure them international visibility and enable them to build research networks. In other words, incapable of acquiring the material and symbolic resources necessary for their institutionalisation in France, IR scholars are perceived as not being in a position to control the

1. The same postulate guided the articles published by partners in the TRIP surveys focusing on specific regions or countries: Canada (Michael Lipson, Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, Michael J. Tierney, “Divided discipline? Comparing views of US and Canadian IR scholars”, *International Journal*, 62(2), 2007, 327-43); Australia and New Zealand (Jason Sharman, Jacqui True, “Anglo-American followers or Antipodean iconoclasts? The 2008 TRIP survey of international relations in Australia and New Zealand”, *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 65(2), 2011, 148-66); Ireland (Stephanie J. Rickard, John Doyle, “International relations in Ireland: A survey of academics”, *Irish Political Studies*, 27(2), 2012, 359-75).

2. Nadège Raqaru, “L'état des relations internationales en France”, 77-81 (77).

3. François Constantin, “Le monde existe, nos instances d'évaluation scientifique l'ont peut-être rencontré”, *Critique internationale*, 4(3), 1999, 58-66 (64); and “Les relations internationales dans le champ scientifique français ou les pesanteurs d'une lourde hérédité”, 90-9 (90).

allocation of certain resources or to be competitive on the international market. Internal marginalisation therefore results in international marginalisation.¹

Furthermore, the strength of the rivalries between individuals and also between IR scholar communities is seen as preventing the creation of a positive dynamic.² This finding is supported by Olivier Godechot and Nicolas Mariot: after analysing the networks that determine who is invited to sit on political science doctoral thesis committees, they conclude that “the relational structure [of international relations experts] provides evidence of many ‘cliques’, very dense networks of relationships between groups of two, three or four individuals; however these cliques are poorly interlinked”.³ Knowing that “the level of cohesion and density of the group enables it to exist, to limit internal competition and to mobilise itself against the other groups in order to obtain benefits for its own members”,⁴ such practices are seen as detrimental to IR. The fact that French IR is monopolised by some centres and departments, all of which are located in Paris, would, if these findings are to be believed, also contribute to France’s isolation⁵ by allowing a small number of well-established professors in the discipline to define the research agenda.⁶ Lastly, and on a broader level, it can be argued that the decline in French influence in the world after the Second World War has put the study of IR in France on the defensive – a phenomenon which, conversely, would work in favour of American IR scholars, who benefit from the rising power of the United States.⁷

Notwithstanding these handicaps, the beginnings of change during the 1990s and throughout the 2000s were also observed, with French IR scholars seemingly wanting to address the structural weakness of IR in France. These changes would take a number of forms. According to François Constantin, there was mounting evidence of this: “the number of conferences, seminars and publications has increased and they illustrate the quality and intensity of the investment” made by French IR scholars.⁸ In addition, in 1987 there was the success of the first expert in international relations to be “*agrégé*”,⁹ the creation of a certain number of research centres focusing on international issues and an International Studies Section (SEI)¹⁰ within the French Political Science Association (AFSP); the organisation of the second pan-European conference of the Standing Group on International Relations in Paris in 1995;¹¹

1. Jean-Jacques Roche, “L’enseignement des relations internationales en France”, 100-7 (104-7); François Constantin, “Le monde existe, nos instances d’évaluation scientifique l’ont peut-être rencontré”, 58-66 (63); Marie-Claude Smouts, “Entretien. Les relations internationales en France: regard sur une discipline”, 83-9 (84); John Groom, “International relations in France: a view from across the Channel”, 164-174 (172).

2. Jean-Jacques Roche, “L’enseignement des relations internationales en France”, 101-7 (103); Nadège Ragaru, “L’état des relations internationales en France”, 77-81 (79).

3. Olivier Godechot, Nicolas Mariot, “Les deux formes du capital social: Structure relationnelle des jurys de thèses et recrutement en science politique”, *Revue française de sociologie*, 45(2), 2004, 243-82 (266).

4. Olivier Godechot, Nicolas Mariot, “Les deux formes du capital social”, 243-82 (277).

5. Marie-Claude Smouts, “Entretien. Les relations internationales en France: regard sur une discipline”, 83-9 (89); John Groom, “International relations in France: a view from across the Channel”, 164-174 (171).

6. Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (119).

7. François Constantin, “Les relations internationales dans le champ scientifique français ou les pesanteurs d’une lourde hérédité”, 90-9 (94-6).

8. François Constantin, “Les relations internationales dans le champ scientifique français ou les pesanteurs d’une lourde hérédité”, 90-9 (99).

9. We also note that the awards committee (*jury d’agrégation*) for the 2012-2013 open competitive examinations to obtain France’s highest academic qualification in teaching and research included two IR experts (Jean-Jacques Roche and its chairman Bertrand Badie).

10. The SEI was replaced in September 2012 by an AFSP “project group”, created on a three-yearly basis and dedicated to multilateralism in IR. For details of this group’s activities, visit the website <http://www.afsp.info/gp/gram.html>

11. Jean-Jacques Roche, “L’enseignement des relations internationales en France”, 100-7 (105).

and also the founding of the Association des Internationalistes (Association of IR Scholars) in 2010. Another sign of change was the launch of two journals, *Cultures et conflits* and *Critique internationale*.¹

Are these assertions supported by the TRIP survey? Several questions were posed with the aim of determining how French IR scholars would themselves assess their discipline and its place in academe. The answers provided confirm, at least in the first instance, the finding of a somewhat negative perception of the place of IR in France: 57% somewhat disagree and 35% very much disagree with the assertion that “IR research and teaching occupies a respectable place within French universities” (Q 386). This is therefore almost a unanimous view. It is a similar situation for the assertion that “there are a lot of IR scholars in France”: 60% somewhat disagree with this assertion, and 34% very much disagree (Q 385).

Only 44% of respondents are members of a French professional association primarily for IR scholars² (Q 381), which is both the cause and the consequence of the poor structuring of IR in France. Without a professional body similar to what exists elsewhere – and notably in the form of associations affiliated to the International Studies Association (ISA) such as the British International Studies Association, or the ISA-Canada – French IR scholars are less able to organise themselves. This type of association notably holds an annual conference which is the opportunity for scholars to come together, to discuss their research and to widen their networks – all of which are elements that would help strengthen French IR. As regards the response rate, it must furthermore be highlighted that the TRIP survey in France had the lowest response rate of all the participating countries: of the 276 IR scholars who received the questionnaire, only 101 participated. France’s 36.6% response rate is considerably lower than the average (49.5%) and, by way of comparison, the country with the second lowest response rate – the United States as it happens – had a response rate of 42.3%. The fact that not far off two thirds of those persons contacted simply did not take the time to reply, or self-excluded as they did not see themselves as IR scholars, would seem to indicate that French IR scholars do not feel like they belong to one and the same community.

The imbalance between Paris and provincial France – an imbalance specific to France in comparison to the other countries involved in the TRIP survey – is another indicator of the poor structuring of French IR (Q 12 and Q 13). The centrality of Paris is blatant, as more than half of the French respondents received their highest degree from four Paris-based institutions (Sciences Po Paris, University of Paris I – Panthéon Sorbonne, University of Paris III – Sorbonne Nouvelle and the School for Advanced Studies in Social Studies (EHESS)). There is certainly more variety with regard to the universities where respondents received their undergraduate degrees; however Paris continues to dominate, as demonstrated by the choice of the five best universities in France for undergraduate students to study international relations: the replies indicate the predominance of Paris (Sciences Po Paris and University of Paris I – Panthéon Sorbonne), followed by the Institute of Political Studies (IEP) of Bordeaux, Institute of Political Studies (IEP) of Lille, University of Paris III – Sorbonne Nouvelle, Institute of Political Studies (IEP) of Grenoble, Institute of Political Studies (IEP) of Strasbourg and Jean Moulin University – Lyon 3 (Q 55).

1. Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (132).

2. Without doubt this refers to the Association des Internationalistes (Association of IR Scholars), founded in February 2010 (<http://www.association-des-internationalistes.org>) – even if this association also includes IR experts affiliated to disciplines other than political science.

Q 55. What are the five best universities in France for undergraduate students to study international relations?

Table 1. The best universities in France for undergraduate students to study international relations (in %)

Rank	French university	
1	Sciences Po Paris	89
2	University of Paris I - Panthéon Sorbonne	56
3	IEP of Bordeaux	52
4	IEP of Lille	33
5	University of Paris III - Sorbonne Nouvelle	33
6	IEP of Grenoble	22
7	IEP of Strasbourg	15
8	Jean Moulin University - Lyon 3	11

However, there are several factors that temper this pessimism. The response to the question concerning how the place of IR within French universities has evolved over the past twenty years is fairly positive: 33% of respondents consider that the place of IR remains unchanged, 56% believe that IR has advanced, and only 11% believe that IR has regressed (Q 384). The claims made by some commentators of an improvement in the position of IR during the 1990s and 2000s is thus supported by the majority of French IR scholars. Similarly, the average age of the French respondents (Q 14) is 40 – quite clearly younger than the global average of 46 – which is the sign of the revival and increased appeal that IR has experienced over the past twenty years. Another sign which could be interpreted as the symptom of a revival¹ is that 38% of the French respondents were women (Q 15). This represents a proportion significantly greater than the global average of 31%. To sum up this first point, the TRIP survey confirms the notion that French IR is not well placed within French academe, while indicating that this position has been improving over recent years.

A French style of IR?

Over the last 30 years in France, several attempts have been made to define a specifically French IR approach. For example, in the 1980s, the French publishing house Presses universitaires de France (PUF) launched a collection publishing the writings of the “École française des RI” (French School of IR), an expression employed in the “temptation to exist” special issue of the journal *Revue internationale et stratégique* concerning French IR scholars, where one of the sections asks whether there is a move “towards a French School of International Relations”.² In 2005, Bertrand Badie posed the question of whether

1. Paul Gecelovsky, Christopher Kukucha, “Canadian foreign policy: a progressive or stagnating field of study?”, *Canadian Foreign Policy*, 14(2), 2008, 109-19 (109).

2. Nadège Ragaru, “L'état des relations internationales en France”, 77-81.

Raymond Aron was a “French-style”¹ thinker in the IR field, and in 2012, Dario Battistella identified the “sociology of international relations” as the dominant feature of the most practised form of IR in France.² Furthermore, in 2010, Battistella and Badie organised a deliberately loosely structured IR summer school, *French Touch*, in order to take stock of any IR specificities in France. The reasons for most of these initiatives are clear: by successfully creating a national identity – in the manner of the English School of IR – French IR scholars would be likely to combine their fragmented efforts rather than tear themselves apart in internal wars, and set in motion a positive dynamic enabling them to better position themselves within French universities and gain a place and recognition in the international arena.

It remains to be seen what response these initiatives received from the IR scholars. In the TRIP survey, the majority of the French respondents have heard of a French School of IR (57% had heard of it, 20% had heard of it but do not know very much about it, 23% had never heard of it) (Q 376), whereas 48% had never heard of *French Touch*, compared to 29% who had heard of it and 24% who had heard of it but did not know very much about it (Q 371). The French School of IR therefore has a certain degree of recognition, in contrast to *French Touch*. Unfortunately no comparative data is available, making it impossible to determine whether these labels are known outside France. That said, there is no comparison with the English School of IR, which has managed to impose itself within the global discipline to the extent, for example, of forming a separate section within the ISA.

The replies to the questions asking whether the IR scholars surveyed had heard of *French Theory* (Q 370) and the Paris School (Q 372), indicate that the majority of respondents (54%) had never heard of the former (while 28% had heard of it and 17% had heard of it but did not know very much about it), nor of the latter (the percentages for the different responses being 75%, 11% and 14% respectively). These last results confirm the disconnect between French IR scholars and global IR, as *French Theory* – which particularly refers to Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze – is well known in the majority of foreign countries, notably in Europe, due to its influence on post-structuralism. The Paris School, associated with Didier Bigo, has been presented by Ole Waever – in a study that again received a certain level of attention abroad – as the French equivalent of the Copenhagen and Aberystwyth Schools as regards security studies.³ In other words, to be a success with French IR scholars, it is not enough to penetrate international markets.⁴ This paradox is in part the result of the development of social sciences in the United States, and the growing success that constructivism has enjoyed since the 1980s,⁵ while in France the latter has had far less influence than the sociology of IR and the analysis of actors and public policies.

Beyond these different labels, several questions in the TRIP survey focus more specifically on the identity of the discipline in France. The majority of respondents think that there is

1. Bertrand Badie, “Raymond Aron, penseur des relations internationales. Un penseur ‘à la française?’”, *Études du CEFRES*, 5, 2005, 3-15.

2. Dario Battistella, *Théories des relations internationales*, 689ff.

3. Ole Waever, “Aberystwyth, Paris, Copenhagen. New ‘schools’ in security theory and their origins between core and periphery”, paper presented at the annual conference of the International Studies Association in Montreal, 17-20 March 2004.

4. Dario Battistella, *Théories des relations internationales*, 715-17.

5. Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011).

a specifically French way of studying IR (26% very much agree, 46% somewhat agree), even if some of them signal their disagreement with this (28% somewhat disagree) (Q 382). Does this specificity lie in the sociology of IR (Q 373)? The picture is more or less identical, as 27% very much agree with this assertion, 50% somewhat agree, 20% somewhat disagree and 2% very much disagree. Overall, the vast majority of French IR scholars are therefore inclined to view the sociology of IR as a French specificity. It is interesting to link this result with the emphasis on the importance of ideational factors (such as culture, perceptions, ideology, beliefs, etc.). In their research, French IR scholars particularly stress the importance of these factors when explaining international outcomes (93% of the French respondents, compared with 84% on average and 80% in the United States), even if they are far from being the only ones to do so – the same applies, for example, to 94% of the respondents in New Zealand and Argentina and 95% in Turkey and Singapore (Q 27).

Does the French specificity lie in the choice of a theoretical framework, in the adoption of a certain epistemology, or in the use of certain methods?¹ The responses concerning theoretical affiliation (Q 21) indicate that in France, as in the rest of the world, IR scholars are split firstly between constructivists (24% in France compared to 22% on average), realists (23% compared to 16% on average) and liberals (7% compared to 15% on average). The relatively large presence of realism and the very low proportion in France of supporters of liberalism must be underlined. Furthermore, and specific to France, a significant proportion of respondents chose to write “political sociology” (6%) and “institutionalism” (2%) in the “other” category. Similarly, as regards the presence of the different paradigms in the different undergraduate Introduction to IR courses (Q 6), several respondents have written “transnationalism” in the “other” category, thus confirming a certain distinctive French characteristic.

Q 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.

Table 2. Theoretical affiliations of the IR scholars (in %)

	Constructivism	English School	Feminism	Liberalism	Marxism	Realism	Political sociology	Institutionalism	Other paradigm	I do not use paradigmatic analysis
All	22	4	2	15	4	16	**	**	15	22
United States	20	2	2	20	2	16	**	**	12	26
France	24	2	0	7	2	23	6	2	8	24

Concerning the epistemological characteristics of the respondents, the three options (positivist, non-positivist, post-positivist) were chosen in similar proportions: 32%, 36% and 32% respectively (Q 26). Although the results from other countries, such as the United Kingdom

1. We will not elaborate here on the different IR theories and epistemologies. For more detail on the specific characteristics of each one, see in particular Dario Battistella, *Théories des relations internationales*.

and Mexico, may be similar to the French results, the proportion of positivist respondents in France is significantly lower than the average proportion of positivists in the other countries, and notably in the United States – the results of which are 59% positivist, 21% non-positivist and 20% post-positivist. As regards the method primarily employed (Q 28), on the one hand, France distinguishes itself by the low use of quantitative methods (2% compared to 15% on average), and on the other hand, by the wider use of pure theory (7% compared to 3% on average) and policy analysis (26% compared to 17% on average). As elsewhere in the world, the majority of the French respondents overwhelmingly employ qualitative methods (57% in France compared to 58% on average). These results are confirmed by the fact that when a department advertises an IR lecturer post, only 12% of the respondents prefer a candidate who knows how to use quantitative research methods rather than a candidate who knows how to use qualitative research methods, compared to 49% who reply that they do not prefer such a candidate, and 39% who do not have a preference either way (Q 368).

Q 26. In general, how would you characterise your work in epistemological terms?

Table 3. Epistemological characteristics of IR scholars (in %)

	Positivist	Non-positivist	Post-positivist
All	47	28	26
United States	59	21	20
France	32	36	32

As regards the other methods employed in addition to the primary method, 54% of the French respondents (compared to 43% on average in the world) use policy analysis (Q 29). Single case study (58% in France compared to 63% on average) and comparative case study (70% in France compared to 79% on average) dominate for those French respondents who employ a qualitative method (Q 30). As for the other types of qualitative methods, the French particularly employ discourse analysis (49% compared to 32% on average), ethnography (30% compared to 12% on average) and process tracing (53% compared to 37% on average).

Another reason often cited as an explanation for France's isolation is the historical development of French IR. It was nurtured by lawyers and historians until the 1960s,¹ whereas this was not the case in the United States.² Today, political scientists still have to compete with lawyers,³ the result of which is a particular conception of the discipline where it is seen not as the preserve of political scientists but rather as a “crossroad discipline”,⁴ whose

1. Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France” 118-37 (122-4); François Constantin, “Les relations internationales dans le champ scientifique français ou les pesanteurs d'une lourde hérédité”, 92; John Groom, “International relations in France: a view from across the Channel”, 164-74 (167-8); Alfred Grosser, “L'étude des relations internationales, spécialité américaine?”, 634-51 (634-6); Matthieu Chillaud, “International relations in France: The ‘usual suspects’ in a French scientific field of study?”, *European Political Science*, 8(2), 2009, 239-53 (239-40).

2. Marie-Claude Smouts, “The study of international relations in France”, 281-86 (281).

3. Marie-Claude Smouts, “Entretien. Les relations internationales en France: regard sur une discipline”, 83-9 (84).

4. Jean-Jacques Roche, “L'enseignement des relations internationales en France”, 100-7.

distinctive feature is its multi- and interdisciplinary nature.¹ In a sense, the problem of defining a single *autonomous* French IR discipline, a problem that has existed since Aron in the 1960s, would still not be resolved in the 1990s,² especially as many French IR scholars justify this multidisciplinary nature by the particular nature of the object that this discipline studies, the study of “international relations” requiring numerous tools taken from sociology, law, political science, psychology, economics, history, etc.³

As a result of this multidisciplinary nature no consensus can be reached on the very definition of what an IR scholar is in France. There are many who oppose the classifying of IR in the field of political science in the strict sense, or who incorporate into IR any research concerning politics in a foreign country – including when it touches on an issue of domestic policies. The line between IR and comparative politics is thus much more blurred than in other countries, and area studies along with comparative politics feature prominently within French IR.⁴ Several commentators stress for example that changing the name of the CERI – one of the main centres of IR research in France – is not insignificant. From the Centre for Studies in International Relations, in 1976 it became the Centre for International Studies and Research in order to encompass area studies and comparative politics.⁵ All these elements are sometimes seen as impediments to the emergence of a fully-fledged French IR, even if some stress that this multidisciplinary nature is a specificity, and therefore, potentially, an “asset” for France.⁶

The TRIP survey results are ambiguous on these questions. Half of the respondents consider IR to be a discipline (22% very much agree, 31% somewhat agree), and the other half does not (36% somewhat disagree, 11% very much disagree) (Q 374). As regards international relations as an object of study (Q 375), respondents are almost unanimous in saying that IR falls within several social sciences (40% very much agree, 53% somewhat agree, 7% somewhat disagree). A link between these two results can be established: because nearly all of the French respondents consider that IR falls within several social sciences, the process that could lead to IR becoming a discipline in its own right is impeded – even though, of course, there are other causes for this impediment.

There is a relatively good self-identification of the respondents as IR scholars (Q 17), as above all they describe their primary field of study as IR or a field linked to IR (foreign relations, international affairs, international studies, global studies) (54% in France compared to 60% on average). Nonetheless, in France a greater proportion of respondents indicate that their primary field of study is political science (19% compared to 14% on average) or

1. John Groom, “International relations in France: a view from across the Channel”, 164-74 (166).

2. Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (110).

3. François Constantin, “Les relations internationales dans le champ scientifique français ou les pesanteurs d'une lourde hérédité”, 90-9 (90-1); Marie-Claude Smouts, “Entretien. Les relations internationales en France: regard sur une discipline”, 83-9 (84); Marie-Claude Smouts, “The study of international relations in France”, 281-6 (281-3).

4. Nadège Ragaru, “L'état des relations internationales en France”, 77-81 (80); François Constantin, “Le monde existe, nos instances d'évaluation scientifique l'ont peut-être rencontré”, 58-66 (59-60); Marie-Claude Smouts, “The study of international relations in France”, 281-6 (283); John Groom, “International relations in France: a view from across the Channel”, 164-74 (166).

5. François Constantin, “Le monde existe, nos instances d'évaluation scientifique l'ont peut-être rencontré”, 58-66 (66); Dario Battistella, *Théories des relations internationales*, 690.

6. Marie-Claude Smouts, “Introduction: a changing discipline”, in Marie-Claude Smouts (ed.), *The New International Relations: Theory and Practice* (London: C. Hurst & Co (Publishers) Ltd, 2001), 1-14 (11).

area studies (14% compared to 10% on average). A certain number of respondents (4%) also chose to put down “international political sociology”.

Q 17. Which of the following best describes your primary field of study?

Table 4. Primary field of study of IR scholars (in %)

Primary field of study	All	United States	France
International relations	38	41	40
Political science	14	17	19
Area studies	10	10	14
Foreign relations	5	5	7
Global studies	5	4	4
International political sociology	**	**	4
International studies	6	5	2
International affairs	6	6	1
Other fields	17	12	9

France distinguishes itself by the strong presence of international relations of a particular region/country (11% compared to 7% on average) and comparative foreign policy (7% compared to 4% on average) as main areas of research within IR (Q 22). As regards secondary areas of research within IR (Q 23), the French respondents, as in the other countries, divide into a large number of categories, which is a sign of a growing fragmentation and specialisation of the discipline. This said, however, a particularly large number of the French respondents chose the study of the international relations of a particular region/country (24% compared to 17% on average) and comparative foreign policy (29% compared to 15% on average). This is a sign of the vigour of area studies in France. On the other hand, international political economy (5% compared to 12% on average), and international security (14% compared to 19% on average) as main areas of research within IR are noticeably lacking in France. However, the weak presence of international security as a main area of research in IR is offset by the fact that 29% of the French respondents (compared to 18% on average) make it one of their secondary areas of research. Furthermore, of the six European countries in which this survey was conducted (Ireland, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Sweden being the others), France has the lowest proportion of respondents considering European integration to be their main area of research within IR.

Q 22. What is your main area of research within IR?

Q 23. What are your secondary areas of research within IR? Select all the areas that apply.

Table 5. IR scholars' areas of research (in %)

Area of research	Main area			Secondary area		
	All	United States	France	All	United States	France
Comparative foreign policy	4	5	7	15	14	29
Development studies	4	5	2	12	13	6
Global civil society	1	2	1	8	8	8
History of the international relations discipline	<1	<1	1	5	3	8
Human rights	2	3	0	10	11	4
Human security	1	2	0	9	7	6
International environment	2	2	1	5	6	3
International ethics	1	<1	0	5	3	4
International history	2	<1	4	9	7	9
International law	2	3	0	8	10	5
International organisation(s)	5	6	7	19	20	26
International political economy	12	13	5	15	17	13
International relations of a particular region/country	7	4	11	17	12	24
International relations theory	7	6	7	20	16	19
International security	19	21	14	18	18	29
International health	<1	<1	1	1	1	3
Philosophy of science	<1	<1	1	3	3	5
US foreign policy	5	8	5	17	22	22
Country X foreign policy	3	--	4	9	--	15
Conflict and violence analysis	--	--	6	--	--	1
Other	9	8	7	11	11	14
European studies / European integration	6	4	11	9	7	23
I am not an IR scholar	6	6	4			

In summary, the precise outlines of a possible French IR approach are yet to be determined. Even if some specificities are emerging and a certain consensus exists regarding the important position of the sociology of IR in France,¹ there are differences between French IR scholars in terms of method, theoretical approach and epistemology. French IR scholars are relatively more oriented towards non-comparative qualitative methods, at a time when quantitative and/or comparative methods are experiencing a revival in other countries, and particularly in the United States, thus confirming French IR's trend to disconnect from global IR. If a large proportion of French IR scholars consider IR to be their primary field of study, the IR in question is multidisciplinary in nature – in line, this time, with a recent trend in the global discipline² – but with a strong flavour of political science, area studies and comparative politics.

How do global IR and French IR influence each other?

According to certain observers, French specificities mean that French debates do not follow the same lines as the discipline's debates, particularly those in America.³ More generally, they claim that French IR scholars do not take any notice of international academic production: almost no seminal work in the IR discipline has been translated into French.⁴ In so doing, the French IR scholars suffer less than elsewhere in the world from "American imperialism" because they do not feel as if they are being "dominated".⁵

The structural weakness of French IR is also said to result in their absence from global IR. Thus, for some, French IR scholars are not read and cited by their counterparts in other countries.⁶ They primarily publish articles or works in French that have practically no impact internationally. They play little part in European calls for tender, are absent from international conferences, and very few of them sit on the editorial boards of the discipline's principle journals.⁷ Aside from the causes already mentioned, other institutional reasons are sometimes put forward to explain this: French academe, which divides teaching and research in too strict a fashion,⁸ does not provide adequate funding or allow enough time to attend international conferences and conduct field studies.⁹

1. The TRIP survey also provides some sociological data on French IR scholars. Like the majority of the other IR scholars, the French respondents keep themselves informed of current events through newspapers (Q 39). IR scholars in France and throughout the world tend to position themselves politically to the left (Q 33 and Q 34).
2. Pami Aalto, Vilho Harle, Sami Moisio (eds), *International Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Patrick Forest, Mathieu Tremblay, Philippe Le Prestre, "Des Relations internationales aux Études internationales: éléments de construction d'un champ de recherche et d'action interdisciplinaire", *Études internationales*, 40(3), 2009, 417-40.
3. Jörg Friedrichs, "International relations theory in France", 118-37 (119); Marie-Claude Smouts, "Introduction: a changing discipline", in *The New International Relations*, 1-14 (10-11).
4. François Constantin cites in particular Robert Keohane, Joseph Nye, Robert Cox, Stephen Krasner and James Rosenau (François Constantin, "Le monde existe, nos instances d'évaluation scientifique l'ont peut-être rencontré", 58-66 (64)).
5. Marie-Claude Smouts, "The study of international relations in France", 281-86 (283).
6. Jean-Jacques Roche, "L'enseignement des relations internationales en France", 100-7 (100-1); François Constantin, "Les relations internationales dans le champ scientifique français ou les pesanteurs d'une lourde hérédité", 90-9 (90); Alfred Grosser, "L'étude des relations internationales, spécialité américaine?", 637.
7. Marie-Claude Smouts, "Entretien. Les relations internationales en France: regard sur une discipline", 83-9 (87-8); Jean-Jacques Roche, "L'enseignement des relations internationales en France", 100-7 (100-3).
8. John Groom, "International relations in France: a view from across the Channel", 164-74 (170-1).
9. Jean-Jacques Roche, "L'enseignement des relations internationales en France", 100-7 (101); François Constantin, "Les relations internationales dans le champ scientifique français ou les pesanteurs d'une lourde hérédité", 90-9 (98); Marie-Claude Smouts, "Entretien. Les relations internationales en France: regard sur une discipline", 83-9 (87); Marie-Claude Smouts, "The study of international relations in France", 281-86 (285).

Once again, however, it is argued that there has been a recent trend towards internationalisation with, in particular, an increasingly strong French presence at international conferences and in foreign research centres, participation in pan-European calls for tender and inter-university discussions, the translation into English of certain works and their publication in international journals, a better knowledge of the theoretical debates taking place on the other side of the Atlantic, the translation into French of articles written by Americans, and so forth.¹ It is also important to highlight the publication in French during the 2000s of two textbooks on international relations theory – one authored by Dario Battistella and published by the Presses de Sciences Po; the other, a work edited by Alex Macleod and Dan O'Meara, bringing together IR scholars from Quebec, and published by Éditions Athéna. These two works are seen to have contributed to raising many French IR scholars' awareness of the debates concerning the discipline taking place elsewhere in the world.

Some of the data provided by the TRIP survey prompts us to qualify this idea of French openness: on certain aspects, France remains in fact only slightly open when compared to other countries, or is somewhat out of step with them. Only 30% of the French respondents are members of a non-French professional association primarily for IR scholars (Q 378). This is confirmation of the, at best, partial opening up of French IR, and of the small number of connections between French IR and global IR. It is also interesting to note the predominance of French universities, both in the undergraduate studies of the respondents (88%) (Q 13) and the institutions where they received their highest degree (93%) (Q 12). Of the French respondents, 82% specified France as their country of origin (Q 16), which positions it as a fairly closed country – as, it is worth noting, are the United States (76%), Canada (82%) and Israel (93%). How advantageous do the French respondents think a PhD completed in an American university is on the French job market, compared to a PhD completed in a French university (Q 45)? Confirming the relatively closed nature of France, 52% of the French respondents replied that it is not advantageous (compared to 35% on average) – after Finland (83% of negative responses), France is the second most closed country from this perspective. The reason for this closure probably lies in the recruitment traditions: it is generally necessary to have completed a PhD in France in order to be considered by the selection boards.

Another disconnect can be observed in relation to the IR scholars considered to have produced the most interesting research over the past five years: the first four researchers considered in France – namely, in alphabetical order, Bertrand Badie, Dario Battistella, Jean-François Bayart, and Didier Bigo – all work in France, and none of them are listed by respondents from other countries. Only three researchers (Barry Buzan, Alexander Wendt and Joseph Nye) are considered both in France and the other countries in the survey to have produced the most interesting research over the past five years. In other words, the French respondents as a whole consider the most interesting research over the past five years to be French productions.

Our data also confirms, to a large extent in any case, that French IR is absent from global IR. At global level, no French researcher, journal, publishing house or university

1. Jörg Friedrichs, "International relations theory in France", 118-37 (132); Nadège Ragaru, "L'état des relations internationales en France", 77-81 (80); François Constantin, "Le monde existe, nos instances d'évaluation scientifique l'ont peut-être rencontré", 58-66 (64); Marie-Claude Smouts, "Entretien. Les relations internationales en France: regard sur une discipline", 83-9 (85); John Groom, "International relations in France: a view from across the Channel", 164-74 (169).

are cited as being among the most influential. Two exceptions must however be noted. One, *a priori* surprising, is the presence of *Le Monde diplomatique*: this monthly periodical, translated into more than twenty languages, with numerous editions in foreign countries, is considered as one of the most influential periodicals in the world, but not in France (Q 46). This paradox is linked to its very great influence in Latin America: the Brazilians, Argentinians, Colombians and Mexicans all consider it to be influential, which is not the case anywhere else. The other, more understandable, exception concerns the French academic institution Sciences Po Paris, considered by 4% of respondents in the world as having one of the best masters programmes (Q 54). Here too, the influence of both Latin and Central America plays a preponderant role, as 12% of Brazilian respondents, 17% of Colombian respondents, and 20% of Mexican respondents consider this programme as one of the best. Furthermore, Sciences Po Paris finds itself in seventeenth position on the list of institutions from which the respondents received their highest degree (Q 12), after being listed by eight respondents outside France (in addition to the 25 respondents within France). On the other hand, Sciences Po Paris does not feature in the twenty top responses where undergraduate studies are concerned (Q 13), nor for the best doctoral programmes (Q 55). In short, and with the exception of *Le Monde diplomatique* and Sciences Po Paris for the aforementioned reasons, French IR never reaches the top of the world rankings.¹

Regarding articles in journals, the results obtained confirm the ambiguous situation of French IR in respect of the degree to which it is open or closed to global IR: 41% of the French respondents would like to be published in what is considered the discipline's leading journal in the world, *International Organization* (Q 379). Their second preferred journal is however the *Revue française de science politique* (22% of French respondents), then *International Security* (19%), *Études internationales* (16%), *World Politics* (16%), *European Journal of International Relations* (13%), *Politique étrangère* (13%) and *Foreign Affairs* (13%). International journals and French or French-language journals (*Études internationales*) alternate therefore in the esteem of French IR scholars, again highlighting that the specificity of French IR competes against the desire to decisively connect up with global IR. Similarly, in undergraduate Introduction to IR courses, French IR scholars make students read slightly fewer American authors than the average (43% compared to 58% on average), and slightly more local, in this case French, authors (27% compared to 25% on average), although, from this perspective, they are no different really from many other countries (Q 5).

1. To say that almost no French IR scholar has (had) an influence on global IR is not incompatible with the fact that non-IR French scholars are recognised as having (had) such an influence: the importance of the *Annales* School – and notably of Fernand Braudel – for the world-systems theory of Immanuel Wallerstein (Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (131)), or the impact of the postmodern French philosophers (Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Jean Baudrillard, etc.) on post-structuralism (Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (122)), or the influence of Pierre Bourdieu on the practice turn in IR (see in particular the issue edited by Didier Bigo and Mikael R. Madsen, “A different reading of the international”: Pierre Bourdieu and international studies”, *International Political Sociology*, 5(3), 2011, 219-24; Frédéric Mérand, Vincent Pouliot, “Le monde de Pierre Bourdieu: éléments pour une théorie sociale des Relations internationales”, *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 41(3), 2008, 603-25; Ted Hopf, “The logic of habit in international relations”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 16(4), 2010, 539-61) are recognised. The fact, however, that the French IR scholars themselves made practically no attempt to reclaim this heritage offered by other disciplines tends to prove conversely the disconnect of French IR in relation to global IR (Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (123-4); John Groom, “International relations in France: a view from across the Channel”, 164-74 (168-9).

Q 379. Rank the top three journals in which you would like to be published.

Table 6. Ranking of preferred journals for publication (in %)

Rank	Journal	%
1	<i>International Organization</i>	41
2	<i>Revue française de science politique</i>	22
3	<i>International Security</i>	19
4	<i>Études internationales</i>	16
4	<i>World Politics</i>	16
6	<i>European Journal of International Relations</i>	13
6	<i>Politique étrangère</i>	13
6	<i>Foreign Affairs</i>	13

However, TRIP survey data also show that French IR scholars are well aware of global trends. The data confirms for example that they read and know American authors. Respondents had to list four scholars who have had the greatest influence on the field of IR in the past twenty years (Q 43). The results obtained reveal a certain closeness of France to the rest of the world, as ten out of the fifteen scholars considered in France as the most influential also feature among the twenty considered the most influential in the world. These are: Alexander Wendt, Robert Keohane, John Mearsheimer, Joseph Nye, Barry Buzan, James Rosenau, Kenneth Waltz, Stephen Walt, Susan Strange and Samuel Huntington. These scholars are considered as essential reading by a large number of IR scholars the world over. The majority of them are American which shows that IR remains an American discipline. The top two authors listed in France (Wendt and Keohane) are also the leading names in the world which, from this perspective, illustrates France's connection with the rest of the world. As has been shown, this finding is qualified when influence exerted over the past five years is taken into account instead of the most important production of the past twenty years. Comparison of these two results could be cause for optimism, given that the recognition afforded French IR scholars over the past five years tends to indicate that, lately, French IR scholars have been seen as having something to say, which had rarely been the case in the past.¹ It must however be noted that this result is perhaps due to the fact that the French respondents first read the research produced by their French colleagues: this research is published in French, in journals published in France, often by individuals with whom they work together often. We know that it takes longer for foreign authors to be assimilated in France, and can therefore infer a kind of time lag: in the short-term, national logics dominate, while in the long-term, what could appear to be a global consensus on the most influential scholars emerges.

Concerning the percentage of IR literature devoted to different paradigms (Q 41), France estimates the presence of constructivism to be greater (31% of the literature compared to 20% on average), and that of liberalism to be lesser (22% compared to 28% on average), however there is little or no difference to speak of concerning the French respondents'

1. A single French author, Bertrand Badie, is cited by French IR scholars as being one of the most influential scholars both in the last twenty years and the last five years.

estimations of realist approaches (29% compared to 33% on average), Marxism (6% compared to 9% on average), feminism (7% in France and 7% on average) and the English School (12% compared to 9% on average). Moreover, there is no French distinctiveness as regards the extent to which these paradigms feature in undergraduate Introduction to IR courses (Q 6): the French give each of the principal IR paradigms approximately the same weight as their colleagues in other countries.

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

Table 7. The paradigms in IR literature (in %)

	Constructivism	Realism	Liberalism	Marxism	Feminism	English School	Non-paradigmatic	Other
All	20	33	28	9	7	9	17	13
United States	17	32	29	7	7	6	19	13
France	31	29	22	6	7	12	18	5

Q 6. Approximately what percentage of your undergraduate Introduction to IR course do you devote to the study and/or application of each of the following IR paradigms? (If you have multiple answers for “other”, only record the most prominent other paradigm).

Table 8. The paradigms in undergraduate Introduction to IR courses (in %)

	Constructivism	Realism	Liberalism	Marxism	Feminism	English School	Trans-nationalism	Non-paradigmatic	Other
All	13	24	21	11	7	8	**	18	15
United States	11	25	22	10	7	5	**	19	17
France	15	25	22	9	4	9	1	23	8

Of the eleven publishing houses which, according to the French respondents, publish the most influential works, all are English-language university presses, with the notable exception of the Presses de Science Po (Q 48). The same is true for the best doctoral programmes in the world for a student who wants to pursue an academic career in IR (Q 53) and for the best masters programmes in the world for those who want to pursue a policy career in IR (Q 54): all are either English or American with the exception of Sciences Po Paris. These results are comparable with those obtained from IR scholars from the other countries, except for the presence of the Presses de Sciences Po and Sciences Po Paris that only the French take into consideration. Here too therefore exists a closeness between French IR scholars and other IR scholars.

The ranking of journals in France (Q 46) also follows the global logic: ten of the fourteen journals considered in France as being the most influential feature in the list of the twenty

most influential journals according to IR scholars from the twenty countries surveyed, and in approximately the same order. They are: *International Organization*, *International Security*, *Foreign Affairs*, *World Politics*, *Foreign Policy*, *European Journal of International Relations*, *Review of International Studies*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *American Political Science Review* and *Global Governance*. The four other journals are French-language journals to which global influence is attributed due to distortionary effects. These four journals (*Critique internationale*, *Cultures et conflits*, *Études internationales*, and *Politique étrangère*) feature among what are considered to be the five most influential French-language journals, the fifth being the *Revue française de science politique* (Q 369).

Q 46. Rank the four journals that publish articles with the greatest influence on the way IR scholars think about IR. These can include IR journals, general political science journals and/or non-political science journals.

Q 369. Rank the three French-language journals that publish articles with the greatest influence on the way IR scholars think about IR. These can include IR journals, general political science journals and/or non-political science journals.

Table 9. Journals considered to be the most influential in IR (in %)

Rank	Title of journal	%	Rank	Title of French-language journal	%
1	<i>International Organization</i>	67	1	<i>Critique internationale</i>	57
2	<i>International Security</i>	39	2	<i>Cultures et conflits</i>	49
3	<i>Foreign Affairs</i>	31	3	<i>Études internationales</i>	46
4	<i>World Politics</i>	19	4	<i>Politique étrangère</i>	38
4	<i>Foreign Policy</i>	19	4	<i>Revue française de science politique</i>	38
6	<i>Critique internationale</i>	17			
6	<i>European Journal of International Relations</i>	17			
8	<i>Review of International Studies</i>	14			
8	<i>Études internationales</i>	14			
8	<i>International Studies Quarterly</i>	14			
11	<i>American Political Science Review</i>	8			
11	<i>Politique étrangère</i>	8			
11	<i>Global Governance</i>	8			
11	<i>Cultures et conflits</i>	8			

What place for theory and its application?

Could the absence of French IR be linked with the poor theoretical contribution of French IR scholars? Theory dominates the global discipline, starting with the United States. Logically then, as Stephano Guzzini stresses, in order to avoid remaining on

the “periphery”, it is *necessary* to do theoretical work.¹ The multi-disciplinary nature of French IR has meant that theorisation has played a marginal role in the discipline,² when law and history do not attach a lot of importance to theory. French IR scholars – with a few exceptions – have not involved themselves in the development of theory, and some are openly sceptical about it, preferring the sociology of IR instead,³ with the result that even journals such as *Cultures et conflits* and *Critique internationale* make an insignificant theoretical contribution.⁴

In fact, the results obtained show that IR theory is not particularly neglected in France: 7% of French respondents consider it to be their main area of research (as many as the global average) (Q 22), and 19% consider it to be one of their secondary research areas (compared to 20% on average) (Q 23). The same is true for the perception of the importance of IR theory in understanding IR (Q 383): almost all of the French respondents consider that theories are important (35% very much agree and 46% somewhat agree), and only 17% of the French respondents disagree (and 2% very much disagree). Our data indicates therefore that the cause of today’s disconnect lies elsewhere than in a lack of regard for theorisation in France.

Is the disconnect attributable then to the absence of links between IR theory and practice? Some – namely those French IR scholars not having access to decision-makers and not being heard – concentrate on teaching at the expense of research whose impact would be negligible.⁵ Once again, the TRIP survey is more nuanced. More French IR scholars than the overall average of IR scholars in the twenty countries surveyed are tempted by consulting or working in a paid capacity for international organisations (23% compared to 11% on average), for think tanks (23% compared to 15% on average) and for their country’s government (25% compared to 20% on average), even if they collaborate less often with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) (7% compared to 12% on average). There are fewer French IR scholars who do not consult or work in a paid capacity for any organisation (41% compared to 53% on average) (Q 51). French IR scholars also collaborate relatively well with these same organisations *without* being paid (Q 52).

It remains true however that French IR is more basic than applied: the majority of French IR scholars consider their research to be “primarily basic” (29% compared to 21% on average) or “both basic and applied, but more basic than applied” (again 29%, compared to 38% on average), whereas only 6% (compared to 11% on average) consider that their research is “primarily applied” and 23% (compared to 15% on average) consider it to be “both basic and applied, but more applied than basic” (Q 31).⁶ When compared to the average of the other countries, it appears that the focus of French IR scholars is more on basic research.

In line with this result, policy relevance/current events motivate the research of the French respondents (Q 32) less than they motivate the research of their IR colleagues in the survey

1. Stefano Guzzini, “The significance and roles of teaching theory in international relations”, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 4(2), 2001, 98-117 (106-7).

2. Jean-Jacques Roche, “L’enseignement des relations internationales en France”, 100-7 (103); Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (119); Nadège Ragaru, “L’état des relations internationales en France”, 77-81 (78).

3. Dario Battistella, *Théories des relations internationales*, 689.

4. Jörg Friedrichs, “International relations theory in France”, 118-37 (132).

5. Jean-Jacques Roche, “L’enseignement des relations internationales en France”, 100-7 (101).

6. The question specifies the meanings of the two terms: “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.”

as a whole (22% compared to 33% on average). Similarly, if respondents around the world are generally motivated primarily by their issue area, the French respondents are especially so (53% compared to 39% on average). When asked what aspect *should* primarily motivate research in the IR discipline, the French respondents most favour the issue area (69% compared to 51% on average) and least favour policy relevance/current events (11% compared to 29% on average) (Q 60). As regards the kinds of IR research which can be useful to policy makers, France is no different from the rest of the world with the majority of respondents considering area studies as somewhat useful, even very useful, while theoretical analysis and formal models are not seen as such (Q 57).

Q 60. Which of the following best describes what you believe should primarily motivate research in the IR discipline? (only one choice possible)

Table 10. Motivation for IR research (in %)

	Appeal to popular audience	Issue area	Methodology	Paradigm	Policy relevance / current events	Region	Other
All	3	51	2	4	29	2	10
United States	2	54	1	3	29	1	9
France	7	69	0	7	11	4	2

From these results it can be deduced that French IR scholars are indeed more focused on basic research, which has no direct policy relevance and no interest in current events. They are however relatively more consulted by policy makers – perhaps this is a way to compensate for the lack of resources available within academe.

The issue of language

Is language another factor to take into account when looking to explain the isolation of French IR, given that the effects of language help structure the discipline?¹ The fact that the French publish in French, when the discipline is dominated by English and few IR scholars speak several languages, is another of the reasons given to explain the disconnect.² This leads, for example, Marie-Claude Smouts to consider it “essential” to adopt a policy for translating French works into English.³

On this subject, the TRIP survey data indicates that French IR scholars are on average more multilingual than the other respondents (Q 36): not one of the French IR scholars speaks

1. Anne-Marie D'Aoust, “Accounting for the politics of language in the sociology of IR”, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 15(1), 2012, 120-31; David Grondin, Anne-Marie D'Aoust, Paul Racine-Sibulka, “La discipline francophone des Relations internationales au Québec et au Canada: Pistes de réflexion sur les enjeux et les dilemmes linguistiques liés au marché du travail”, *Politiques et sociétés*, 31(3), 2012, 9-37.

2. Jean-Jacques Roche, “L’enseignement des relations internationales en France”, 100-7 (105); John Groom, “International relations in France: a view from across the Channel”, 164-74 (165); Matthieu Chillaud, “International relations in France: the ‘usual suspects’ in a French scientific field of study?”, 239-53 (248).

3. Marie-Claude Smouts, “Entretien. Les relations internationales en France: regard sur une discipline”, 83-9 (87).

only their native language (compared to 22% on average and 30% in the United States), 39% speak one foreign language (compared to 37% on average and 39% in the United States), 37% speak two foreign languages (compared to 26% on average and 22% in the United States), 24% speak three or more foreign languages (compared to 14% on average and 9% in the United States). It must be noted however that when looking solely at those countries for whom English is not the official language (France, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Israel, Turkey, Hong Kong, Singapore, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico), the average number of languages spoken by the French IR scholars is comparable to the number spoken by the IR scholars in these other countries. This is linked to the fact that as English dominates the discipline, it is less of a necessity for those IR scholars whose native language is English to have a good command of other languages, whereas it is an essential requirement for the other IR scholars to have a good command of at least English. These findings are confirmed by the frequency with which respondents use sources and documents that are not in their native language to conduct their scholarly research (Q 37): 93% of the French respondents do so regularly, while the figure stands at only 46% when all the respondents from across the world are taken into account, and 27% in the case of the United States.

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

Table 11. Foreign languages spoken by IR scholars

	None	One	Two	Three or more
All	22	37	26	14
United States	30	39	22	9
France	0	39	37	24

It is interesting to note that despite having a good command of the English language, the majority of the French respondents (71%) in the last three years have not co-written a paper presented at an academic conference with an English-speaking scholar, co-written an article published in an academic journal with an English-speaking scholar, or co-edited a work with an English-speaking scholar. Only 29% of them have collaborated with an English-speaking scholar (Q 380). This is a sign that French IR scholars are relatively closed. However, this low level of collaboration is also due to the fact that in France, compared to other countries, books are more important and articles less so. Regarding the three kinds of research outputs that it is most important for IR scholars to publish in order to advance their academic career, in France, single-authored books (87% compared to 86% on average), but especially co-authored books (32% compared to 19% on average), and edited books (39% compared to 11% on average) are more important, provided that they are published by university presses – single-authored books published by commercial publishing houses being perceived as of particularly low value in France (5% compared to 27% on average) (Q 50). Peer-reviewed articles are relatively less valued, whether they are single-authored (74% in France compared to 88% on average) or co-authored (29% compared to 37%). By contrast, in the United States, articles are more important and books less so. This specifically French feature both explains and reflects the fact that French IR scholars have

difficulty penetrating markets in which relatively more importance is attached to peer-reviewed articles, such as the United States. More oriented towards producing books for national reasons, it is logical that French IR scholars be less present internationally, where articles are more valued.

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

Table 12. Ranking of the kinds of research outputs it is important to publish in order to advance an academic career (in %)

	All	United States	France
Book: SA, UP	86	90	87
Book: SA, CP	27	22	5
Book: CA, UP	19	19	32
Book: CA, CP	2	2	0
Book: E, UP	11	10	39
Book: E, CP	2	< 1	0
Book chapter: UP	11	11	11
Book chapter: CP	2	1	0
Journal article: SA, PR	88	89	74
Journal article: SA, NPR	3	3	3
Journal article: CA, PR	37	41	29
Journal article: CA, NPR	< 1	< 1	3
Conference paper	4	4	13

Note: SA = single-authored; CA = co-authored; UP = university press; CP = commercial press; E = edited; PR = peer-reviewed; NPR = not peer-reviewed

*
* *

Following this analysis of the data gathered through the TRIP survey, an ambivalent picture emerges of the IR discipline in France and its integration within the global discipline. If the French IR scholars who responded in this survey appear open and in step with the global discipline in regard to their theoretical trends, the number of languages spoken, and the methods employed, they notably remain rather closed in regard to their places of study, the scholars who they consider to have been interesting in recent years, and the tendency to publish books rather than articles, among other factors.

It is no longer possible to say that French IR is isolated from the rest of the world as was the case for a long time; the hope nourished during the 1990s by several commentators is beginning to materialise. However, this emergence remains partial in a number of aspects: French IR scholars continue to feel marginalised in French academe, while the influence of

political science and area studies remains strong. Not one French IR scholar or French journal is recognised internationally. The majority of French IR scholars are neither members of a French association for IR scholars only, nor members of an equivalent international association. The picture then is mixed, both in regard to the place of IR in France and the place of French IR in the world. It is as if French IR scholars are hesitating between a desire to differentiate themselves, as evidenced by the debates on a French School of IR, multidisciplinary and the sociology of IR, and a desire to integrate with the global discipline, as shown by the importance they attribute to American journals and American authors. There is no doubt this paradox explains a number of the results obtained in the survey. Furthermore, the question as to whether several of the trends observed are specific to IR still remains: in particular, we can consider the lack of publications in English, the non-presence in the discipline's major decision-making centres across the world, and the paucity of quantitative studies as being far from exclusive to IR. It would therefore be interesting to conduct research focusing on a series of French sub-fields of social sciences in order to see whether there are any recurrences and to try to explain them.

As we highlight in Annex 1, only political scientists were considered IR scholars in this survey and they were the only ones invited to participate in the survey, in accordance with the guidelines provided by the American managers of the TRIP project. Such a definition has undoubtedly influenced the results obtained. However, it is precisely one of the strengths of the research undertaken here that it reveals the existence of French IR scholars who are beginning to be well connected within the global discipline after having spent a long time in the shadow of lawyers, historians and even other political scientists. The best evidence that French IR is evolving is undoubtedly the fact that for the first time the TRIP survey was conducted in France. It is a sign that France is little by little beginning to become part of the global discipline. It is to be hoped that the arms outstretched by global IR to French IR will in the future be grasped by more IR scholars than the solitary third among them who agreed to take part in this survey. This response rate, the lowest of all the countries involved in the TRIP survey, illustrates just how much further there is to go before a genuine community of French IR scholars emerges.¹

Jérémie Cornut and Dario Battistella

Jérémie Cornut is a post-doctoral fellow at McGill University in Montreal where he is studying diplomatic practices, international relations theory and Canadian foreign policy. He has notably been published in the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* and *International Journal* (McGill University, 845 rue Sherbrooke Ouest, Montreal (Quebec) H3A 0G4, Canada, jeremie.cornut@mail.mcgill.ca).

Dario Battistella is Professor of Political Science at the Institute of Political Studies (IEP) of Bordeaux. He has recently published the fourth edition of *Théories des relations internationales* (Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 4th edn, 2012); (with Frank Petiteville, Marie-Claude Smouts and Pascal Vennesson), the third edition of the *Dictionnaire des relations internationale* (Paris: Dalloz, 3rd edn, 2012); as well as “Raymond Aron: a neoclassical realist before the term existed?”, in Asle Toje, Barbara Kunz (eds), *Neoclassical Realism in European Politics: Bringing Power Back In* (Manchester:

1. The authors sincerely thank the reviewers and the editorial board of the journal for their comments and suggestions.

Manchester University Press, 2012), 117-37. His works focus on international relations theory and the contemporary international system (Sciences Po Bordeaux, 11 allée Ausone, 33600 Pessac, d.battistella@sciencespobordeaux.fr).

Annex 1. Description of the protocol used

TRIP is a project that, since the early 2000s, has painted a picture of the IR discipline and its development from surveys sent to IR scholars, investigating the theoretical approaches they adopt, the research methods they favour, the content of the courses they teach, the links they maintain with the practice of international relations, the place of women within the field, those they consider to be the big names in the discipline, the universities which they think offer the most prestigious masters and doctoral programmes, the journals and publishing houses they deem to be influential, etc. The success of this undertaking is such that the results obtained are today used regularly by IR scholars, whether it be in order to analyse gender inequality in the United States;¹ to study the place of paradigmaticism and pluralism;² to compare American and British schools of international political economy;³ to paint a picture of Canadian foreign policy scholars;⁴ or to monitor the development of the discipline over the course of time,⁵ and so forth.

After an initial survey in 2004 focusing solely on American IR, the TRIP project expanded to include, successively, Canada in 2006, then some ten English-speaking countries in 2008. The fourth survey, conducted in 2011, was a comparative survey focusing on twenty different countries: United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, France, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Israel, Turkey, Hong Kong, Singapore, South Africa, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico. Thanks to its comparative aspect, this most recent survey paints a picture of the discipline in its entirety and begins to answer certain questions relating to the extent of the emergence and the specificity of French IR. More precisely, there are two kinds of information provided by the data collected in this survey:⁶ on the one hand, subjective information concerning how IR scholars perceive themselves and perceive their discipline in terms of theories, methodologies, epistemologies, etc.; and on the other hand, objective elements concerning how open or closed IR is in the different countries based on indicators such as the university where the highest degree was obtained, the number of foreign languages spoken, the importance given to authors of different nationalities in the courses taught, etc. This annex explains the method used to obtain and process the data. All the data and the research protocol are available on the project website

1. Ackerly Brooke, Jacqui True, "An intersectional analysis of international relations: recasting the discipline", *Politics and Gender*, 4(1), 2008, 156-73.

2. Rudra Sil, Peter J. Katzenstein, *Beyond Paradigms: Analytic Eclecticism in the Study of World Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 24; Jeffrey Checkel, "Theoretical synthesis in IR: possibilities and limits", *Simons Papers in Security and Development*, 6 (Vancouver: School for International Studies, Simon Fraser University, 2010), 6.

3. David Lake, "TRIPs across the Atlantic: theory and epistemology in IPE", *Review of International Political Economy*, 16(1), 2009, 47-57; Daniel Maliniak, Michael J. Tierney, "The American School of IPE", *Review of International Political Economy*, 16(1), 2009, 6-33.

4. John Kirton, "The 10 most important books on Canadian foreign policy", *International Journal*, 64(2), 2009, 553-64; Jérémie Cornut, Stéphane Roussel, "Canadian foreign policy: a linguistically divided field", *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 44(3), 2011, 685-709.

5. Dario Battistella, *Théories des relations internationales*, 667-9.

6. Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, Michael J. Tierney, "International relations in the US Academy", *International Studies Quarterly*, 55(2), 2011, 437-64.

(<http://irtheoryandpractice.wm.edu/projects/trip/index.php>), or have been published in academic journals.¹ More specifically, the majority of the statistics analysed in this article are presented in the report on the TRIP 2011 survey, available at the following address: <http://irtheoryandpractice.wm.edu/projects/trip/TRIPAroundTheWorld2011.pdf>. This is the reason why not all the tables are reproduced in this article. Those questions numbered higher than 100 were only posed to the French respondents (see Annex 2), and there is no comparative data available for these.

In 2011, the choice of the twenty countries to be studied was made on the basis of the personal networks and interests of the researchers at the College of William & Mary. Naturally, this selection criterion poses a problem: not only have many IR scholars across the world not been surveyed, but in respect of France those countries that are *a priori* comparable such as Germany and Italy do not feature in the survey. For the first time, questions were not only posed in English but also in five other languages. In total, 87 common questions, divided into four sections, were sent to 7,001 IR scholars; 3,446 of them participated in the survey. The rate of 49.5% (36.6% for France) corresponds to the percentage of IR scholars contacted who participated, however only a little over one third of them replied to *every* question posed. In addition to these common questions, each country had a set of country-specific questions found in a fifth section (Section V).

In exchange for preferential access to the data, the authors of this article were responsible for identifying the French IR scholars, translating the common survey questions as well as the letters inviting the scholars to participate in the survey, and drafting the questions for Section V specific to France. Section V therefore represents the way in which these authors raise the issues that they have identified as likely to more specifically concern IR in France. The sending of the survey, collection of data and its aggregation were the responsibility of the College of William & Mary.

The first stage consisted of identifying the French IR scholars. Every TRIP partner was provided a Survey Sample Codebook: the research protocol that has governed the surveys since the launch of the very first TRIP survey, and which details the characteristics to look for within individuals that would make them IR scholars, the sole group invited to participate in the survey. In order to define the corpus concerned, the identification procedure was based therefore on the American definition of IR. This led to the selection of any individual conducting research in the field of IR or teaching an IR course in a department or school of political science, or an Institute of Political Studies (IEP).²

1. Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, Michael J. Tierney, "Women in international relations", *Politics and Gender*, 4(1), 2008, 122-44; Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, Michael J. Tierney, *The View From the Ivory Tower: TRIP Survey of International Relations Faculty in the United States and Canada* (Williamsburg: Program on the Theory and Practice of International Relations, College of William & Mary, 2007); Susan Peterson, Michael J. Tierney, Daniel Maliniak, "Inside the ivory tower", *Foreign Policy*, 6, 2005, 58-64; Richard Jordan, Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, Michael J. Tierney, *One Discipline or Many? TRIP Survey of International Relations Faculty in Ten Countries* (Williamsburg: The Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations, College of William & Mary, 2009); Daniel Maliniak, Susan Peterson, Michael J. Tierney, *TRIP Around the World: Teaching, Research and Policy Views of International Relations Faculty in 20 Countries* (Williamsburg: The Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations, College of William & Mary, 2012); Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, Michael J. Tierney, "International Relations in the US Academy", *International Studies Quarterly*, 55(2), 2011, 437-64.

2. Daniel Maliniak, Susan Peterson, Michael J. Tierney, *TRIP Around the World*.

In practical terms, an expert in the history of IR who teaches in an IEP or a department of political science is considered to be an IR scholar but, on the contrary, is excluded from the sample if he or she teaches only in a history department. The same applies to lawyers, philosophers, sociologists, economists, business school professors, etc. An expert in European studies or area studies is considered to be an IR scholar if he or she deals with issues relating to IR, to defence policy, or to the external policy of the European Union (EU) or of the countries in his or her regional area of expertise. Conversely, the individual is excluded if he or she addresses issues that instead concern the internal aspects of the EU or the other regions. It should be stressed that the individual needs only to be a teacher in order to be considered as an IR scholar: there are no criteria as to the status of the teacher. An individual recruited in a temporary or assistant capacity to the teaching and research staff of a university (an ATER in France and an adjunct in the United States) – was considered to be an IR scholar and invited to participate in the survey. It should also be added that where there was any uncertainty, in order to avoid giving any impression of arbitrary exclusion, the researcher or teacher in question was considered to be an IR scholar – this is, for example, what led to the inclusion of the members of the Centre Thucydide (University of Paris II – Panthéon-Assas), a research institute dedicated to the study of international political relations.

As regards the corpus of teaching and research establishments considered to run IR courses and conduct IR research, the starting point was a list of 350 French academic institutions compiled from a database managed by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). For the French partners of the TRIP project, it was a matter of reviewing this list in order to determine whether these institutions had a department or school of political science, or an institute of political studies or, where applicable, an institute of political science or of law, the aim being to identify French IR scholars and find their contact details via the websites of these institutions. This second stage resulted in the identification of 32 institutions, notably the nine Institutes of Political Studies (IEP), the School for Advanced Studies in Social Sciences (EHESS), the Institute for Strategic Research (IRSEM), the departments of (law and/or) political science of the universities of Paris I, Paris II, Paris III, Lille 2, Grenoble, Strasbourg and Lyon 3, the Catholic University of Paris, etc. No organisation based on the think tank model was looked at, only public academic and research institutions were considered. This said, members of the leading French think tanks – the Institute for International and Strategic Relations (IRIS), the French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) and the Foundation for Strategic Research (FRS) – were invited to participate in the survey but only if they taught or conducted research within a public institution. In August 2011, these institutions accounted for approximately 300 French IR scholars.

It is not inconceivable that certain individuals contacted did not consider themselves to be IR scholars, while others who do consider themselves to be IR scholars were not contacted. The fact that only 4% of respondents did not consider themselves to be IR scholars (Q 22) indicates however that this is a survey in which only IR scholars participated. Even if only one third of those contacted participated in the survey, it can be said that the majority of French IR scholars were contacted in this survey. The majority of the French respondents are *maîtres de conférences* (roughly equivalent to assistant or associate professor in the United States and (senior) lecturer in the United Kingdom), *chargés d'enseignement* (teaching staff with no research responsibilities) and full professors (*agrégé*) (Q 35). In terms of highest educational degree completed, 20% of the French respondents have a DEA or Research Masters incorporating a dissertation and 70% have a doctorate (Q 11).

Q 35. What is your current status within your home department?

Table 13. Status of respondents within university (in %)

Status in the department	Maître de conférences (Associate / Assistant professor)	Chargé d'enseignement (teaching staff only)	Full Professor (agrégé)	Adjunct lecturer & researcher (ATER)	Enseignant-chercheur (Lecturer-researcher)	Chargé de recherche (Research fellow)	Professeur associé (Associate professor)	Directeur de recherche (Director of research)	Stagiaire postdoctoral (Postdoctoral fellow)	Other
%	18%	14%	13%	12%	11%	8%	4%	1%	1%	17%

Once the French IR scholars were identified, the questions intended for them were translated. Furthermore, twenty questions specific to the survey in France were added to the 87 questions posed to all of the IR scholars around the world. These questions concern the study of IR itself, how French IR scholars perceive their discipline in France, how often they collaborate with English-speaking scholars, the extent of their knowledge of certain theoretical labels, etc. Given the linguistic proximity of Quebec and France and in order to facilitate comparisons, some of these questions were also posed in the survey sent to Canadian IR scholars.

This research undeniably has methodological limitations. Because of the representativeness of the sample of respondents and the variety of interpretations to which some questions and answers can give rise, there is always a double risk in any interpretation of a survey's results, namely of attributing views to individuals who have not spoken at all and attributing the wrong views to respondents who have spoken. There are also some problems linked specifically to comparisons between different countries: it was necessary to translate the questions, and in certain cases the meaning could not be reproduced accurately (a professor in France does not exactly have the same status as in the United States for example). Furthermore, there are some legal issues (it is not possible, for example, to ask questions on the ethnic origin of the respondents in France) and political issues (for example, the left and the right do not correspond exactly with the same political persuasion in every country).

Added to this are other problems inherent in conducting a survey, problems identified by Pierre Bourdieu who challenges three assumptions: it is necessary to assume "that everyone can have an opinion", "that all opinions have the same value", and "that there is a consensus about the problem".¹ The survey conducted here does not escape these faults. For example, when respondents are asked to rank the best doctorate programmes in the world, it is not certain that all of them had enough information on this issue in order to express an informed opinion. More generally, there is no distinction made between the respondents according to their knowledge of the discipline. Well-informed and less well-informed opinions are regarded in the same light. It should also be stressed that when some questions suggest a list of answers to choose from, this pre-determined list is likely to influence the results obtained. For example, in the question regarding which theoretical approach to the study of IR is adopted by the respondent (Q 21), six paradigms are suggested (constructivism, English school, feminism, liberalism, Marxism and realism). This puts these six paradigms at an

1. Pierre Bourdieu, "Public opinion does not exist", in Armand Mattelart and Seth Siegelau (eds), *Communication and Class Struggle. Volume 1: Capitalism, Imperialism* (New York: International General, 1979), 124-30 (124).

advantage and those paradigms not proposed at a disadvantage. Similarly, Section IV poses questions concerning current international issues which often reflect American priorities.

Furthermore, there are specific difficulties in conducting a survey of academics. All the individual responses are aggregated and it is no longer possible to identify the logic behind the answers to certain questions, which is often linked to the respondent's position within the disciplinary field.¹ In fact, in responding to a survey's questions, academics are not abandoning the logic that drives them, and which consists of battling for the available resources. In particular, they are going to be tempted to influence the image of the discipline that the survey produces. In other words, for example, when they respond to the question concerning the most influential IR scholars or journals in the field today, they are influenced by their own perceptions and interests. Thus, there is a difference between the results of the TRIP survey and those obtained by calculating the impact factors.²

Lastly, it should be noted that our data does not allow us to measure comprehensively the extent to which French IR has emerged. In particular, in this study the international impact of the publications authored by French IR scholars is not measured, nor is their presence in international conferences quantified, or their place within French universities evaluated. The data that would enable a dynamic picture to be painted and evolution over time to be plotted is not available either, given that the survey was conducted in 2011 for the first time and therefore any comparison with previous data is impossible. As the response rate in France was only 36.6%, it would also be of interest to supplement the results presented here with more factual data, concerning for example the titles of the course syllabi that can be found in the main academic institutions, the titles of the important books published recently in France, the content of articles on IR published in French journals, etc. Furthermore, the authors of this study did not carry out multivariate analyses, which would have entailed crossing several factors with each other, in order to better understand the sub-populations of French IR scholars. Because it was a question of studying French IR as a whole, the French respondents were generally treated as a single group. Yet the fact remains that deep divides most certainly exist – notably generational and institutional differences – and painting a picture of the discipline on a national basis, without looking at other divisions likely to cross borders, is problematic.³ Furthermore, we did not specifically ask ourselves to what extent the disconnect is specifically a French phenomenon. If we accept that IR is an American discipline, as asserted by Stanley Hoffmann,⁴ to some extent all other countries are at least partially disconnected. It would therefore not be a feature specific to France.

Although all this prevents the survey from giving a complete picture of the discipline, it can, nonetheless, indicate certain trends. We believe that our research provides a certain number of elements to determine the extent to which French IR scholars are emerging both in France and internationally. Indeed, conducting this survey has several advantages over the alternative methods: it is a very effective tool for objectification in so far as it strives for completeness,

1. Pierre Bourdieu, "The specificity of the scientific field and the social conditions of the progress of reason", *Social Science Information* (14)6, 1975, 19-47 (26)

2. Michael Horowitz, Allan Stam, "Ranking scholars and departments: comparing subjective and objective measures", paper presented at the TRIP Data Workshop of the annual conference of the International Studies Association (ISA), Montreal, 15 March 2011.

3. Oliver Kessler, Xavier Guillaume, "Everyday practices of international relations: people in organizations", *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 15(1), 2012, 110-20 (118).

4. Stanley Hoffmann, "An American social science: international relations", *Daedalus*, 106(3), 1977, 41-60.

provides standardised responses, and enables comparisons. Many questions are open and respondents often have the opportunity to enter the answer of their choice, without being guided. At any moment, they can check the “I don’t know” box, or move on to the next question without responding, which in part explains the variations in the rates of response from one question to another. Furthermore, this survey partially depersonalises the debates, whereas qualitative analyses are far more likely to be seen as playing into the jockeying for position. The data made available in this research has led us to qualify, or even disprove, several assertions repeated by some commentators. Moreover, in a survey, every IR scholar has a voice regardless of his or her influence and standing: this gives equal weight to everyone, without status within the discipline skewing the analysis. For all of these reasons, disciplinary sociology,¹ which continues to grow in importance, regularly uses surveys, including in France.²

Annex 2. List of questions only featuring in the French survey (Section V)

1 – International relations research and teaching occupies a respectable place in French universities.

- You very much agree with this assertion
- You somewhat agree with this assertion
- You somewhat disagree with this assertion
- You very much disagree with this assertion

2 – There are a lot of IR scholars in France.

- You very much agree with this assertion
- You somewhat agree with this assertion
- You somewhat disagree with this assertion
- You very much disagree with this assertion

3 – How has the place of international relations evolved within French universities over the past twenty years?

- International relations occupies the same place as 20 years ago
- International relations has advanced over the past 20 years
- International relations has regressed over the past 20 years

4 – International relations theories are important to understanding international relations.

- You very much agree with this assertion
- You somewhat agree with this assertion

1. Christian Bueger, “From epistemology to practice: a sociology of science for international relations”, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 15(1), 2012, 97-109.

2. Emiliano Grossman, “Les stratégies de publication des politistes français: facteurs d’unité et de diversité”, *Revue française de science politique*, 60(3), 2010, 565-85.

- You somewhat disagree with this assertion
- You very much disagree with this assertion

5 – There is a specifically French way of studying international relations.

- You very much agree with this assertion
- You somewhat agree with this assertion
- You somewhat disagree with this assertion
- You very much disagree with this assertion

6 – The French specificity in the study of international relations lies in the sociology of international relations.

- You very much agree with this assertion
- You somewhat agree with this assertion
- You somewhat disagree with this assertion
- You very much disagree with this assertion

7 – International relations is a fully-fledged discipline modelled on the other social sciences.

- You very much agree with this assertion
- You somewhat agree with this assertion
- You somewhat disagree with this assertion
- You very much disagree with this assertion

8 – International relations is an object of study which falls within several social sciences.

- You very much agree with this assertion
- You somewhat agree with this assertion
- You somewhat disagree with this assertion
- You very much disagree with this assertion

9 – Have you ever heard of a French School of International Relations?

- Yes, absolutely
- Yes, but I do not know very much about it
- No, never

10 – Have you ever heard of *French Theory* in international relations?

- Yes, absolutely
- Yes, but I do not know very much about it
- No, never

11 – Have you ever heard of the *French Touch* in international relations?

- Yes, absolutely
- Yes, but I do not know very much about it
- No, never

12 – Have you ever heard of the Paris School in International Relations?

- Yes, of course
- Yes, but I do not know very much about it
- No, never

13 – Rank the three French-language 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.

14 – When your department advertises an IR position, do you have a personal preference for a candidate who knows how to use quantitative research methods rather than a candidate who knows how to use qualitative research methods?

- Yes
- No
- I have no preference either way

15 – In the last three years, have you co-written a paper presented at an academic conference with an English-speaking scholar, co-written an article published in an academic journal with an English-speaking scholar or co-edited a work with an English-speaking scholar?

- Yes
- No

16 – Rank the top three journals in which you would like to be published (1 indicates the journal in which you would most like to be published, 2 indicates the journal in second place, etc.).

17 – In the last three years, what percentage of your work has been written:

- In French: ___ %
- In English: ___ %
- In a language other than French or English: ___ %

18 – Are you a member of a French professional association primarily for IR scholars?

- Yes
- No

19 – Are you a member of a non-French professional association primarily for IR scholars?

- Yes
- No

20 – Do you read articles published in the journal *Études internationales*?

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- Frequently