

## DEBATING AN ISSUE

# RUSSIAN AND INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC PRACTICES IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE<sup>1</sup>

IGOR ISTOMIN, ANDREY BAYKOV

MGIMO–University, Moscow, Russia

## Abstract

The trend towards widening of the international academic discourse through integration of non-Western national schools in IR, affects the Russian scholarly community today only marginally. Russian scholars are hardly ever included in international debates regarding the major directions of political, economic and social development in the globalized world. Therefore, they are unable to influence the intellectual landscape of the current international relations. The current article emerged from a comparative study of the domestic and international academic and publication practices. It aims to identify key barriers towards greater engagement of Russian authors in the global academic debate on world politics. The article views the academic practices, which emerge from interaction between members of the scholarly community, as crucial regulatory frameworks, which define the quality of research publications. Since 2012 Russian authorities have adopted multiple decisions, aimed to integrate Russian science in the international context. These measures significantly affect Social Sciences, including International Studies. They resulted in an accelerated adoption of formal requirements to scholarly publications, while academic journals became the major enforcers in this process. However, the current study confirms that the internalization of new standards and practices by the academic community is far from being complete. This process is complicated by the fact that the epistemological and methodological foundations of the Russian school differentiate it significantly from Western IR. Meanwhile, the major differences lie in the definition of aims and structure of scholarly publications, as well as in criteria of academic study. Thus, the authors of the article come up with proposals, intended to foster a more successful integration of Russian IR in the global academic discourse. The study relies on the monitoring of self-positioning of journals and their requirements for authors, as well as on interviews conducted with publishers and editors of major Russian and international journals and authors who have a record of publishing in both contexts.

## Keywords:

global academic discourse; International Studies; science policy; leading academic journals; Russian school in IRT; international databases Scopus and Web of Science; U.S.; UK.

The intensification of transnational exchanges and the thickening of the international society is accompanied by the emergence of a common space of intellectual reflec-

tion of complex social systems in their multiple dimensions [Voytolovsky 2006]. The rise of a global academic discourse is becoming ever more apparent.

<sup>1</sup>This article was prepared within the framework of implementation of social projects for the presidential grant, with the support of the Institute of Socio-Economic and Political Studies. The authors would like to thank I. Garmaeva, O. Tropashko, T. Tyukaeva who helped in the preparation of empirical data, as well as all the experts who agreed to participate in the interview, as well as the colleagues who took part in the discussion.

*Corresponding author:*

Email: info@obraforum.ru

Historically, it was formed in the West and based on the American experience of University studies [Batalov 2014: 9-10]. Nevertheless, today the global discourse is becoming increasingly inclusive, accommodating national schools from European and even non-Western countries (especially the growing centers of scholarship – China, Turkey, India [Tickner, Waever 2009; Acharya, Buzan 2010; Zhang Zhuychzhuan, Korolev 2010; Grachikov 2014]). The most successful representatives of these new schools are even to some degree capable of occupying positions of influence in the international research community alongside their more traditional American counterparts. They attempt to introduce new topics and approaches, which better reflect priorities of their home nations, while adhering to the basic methodological attitudes, as well as institutional principles of the Anglo-Saxon academic discourse.

The Russian scholarly community, nowadays, remains to a large extent on the periphery of this process [Tsygankov, Tsygankov 2014]. It lags behind not only Europe but also a number of large developing countries in the representation of its academic achievements<sup>2</sup>. The inadequate representation of national research in the global debates is equivalent to the lack of influence on the intellectual landscape defining political, economic and social development of the world.

In this regard, national authorities encourage active involvement of the country's research community in transnational academic communication<sup>3</sup>. The main emphasis, however, in the state supported efforts to increase competitiveness of Russian scientific schools is placed upon Natural Sciences. Meanwhile, similar efforts by specialists in Social Sciences, such as IR, should take into account specific standards and practices developed in their area of expertise.

Successful integration of Russian scholars in the global academic discourse cannot be achieved through plain copying of foreign experience. This approach may lead to the loss of the

previous achievements, and therefore, of the comparative advantages of the national school that have significant value [Bogaturov 2004; Tsygankov 2013; Tsygankov, Tsygankov 2006]. Similarly, limitations in the training and established methods of work of Russian specialists cannot be ignored. Thus, an increase in the representation of national scholars in the international debate is not possible without taking into account the existing community approaches to the preparation and presentation of research.

*The aim of the study, therefore, is to identify the major differences in Russian and international research and publication practices and to identify the barriers to the integration of Russian authors in the global academic discourse.*

*Some aspects of modern scientific practices became the subject of detailed studies.* In particular, much attention has been paid to the problem of correlating further deepening fundamental and theoretical research with the objectives of their application to the resolution of applied problems [Jentleson, 2002; Ish-Shalom 2006; Lepgold, 1998; Lepgold, Nincic 2001; Walt 2005]. In 2008, this theme was the subject of a special debate organized by the flagship journal of the International Studies Association [Tickner, Tsygankov 2008].

Advanced Western standards of academic research were reflected in the works on the methodology of quantitative and qualitative research [Bennett, Checkel 2015; Brady, Collier 2010; George, Bennett 2005; King, Keohane, Verba 1994]. However, in recent years critical evaluations of the dominant paradigm of hypothetical-deductive logic of structuring papers became more apparent. The various sources of dissatisfaction in it became apparent in the publications by R. Clarke and D. Primo [Clarke, Primo 2012], D. Levine and A. Barder [Levine, Barder 2014], J. Mearsheimer and St. Walt [Mearsheimer, Walt 2013]. In this context also it is relevant to mention the once again growing discussion on transparency of the inquiry in academic publi-

<sup>2</sup>At the same time, such a peripheral nature is typical for a number of major Western schools – primarily French one.

<sup>3</sup>Presidential Decree № 599 "On measures to implement the state policy in the field of education and science." URL: <http://5top100.ru/upload/iblock/fa5/fa59da2ed5ba2da3352d1045ed2c2d6e.pdf>

cations [Altman, King 2007; Lupia, Elman 2014; Moravcsik 2014a; Moravcsik 2014b].

Meanwhile, it is hardly possible in the existing literature to find *general works covering academic and publication practices in IR as a complex, but at the same time holistic, socially constructed phenomenon. In Russian research literature, this topic is even less present.* Russian specialists are paying more attention to the peculiarities of the organization of science "input" – to the models of state and other support for research activities, but not to the expected results of research efforts "output" and forms of their presentation.

In this regard, the article is intended to draw attention to the core issues of the current academic production – expectations of the Russian and international academic journals regarding submitted research papers. It should be stressed that the existing Russian works in this area are mainly represented by publications in bibliometrics seeking to define existing methods and tools of measurement and evaluation of the productivity of research [Marshakova-Shaikaevich 2008]. At the same time, numerous qualitative differences (substantive and organizational) of research discourses are out of focus in this analysis. An exception in this regard is a book "The Russian Science of International Relations: New Directions," published back in the mid-2000s [Tsygankov, Tsygankov 2005].

The present study is *based on the* structured comparison of standards and practices of both foreign editions among themselves, and with their Russian counterparts<sup>4</sup>. Taking into account the non-uniformity of any social community, the emphasis was placed on the study of what can be described as "best practices" in Russia and in the world. In this regard, the main attention was focused upon the experience of leading national and foreign experts and publications. A considerable part of publications both in Russia and abroad, as it is evident, are the works that do not quite meet the high requirements that are considered in this article.

The article incorporates the monitoring of expectations and preferences of foreign pub-

lishing communities, as well as materials of 30 expert interviews conducted with the editors of Russian and foreign academic journals, representatives of the leading international publishing houses, and also with Russian and foreign scholars with experience publishing in international journals. The research results were presented during the thematic roundtables held in MGIMO and the Moscow State University by M.V. Lomonosov in May 2015.

# 1

The notion of "social practices" became one of the key categories of modern Social Sciences. Its initial conceptualization is associated with the works of the Austrian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein [Schatzki 1996] (in particular, with his work "Philosophical Investigations" [Wittgenstein 1985]). However, its application increased dramatically with the "interpretive turn" in Sociology in the 1970s [Shugalsky 2012: 276]. An important role in the elaboration of the notion played the works by M. Foucault, P. Bourdieu, E. Giddens, G. Garfinkel [Reckwitz 2002: 243].

The interest in the study of social practices emerged as a response to the rigidity of the previous oppositions of structure and agent [Giddens 2008]. The appeal to them allowed a fresh look at one of the fundamental issues in philosophy and science – the degree of determinism of social behavior, the reality or illusion of freedom of human will. While the traditional sociological approach presumed strict conditionality of behavior of the individual by the organization of the system in which it is immersed, the theory of social practices alleged interactive and mutually constitutive nature of agents and structure.

The presence of social practices is associated with the correlation by the subjects of their own actions with the established notions of acceptable and desirable and at the same time with their struggle to change their environment [Bourdieu 1994]. The emergence of this category resulted in a shift in research from determining of driving forces to the analysis of the process of construction of social reality.

<sup>4</sup>For more on the methodology, see [George, Bennett 2005]

The paradigm shift in the study of social processes also affected the Sociology of research. The French specialist Bruno Latour and his British counterpart Steve Woolgar made a significant contribution to the appreciation of the importance of research practices [Ivanov, 2012]. They concentrate their attention on the dynamics of the formation of scientific knowledge under conditions of interaction among researchers and between them and other parts of society [Latour 2013; Latour, Woolgar 1986]. They see in the research an attempt to organize information into evidence, which for those outside the discipline could appear as a chaotic set of loosely related facts. The aim of research then is to choose from a variety of competing interpretations of the observed phenomena. The ability of members of the academic community to interpret reality consistently and to agree on the criteria for scientific character and validity of the hypothesis made, are conditioned by the skills and knowledge they receive throughout learning and working together, their socialization in science.

Unlike the works of Latour and Woolgar, the present article does not set itself the mission of making an anthropological study of the formation of social and scientific knowledge in a historical retrospective. In this case, the category of "scholarly and editorial practices" is used to reflect well-established models of preparation and presentation of research results. The constructivist nature of this concept allows to draw a fine line between strict determinism, and complete voluntarism, emphasizing the dependence of the current situation on the collective social experience.

In contrast to the traditional analysis of regulation in society within the tradition of legal research, the study of the social practices pays greater attention to its informal aspects. It is often impossible to identify a specific date, author or document codifying and enshrining the rules of conduct. In this regard, it is useful to apply the model of the "life cycle" developed by the American scholars M. Finemor and K. Sikkink to define the pathway of the social

practice's formation. This model allows to estimate the level of the potential costs of implementing standards and the degree of their stability. According to its authors, the successful introduction of new rules is inevitably connected with external monitoring and control of observance. As assimilation of these norms turns them into a custom, the cost of policing is reduced, and the regulatory framework becomes self-sustaining. Through time it gains a certain force of inertia.

The model of Finnemore and Sikkink includes three major stages of development of formal and informal regulation: origin, "cascade" and internalization of norms [Finnemore, Sikkink 1998]. At the first stage, the originator of the future standards articulates their adoption, and he uses the available resources to put pressure on the members of the target community. At the second stage, under the influence of rational approach, a growing number of members of the social system begins to adhere to them because conformity becomes a beneficial strategy. The internalization of norms (the third phase in the cycle) is associated with a widening acceptance of practices as self-valuable, which drives social agents to execute them without external coercion, even in the absence of apparent immediate benefits or sanctions for non-adherence.

In our view, the model of "life cycle" may well be applied to the evolution of academic and editorial practices in Russia at the moment. In recent years, the initializing role in the national academic community belongs to the government agencies which apply (often uncritically) Western scholarly practices as a reference model. The most important tool used by the Ministry of Education and Science to implement these standards is grant funding. Access to government spending at the level of individual researchers and research institutions is stipulated by the publications in journals, which are indexed in international databases (mostly in *Scopus*, *Web of Science*, but also in some of the thematic ones)<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>5</sup>See, for example, the Tender documents to carry out an open public tender for the grants of the Russian Science Foundation in the priority area of the Russian Science Foundation "Fundamental research and exploratory research by individual research groups." 2/5/2014 URL: [http://phd.pph/sites/default/files/docfiles/konkursnaja\\_dokumentacija.pdf](http://phd.pph/sites/default/files/docfiles/konkursnaja_dokumentacija.pdf)

Another mechanism used by the government is the mandatory requirements to academic journals imposed by the Higher Attestation Commission, which regulates allocation of Ph.D. degrees in the country<sup>6</sup>. They are expected to make a clear choice of disciplinary specialization, perfect use of external peer review to assess manuscripts, present bibliography in accordance with international standards, as well as other metadata<sup>7</sup> for English-speaking audience.

In relations with the research communities the Ministry acts as a source of external pressure, which determines the conditions for access to both material and status resources. At the same time, it has limited possibilities for monitoring and control, related primarily to the tracking of a number of formal criteria<sup>8</sup>.

However, there are clear signs of transition to the second phase of the cycle: the national research community in the last three to four years has witnessed a cascade of recognition of imported norms. Academic journals themselves served a principal facilitating role for spreading normative innovations. Currently, as a part of the "race for Scopus," leading journals provide more explicit and detailed explanations of their editorial policy as well as requirements for the articles, take public commitments to adhere to the highest standards of publication ethics, adopt the procedure of the double-blind peer review. The growth of the specialized publications devoted to various aspects of scientific production is significant, including the improvement of their websites [Grigoriev 2014; Kirsanov 2014]. Consequently, the researchers, who are inter-

ested in the publication of their studies and promotion up by the career ladder have to meet the criteria transmitted by the journals.

Thus, currently, international publication practices are increasingly formalized as the mandatory requirements of institutions providing support for research activities and the presentation of their results. The most striking evidence of the latter becomes the experience of the "Vestnik of MGIMO-University", which requires the submission of articles in a specific form, reproducing the logic of articles in international journals<sup>9</sup>.

However, the need to formalize these kinds of requirements proves that internalization of international scientific practices by the Russian scholarly community has still not occurred. Their reproduction in domestic publications depends on a constant external influence (structural coercion and encouragement). A significant number of Russian academic journals demonstrate that new standards often receive only formal adherence in connection with the need to meet the state requirements. That is why this study aspires to compare academic and editorial practices in those areas which are less subject to formal regulation. For these purposes, epistemological, methodological and structural differences in the preparation and presentation of research results, as well as actual demarcation of the scholarly activities, were considered.

## 2

Despite the rise of a global academic discourse accommodating representatives of multiple research cultures; substantial national,

<sup>6</sup>Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of Russia of July 25, 2014 № 793. On approval of rules of formation in the notification procedure of the list of peer-reviewed scientific publications, in which should be published basic scientific results of dissertations for the degree of candidate of science, for the degree of Doctor of Science and requirements for peer-reviewed publications for inclusion in the list of peer-reviewed publications, in which to be published basic scientific results of dissertations for the degree of candidate of science, for the degree of Doctor of Science. URL: <http://vak.ed.gov.ru/documents/10179/513662/4.%D0%9F%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0%D0%B7%D0%E2%84%96%20793+%D0%BE%D1%82%2025.07.2014.pdf/d1c208f5-55a2-40c0-9243-d91937ead477>

<sup>7</sup>Names of articles, information about authors, editors, annotations to the articles are understood being metadata.

<sup>8</sup>Ivailova I. The monitoring of high schools will take into account the employment of their graduates // Rossiyskaya Gazeta. 12/22/2014

<sup>9</sup>According to the English-language acronym, the format is called IMRAD: introduction, methodology, results and their discussion [Nair 2014: 13-25].

regional and paradigmatic differences still persist. Even the Western scholarly community is not homogeneous and is characterized by serious metatheoretical and methodological differences. Back in the 1990s, Ole Waever noted a growing gap between the U.S. community dominated by positivism and post-structuralist theorizing characteristic of leading European schools [Waever 1998].

This separation remains significant. According to the survey "Teaching, research and international policy," conducted in 2011, more than half of American specialists use rationality in different forms as a key category for explaining IR (57%). The share of adherents of its purest form – rational choice theory (RCT) – is up to 7%. Meanwhile, out of the six European countries, in which this research was carried out, the similar situation is characteristic only for Ireland (53%) and Norway (66%).

The criticism of rationality of the participants of the international politics is inherent in the large Western schools outside the United States. In the UK, 67% of researchers identify themselves with it and only 3% use the RCT. In Australia, there are 63% of critics of rationalism and also 3% of RCT supporters; in New Zealand – 71% and 0; in Finland – 75%, and 0%, respectively. In other European countries, the gap is somewhat smaller, but also is significant: France – 50% and 2%; Denmark – 55% and 9%; Sweden – 57% and 4%. Even in geographically close to the United States, Canada, those who disagree with the assumption of rational behavior of political actors are in the majority – 54%. While, in the United States 59% of researchers describe themselves as positivists, in the UK, there are only 27% of those, in France – 32%, in Denmark – 34%, and in Australia – 35% [Maliniak 2012]. The situation is quite similar also in Germany which was not included in the study<sup>10</sup>.

Existing epistemological differences are reflected in the choice of the preferred methodology. Among the study participants of "Teaching, research and international politics" 46% of American experts stated that they use quantitative methods of analysis<sup>11</sup>. In the UK and France, the figure was 20% and 19%, respectively (as the main method in research, they are used by 6% and 2%). As with meta-theoretical foundations of research, out of the European countries, Ireland and Norway represent standing alone cases. In these two quantitative methodology is applied by 49% and 57% of specialists respectively<sup>12</sup>.

In the U.S., since 1960s, the trend towards establishing International Relations as a scientific discipline resulted in active attempts to quantify research, the way it was achieved in Economics and Political Science. Meanwhile, in European countries poststructuralist relativism has a much greater impact on social research [Tsygankov, Tsygankov 2006: 99-100, 111-112]. Existing quantitative techniques did not give the right tools for discourse research, study of language and cultural foundations of political behavior.

In non-Anglo-Saxon academic communities there is a widespread belief that in most Social Sciences (including History, Political Science and International Relations) the methodology based on empirical verification of hypotheses, is just an unnecessary work, which does not really lead to an increase in knowledge; and articles published in "standard" American academic journals contain trivial argument, which does not require sophisticated confirmation.

As an argument in favor of this point of view, many full professors in the U.S. often cease to publish in peer-reviewed journals, while almost all their articles in Scopus and Web of Science

<sup>10</sup>The interview with G. Schneider (Professor, University of Konstanz, Germany, editor of the journal *European Union Politics*)

<sup>11</sup>The contraposition of quantitative and qualitative methods is the traditional division in the methodology of social sciences. The report "Teaching, research and international policy" the first refers primarily to different statistical methods for the analysis of empirical data. In other cases in this category, the game-theoretical modeling also is included.

<sup>12</sup>Norway is an exceptional example of the dominance of quantitative methodology, whereas in all the other countries studied, it is less popular compared to qualitative research.

refer to the previous period of aspiring for this position. When they receive their tenure, they mostly write for policy magazines, their own blogs, op-eds or publish monographs, trying to escape editorial red tape.

A similar gap became evident in interviews conducted for this study. However, the survey results cast doubt on the prognosis made by O. Waever that the differences highlighted between the American and European schools will continue to grow [Waever 1998: 689]. Several interviewees<sup>13</sup> noted that in recent years there have been changes in the epistemological and methodological preferences of European schools. The desire to increase competitiveness of their own work given the dominance of American researchers, universities and scientific publications pushes them to partly accept the US methodological and epistemological approaches. The expansion of American practices becomes more evident in traditional centers of European research.

The Russian school of International Studies developed similarly to its European counterparts primarily from Historical disciplines [Bogaturov, 2004; Torkunov 2012]. Despite the long period of ideological pressure of the Marxist doctrine, relying on economic determinism (or perhaps because of it) [Tsygankov, Tsygankov 2005: 25-29, Tyulin 2002: 395-397], it is less than American schools, was influenced by the behavioristic shift in Economics. In addition, it was obliged from the very start to provide immediate results for foreign policy decision making [Khrustalev 2006].

Therefore, quantitative research methodology in Russia remains even less represented than in other European countries. The analysis of publications from five leading national academic journals on international politics for 2014 demonstrated that articles containing quantitative research, accounted for about 7% of all articles. Given the broad, interdisciplinary focus of some of the volumes,

they include also publications with quantitative analysis, but in the other fields of Political Science, as well as sociological and economic studies, which are not always directly related to international studies. The rest contain qualitative analysis of the results of quantitative surveys conducted by the authors themselves<sup>14</sup>.

The Russian academic publications quite rarely apply methods of statistical analysis of quantitative data. In most cases, it uses descriptive statistics. Examples of formal modeling are extremely rare. The findings of our research in this case are very similar to the results presented by Denis Degterev in the current issue.

It is worth noting that in other disciplines (such as History, Economics or Law) methodological barriers between Russian and Western (or rather American) academic communities are lower<sup>15</sup>. The techniques, used by the authors from different schools, are much more compatible. International political studies, however, are in somewhere between Social Sciences, which in methodological terms are closer to the Natural Sciences (such as Economics and Sociology), and those which rely on traditional narrative types of analyzes (including, for example, "History", "Anthropology").

Such methodological preferences suggest a similarity of initial positions of national researchers and representatives of other European academic schools. Meanwhile, at a deeper epistemological level there is a substantial distinction between them.

Previously, we mentioned the post-positivism influence on the development of international research outside the United States. This trend has had a smaller impact on Russia than on most other European countries. The analysis of Russian publications for 2014 shows that only in 35.9% of the articles, there are elements of the anthropological, discursive, cultural or semiotic studies which are

<sup>13</sup>The interview with B. Heuser (professor at the University of Redding, United Kingdom, editor of the journal *Cold War History*), G. Schneider

<sup>14</sup>In other cases, the use of descriptive statistics did not count.

<sup>15</sup>The interview with. P.A. Kalinichenko, R. Connolly, A. Fedyashin)

*Table 1*  
**The epistemological and methodological preferences  
of the leading national journals on international relations<sup>16</sup>**

№	Journal	Share of works using anthropological, discursive, cultural or semiotic explanations of political phenomena	Share of works using quantitative methods of analysis
1	Vestnik Mezhdunarodnykh Organizatsiy (Bulletin of international organizations)	23.5	20.6
2	Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya (International Relations)	40.9	0
3	Mezhdunarodnye Protsessy (International Processes)	46.2	0
4	Mirovaya Ekonomika (World Economy and International Relations)	26.7	5
5	Polis. Politicheskie Issledovaniya (Political Studies)	51.7	13.3
Total share		35.9	6.9

*Source: Authors' calculations based on the publications of the journals.*

associated with the Post-Positivist paradigm<sup>17</sup>. In a recent study, Andrey Tsygankov and Pavel Tsygankov reveal key concepts of the Russian theory of international relations, which also reflect the positivist view of international studies. Meanwhile, in the conceptualization of the national foreign policy a key place is occupied by issues of identity, in the analysis of which post-structuralist analy-

sis plays an important role [Tsygankov, Tsygankov 2014: 94].

In the epistemological sense, the Russian school of the international studies occupies an intermediate position between the American and European poles of the international academic discourse. This school is much more concerned than the British and continental researchers about the structural organization of the world system, the polarity and hierarchy of the states. At the same time, its members turn to the constructivist explanatory framework in the study of the foreign policy thinking. In most cases, for the Russian specialists, this combination is not problematic – for them the contraposition of positivist and post-positivist explanations is not unusual. Such a combination could be found in writings of a number of the leading representatives of the discipline, A.D. Bogaturov [2008; 2006], A.D. Voskresensky [2006; 2013], N.A. Kosolapov [2002; 2008], T.A. Shakleina [2012] and others.

This eclecticism in the eyes of a foreign observer, in fact, reflects the uniqueness of the historical development of the school. It created a fundamentally different system of demarcation in the Russian academic community, reflecting the dynamics of internal debate. It was focused to a significant degree on disputes about the relationship of subject boundaries, methodology, and if anything, the heuristic potential of International Relations, on the one hand, and World Politics as a separate discipline – on the other. As a consequence, the Russian immature and fragile school of international relations found itself early fragmented into two segments. This created a threat of separating into two sub-theories, institutionally separated academic schools, and as a result brought about the risk of a loss of a common understanding of the subject matter [Bogaturov 2005; Tsygankov 2013].

<sup>16</sup>The analysis included five leading journals in terms of Science Index for 2014 in the category "Politics. Political sciences." Among them, publications were chosen only in which international political issues are a major theme, or take an important place. The journal *"Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn"* ("International Affairs"), which meets these criteria, was excluded because of its predominantly expert-analytical and journalistic, rather than strictly scientific orientation.

<sup>17</sup>At the same time, the largest share of such articles is observed in the journal *Polis* that in a greater degree is focused upon the problems relating to domestic policy.



In the Western academic discourse, World Politics is not viewed as something substantially different from International Relations. This notion reflects major, structurally important communications in the international system, which operate along with the other types of interactions – the world economy, security, etc. [Tsygankov 2013]. In Russia, however, the dispute led not only to the rise of new topics, but meant also the separation of World Politics as an academic and educational discipline which attempted to institutionalize itself through the creation of departments, faculties and magazines, including the appearance of a "canonical" textbook [Lebedeva 2003].

The institutionalization of World Politics studies, effectively legitimized neoliberal and then constructivist paradigms in International Relations, with their traditions, axioms and research priorities. Otherwise, the dominance of the structural realist paradigm in Russian International Studies would preclude the introduction of these theoretical approaches into the expert discourse. In the second half of the 1990s, for a number of experts, it was easier to isolate themselves and move into another discipline than to prove that they belonged to a different research tradition. This became a huge creative force, which contributed to the opening by the Russian academic community of the new tools and approaches in the 1990s – early 2000s [Bogaturov 2005].

The lack of a conscious self-identification by the majority of scholars in terms of adherence to a paradigm in the Western sense prevented them from having a critical look at the limitations of the applied methodology, as well as recognition and attribution in the international discourse, built upon specific pathways of constructing academic research.

### 3

The fundamental differences in Russian and Western academic practices, can be defined by the conceptual and structural differences in the presentation of research results. Despite the continuing epistemological and methodological divisions, between scholars in the US and Europe, the sphere of consensus remains much wider among them. Therefore, the frontiers between these two communities are much more permeable than between them and Russian academic schools.

The results of this study confirm the widespread notion that preparation of publications for international publications is associated with greater complexity and time investment compared with the writing of articles for Russian journals<sup>18</sup>. In part, this difference is related simply to the size of academic papers. Foreign editors accept publications, which on average are up to two times longer than Russian journals. For some journals, *primarily*, for *International Security*, the difference may be even greater<sup>19</sup>.

Some scholars interviewed noted that all the relevant research results of the Russian Ph.D. thesis can be presented in one academic article for an international journal<sup>20</sup>. In this regard, the differences in the expected productivity of the authors are also revealing. While in the Western academic community the preparation of one or two articles a year or even less is quite sufficient<sup>21</sup>, in Russia researchers are expected to prepare a large number of publications while having a larger teaching load<sup>22</sup>.

The differences are not purely technical; they refute a substantive difference in the understanding of the genre of the research article as well as in expectations in terms of the level of scientific validation. For the Russian authors, the main task remains to explain politi-

<sup>18</sup>The interview with P.A. Kalinichenko (Professor of Moscow State Law Academy, editor of *Kutafin University Law Review*), Yu.A. Nikitina (Associate Professor of MGIMO)

<sup>19</sup>The publication edits articles of up to 20 thousand words, which roughly corresponds to 4 author's sheets

<sup>20</sup>The interview of Yu.A. Nikitina (Associate Professor of MGIMO)

<sup>21</sup>The interview with A. Fedyašin (assistant professor at American University, USA)

<sup>22</sup>In research universities in the US, which account for the above-the line scientific work, the research positions shape a significant proportion of faculty. More than half of such specialists have 4 and fewer hours of teaching per week [Dillow, Snyder 2015: 503]

cal significance of the problem and present a logically consistent argument, supported by empirical evidence, or analysis of discourse. It rarely presumes an attempt of theoretical generalization<sup>23</sup>. The Russian international Area studies, which are characterized by suspicion to generalizations.

This approach leads to the predominance of the narrative and inductive structure of research; which is built on an aspiration to identify a case-specific trend or pattern from a study of individual data. In these circumstances, the introductory part of the publication is often poorly structured and designed primarily for the presentation of the issues of concern to scholars<sup>24</sup>. The academic article reproduces the structure of detectives in which the identity of the offender is revealed only at the end.

This structure contributes to the multifaceted representation of the phenomenon under study, and to a detailed description of the facts. Within the narrative-inductive approach, it is relatively simple to incorporate a wide range of explanations for a studied phenomenon.

Meanwhile, such structuring of works is less adapted to verifying causal relations, which is essential to theory development. It does not assess the degree of influence of certain variables on subsequent developments, since induction is not to determine whether all the necessary and sufficient conditions that predetermined the result are identified. This problem was addressed by Karl Popper in his deliberation on the problem of "black swan" – the accumulation of any number of evidence confirming a consistent pattern, does not give any

reason to expect that it will remain accurate in the future [Taleb 2009].

In the United States IR's aspiration for a "scientific" status, significantly increased the requirements for the methodological soundness of articles. From the outset, the researcher is required to present the intellectual context and identify gaps or inconsistencies in the existing literature, which she seeks to fill [Jesson 2011: 1-10]<sup>25</sup>. In many cases, a literature review occupies a significant part of the introductory sections of the article. The Western academic tradition largely internalized the revolution in the bibliometric, sociology of science and cognitive psychology, which occurred in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In this regard, it is characterized by a more critical attitude of researchers, their ability to absorb information and to obtain valid conclusions based on it. The modern research practices are significantly affected by the legacy of K. Popper and I. Lakatos<sup>26</sup> [Popper 1983; Lakatos 2008].

Unlike the Russian academic community, international discourse is dominated by the hypothetical-deductive logic of research [Clarke, Primo 2012]. It presumes the presentation from the outset of the expected results based on theoretical models. The articles also pay greater attention not only to proving the main hypothesis, but also to discrediting the alternative ones. This logic is applied to different types of academic production, including not only articles, but books as well.

The hypothetical-deductive logic is primarily associated with theoretical works, pursuing the task of identifying and interpreting sustainable patterns of social development. Consistent

<sup>23</sup>The non-theoretic character of the domestic researches was noted by I.G. Tyulin at the end of the 1990s [Tyulin 2002 401–403], since then the amount of theoretical work has increased, but they still occupy a small niche. Editors of domestic journals note a very small proportion of the actual theoretical work (the interview with M.V. Kharkevich (MGIMO Associate Professor, editor of *Vestnik MGIMO University*), S.V. Chugrov (MGIMO professor, editor in chief of the journal *Polis. Politicheskie Issledovaniya (Political Studies)*)

<sup>24</sup>Inversion of this approach is to recognize the popular among the domestic publications, an essay or feature article format, which is a free discourse on the chosen topic, followed by unstructured references to some specific factual confirmation.

<sup>25</sup>The interview with V. Feklyunina (Associate Professor of the University of Newcastle, the editor of the magazine *Politics*), A.P. Tsygankov (Professor of San Francisco State University), G. Schneider

<sup>26</sup>An explicit example of the latter provides a collection designed to assess the state of the main theoretical approaches of discipline assuming the criteria laid by I. Lakatos, its preparation was attended by the leading US international relations experts [Elman, Elman 2003]

with the logic of K. Popper, potential theoretical reasoning should be formulated in such a way as to yield to empirical testing. This structure, however, is also applied to studies of particular phenomena or specific events. In the beginning of the paper, one should formulate an explanation and alternative interpretations of the studied object, and then find confirmation of the assumptions and rebuttals of the alternative ones<sup>27</sup>. In this case, the more appropriate analogy becomes not a detective investigation as in the case of the Russian publications, but a court hearing in which the defendants are known in advance, but their guilt shall be proven.

If within the scope of the behavioral revolution originally, the tendency to increase requirements for the methodological soundness of the results was expressed in the development of techniques of quantitative analysis, in the last two decades standards of works carried out in the methodology of qualitative research also have significantly increased [King, Keohane, Verba 1994; George, Bennett 2005]. Given that in such publications the generalizations are made based on material related to a limited number of empirical examples, particular attention is paid to the scientific significance and representativeness of the selected cases. The paper published in the international edition, as usual, should include substantiation of methods and sampling of cases for analysis.

Moreover, today, in qualitative research (similar to quantitative) a number of experts are demanding to increase transparency of information substantiating the author's claims [Moravcsik 2014a; Moravcsik 2014b]. In quantitative research publishing raw data became an established practice, so that colleagues could rerun the models and check the results [Altman, King 2007]<sup>28</sup>. The transfer of this practice within the sphere of qualitative analy-

sis does not necessarily bring the same results as in this case, while there is more room for different interpretations of the information obtained from sources<sup>29</sup>.

The described structural disparities are caused by the difference in functional understanding of research contribution: the Russian academic community puts a greater emphasis on describing the actual events of the international environment in all their complexity, which in international journals occupies a marginal position. In the West, by contrast, the emphasis is on identifying variables and assessing their effect. Although, some writings on IR history are still adherent to the narrative approach, even in this field authors attempt to define ever more rigorously an analytical prism, through which the patterns are estimated<sup>30</sup>.

For all the merits of the hypothetical-deductive approach in recent years, in the Western research community itself there is increasing criticism from different methodological positions. In particular, John Mearsheimer and Steven Walt pointed that the excessive focus of scholars on the verification of individual hypotheses obscures the need for incorporation of their results into a broader explanatory scheme to which the studied phenomenon pertains [Mearsheimer, Walt 2013]. Meanwhile, this out of context research becomes less relevant in explaining the real-world effects. The consistent application of a hypothetical-deductive approach leads to the impoverishment of descriptions of phenomena, that may result in emasculation of understanding of their essence<sup>31</sup>. Moreover, Richard Clarke and David Primo formulated an even harsher criticism of the hypothetical-deductive approach, noting that the emphasis on verification of theories impoverishes academic activities, as other significant research problems are misplaced at the periphery [Clarke, Primo 2012].

<sup>27</sup>It is worth noting that despite the warnings of K. Popper in relation to "the logic of confirmation," it continues to play a significant role in the research practices of foreign scientific communities.

<sup>28</sup>The interview with H. Urdal (editor of *Journal of Peace Research*)

<sup>29</sup>The interview with A.P. Tsygankov

<sup>30</sup>The sensational work of Christopher Clark, dedicated to the origins and causes of World War I, is a good example of it [Clark 2012]

<sup>31</sup>The interview with A. Vasilieva (professor at the Monterey Institute of International Studies)

In a highly competitive environment, the trend towards fragmentation of the subject field is evident: for researchers, especially young ones, it is easier to study issues, regardless of their practical or theoretical significance, if they are convenient from a methodological point of view, and allow to prepare an article quickly<sup>32</sup>. A couple of decades ago, international studies in the West have been criticized for unproductive paradigmatic dispute – "great debates" without effect. Today, they are faced with the opposite problem – too much enthusiasm in particular matters, which contribute little to the overall understanding of international politics.

The unfolding discussion about the relevance of academic publications on international relations to the practice of foreign policy is indicative. Although in the United States, there is a constant flow of ideas between the political and the academic community, it consists of a limited group of experts [Istomin 2012]. A significant part of publications is a "pure study," devoid of prospects for practical application, and not conducive to the development of theory.

A number of interviewed experts attributed the greatest barriers to the integration of Russian representatives in the global academic discourse primarily to the structural and functional differences<sup>33</sup>. At the same time, it seems to be wrong to absolutize their depth. At the level of MA and Ph.D. theses hypothetical-deductive logic of the study is very much present. Currently, the requirement on justification of the study in terms of its contribution to the existing literature, the theoretical and methodological foundations of the research, as well as the substantiation of the theoretical significance of the work, is not only part of the academic tradition, but is incorporated in the formal requirements<sup>34</sup>.

Thus, Russian experts, for the most part, are not only familiar with this form of structuring the papers, but also have the experience of their implementation.

At the same time, attempts made today to involve Russian researchers in the international academic environment do not always properly reflect the nature of existing differences. Moreover, in some cases, they may contribute to further conservation of barriers.

In particular, the current prescriptions of the Ministry of Education and Science of Russia to increase expectations regarding publication activity by authors and adherence to bibliometric databases has led to an actual further reduction of the length of articles. Thus, the growing requirements for postgraduates and postdoctoral students to reflect the results of their thesis research in a large number of publications have stimulated a pressure on academic journals, forced to include more works in limited available space. The need for detailed abstracts and bibliographies (for the people aspiring to get to the International Review databases in two versions – in accordance with the Russian State Standard and for an international audience) takes a substantial part in journals. Under these circumstances, it is ever more difficult to expect productive discussions with the existing literature, the intensive use of a references, a detailed justification of the methodology used in a shortening format of scholarly papers.

#### 4

While there is a significant gap in preparation of articles between Russia and the West, there is some convergence in practices of academic editing in recent years. The leading role in this process belongs to top Russian magazines such as "Problems of Economics," "Sotsis", "Polis", "International Processes". Meanwhile, the competition between editions

<sup>32</sup>The interview with R. Connolly (Professor, University of Birmingham, the editor of *Eurasian Geography and Economics*)

<sup>33</sup>The interview with A. Vasilyeva, R. Legvold (professor at Columbia University), M.V. Kharkevich, A.P. Tsygankov

<sup>34</sup>GOST R 7.0.11–2011 Dissertation and Extended Abstract of Dissertation. The structure and rules of execution. URL: <http://protect.gost.ru/v.aspx?control=8&baseC=-1&page=O&month=-1&year=-1&search=&RegNum=1&DocOnPageCount=15&id=171831&pageK=180F672A-F6A9-4CA1-BAD8-C3BB4D691DB7>

promotes the transfer of the advanced standards to some other journals.

Currently, a new type of editions has started to emerge – published by Russian editorial teams, but from the very beginning oriented towards dialogue with foreign audiences. This phenomenon is typical for the international legal disciplines (the appearance of new journals, such as "Russian Law Journal," "Kutafin University Law Review"), which for a long time remained among the least internationalized.

Emerging trends in adaptation of the best international practices of publication are stimulated by the government policies for integration of Russian academic publications in the international database (*Web of Science and Scopus*). Given the active position of the national government bodies, the interest and attention to bibliometric tools of research productivity significantly increased in Russia in recent years [Arefiev 2014: 93].

The survey conducted for the current article demonstrated that scholars from the U.S. universities showed little interest in the quantitative evaluation of academic productivity by their employees. When searching for literature and choosing books for the publication, they are primarily looking on the quality performance and knowledge of the own discipline. In this context, a meaningful evaluation system, based on the practice of "double-blind peer review" plays an important role. Only in assessment of the activities of scholars for tenure the issue of bibliometric indicators becomes relevant<sup>35</sup>.

A similar focus on quality assessment instruments is typical for European researchers. At the same time, they pay more attention to bibliometrics compared with overseas counterparts. In the case of the UK, this attention is linked to the procedure of regular government monitoring of Universities and to the role of

the state grant funding. Similarly as in Russia, in Britain the supervisory government agencies use bibliometric indicators to measure productivity of researchers<sup>36</sup>. While European universities lack the institution of tenure, scholars face reassessment every several years through their career<sup>37</sup>.

Therefore, the recent years witnessed a growing importance of the *Google Scholar* search engine which is used as a tool to monitor publication activity both by governments and scholars themselves. Although, bibliometric mechanisms are more susceptible to manipulation compared to Scopus and Web of Science, it has an undoubted advantage as it automatically integrates links to the articles in full-text databases. For example, in the UK it is *Google Scholar*, which has been selected by the government departments and the university community as a key mechanism for tracking the publication activity of scholars<sup>38</sup>.

The Russian editions in their requirements for submitted manuscripts, largely repeat the standards of the leading international journals, including the demand of a significant contribution to the academic debate, reliance on theoretical knowledge, provision of methodological support, involvement in the discussion with the literature. However, these points remain rather wishes related to the ideal model. In published articles several components from the list may be well absent. The process of internalization of the adopted standards is far from complete. Despite the growing recognition of the proclaimed standards as justified, they are still often perceived as imposed from above. Observance of the best practices is dependent on maintaining external pressure, as well it is embodied in a concentration on following formal criteria often without mastering the academic culture that lies at the core.

Meanwhile, Western research communities also face transformation of publication prac-

<sup>35</sup>The interview with J. Knopf (professor at the Monterey Institute of International Studies), R. Legvold, A. Fedyashin

<sup>36</sup>In the US today, the attempts to build more sophisticated evaluation of scientific productivity are assumed [Lane, Owen-Smith, Rosen, Weinberg 2014]

<sup>37</sup>The interview with B. Heuser, V. Feklyunina

<sup>38</sup>The interview with E. Karagiannis (Associate Professor at King's College, University of London), V. Feklyunina

tices. The growing competition between journals and authors deforms the established rules, and the introduction of new information systems leads to the emergence of new formats of the dissemination of research results.

## 5

In both Russian and international journals in most cases, editorial teams and editors-in-chief in particular play the central role in publication process<sup>39</sup>. Editorial boards, reviewers and publishers play only a supporting role, although important, in the publication process. Definition of strategic directions of editorial policy and decision on publication of individual articles remains the prerogative of the editors-in-chief.

Such centralization in international journals even increased recently due to the growth in the number of submissions. Although, many editorial teams are formed at Universities, they provide a free opportunity to submitting articles for publication, and institutional affiliation does not create significant benefits for the local researchers. Moreover, the founders of the most authoritative foreign publishers are often professional associations, interested in the broadest possible representation of different authors.

As a result of the increase in the flow of manuscripts, the refusal rate by the editorial teams without review (the so-called "*desk reject*") is on the increase as well. The demarcation of journal profile and priorities, as well as its methodological and thematic expectations has an enhanced significance<sup>40</sup>. This trend contradicts the desire of the leading journals to act as integrators of the discipline and even platforms of interdisciplinary dialogue on urgent problems of social development. This

contradiction pushes them to the methodological and theoretical cohesiveness. Meanwhile, consolidation of hierarchies of academic publications forces most editions, apart from a few leading journals to search for their own niche to win a stable, albeit a limited audience<sup>41</sup>.

The structure of the Russian editorial community is significantly different. Except for a small range of the volumes ("Polis", "International Processes") most journals belong to individual universities or institutes of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Universities "Bulletins" serve primarily the interests of their faculties and graduates. Therefore, the journal tends to publish mostly the authors a specific institution to which it is related. Along with the scientific function, they work for something which could be called a social cause, helping young researchers publish their first works, as well as enabling professionals working on the basis of grants, to fulfill their conditions. The publications of the Academy of Sciences, tend, as a rule, to show greater openness than University publications. Still, only a small circle of leading journals act as nationwide platforms.

The Russian scientific community does not incur a deficit of papers, although sometimes a considerable part of the manuscripts coming to the editions is characterized by low quality<sup>42</sup>. At the same time, the level of competition between authors, even in the top Russian journals is lower than in the international ones. As a result, in Russia there is no significant thematic and methodological differentiation of journals, as it is in the global academic discourse.

This situation has a negative impact, particularly on the competitiveness of the national

<sup>39</sup>The interview with B. Jan (Professor at the University of Sussex, the chief editor of *European Journal of International Relations*), K. Inglis (Professor, University of Sydney, the chief editor of *International Sociology*), S. Lynn-Jones (editor of *International Security*), J. Urdall, P. Hut (professor at the University of Maryland, the editor of the journal *Journal of Conflict Resolution*), as well as D.A. Maleshin (Professor of Moscow State University by M.V. Lomonosov, editor of *Russian Law Journal*), M.V. Kharkevich, A.L. Chechevishnikov (Deputy Director of the Institute of International Studies, MGIMO, the chief editor of the almanac *Notebooks for conservatism*), S.V. Chugrov, Some exceptions from the total number. Publications *Cold War History* (interview with B. Heuser)

<sup>40</sup>The interview with P. Hut, G. Schneider

<sup>41</sup>The interview with R. Connolly

<sup>42</sup>The interview with P.A. Kalinichenko, M.V. Kharkevich, S.V. Chugrov

research community in the global academic debate where one of the most important keys to a successful publication – is the selection process which is performed by a suitable journal<sup>43</sup>. Russian scholars often do not have these skills and recognize the specifics of editorial policy of different journals poorly. This has negative impact on the prospects of their articles being selected for publication.

Another important institute in the international scholarly practice is the "double-blind peer review." It involves an assessment of the manuscripts by external and independent experts who receive them without the author's name. Similarly, the personality of the reviewer is not revealed to the author. In recent years, top Russian journals have become much more responsible in peer reviewing their submissions. They are pushed to perfect it, in particular, linked to the requirements of international databases.

Russian and international journals face similar challenges in searching for qualified specialists capable of providing a deep and fair evaluation of the submissions<sup>44</sup>. Given that this activity in most cases does not imply a financial reward, and is not taken into account in the academic assessment in Universities, the consent to review manuscripts of high-quality professionals becomes highly valuable. Apparently, the prestige of being a reviewer is no longer a sufficient incentive for scholars dealing with other priorities. In this respect, the journals have to rely more on the members of editorial boards to participate in the examination of the materials obtained, who are not always available or knowledgeable on the particular issues.

Despite the strengthening of peer review procedures in the Russian research community, there are still many differences with international academic practices. Russian journals perceive it primarily as a tool to make informed decisions on acceptance or rejection. They can also use them to justify rejection by transferring responsibility from the editors to anonymous reviewers.

Similar motifs are present in the international editorial teams. However, peer review is also seen as a tool to improve the quality of the papers<sup>45</sup>. It is extremely rare that the manuscript is published in its original form. As a rule, reviews provide substantial recommendations, which help to develop the argument. Therefore, external expertise is considered not only in terms of its value to the editors, but also of its usefulness for the authors.

This application of reviews requires the culture of constructive perception of criticism, which is largely present in the Western community. Despite some cases of harsh reviews, international journals expect authors to take into account comments or express a justified rebuttal. However, some Russian authors are more sensitive regarding such form of critical evaluation. It is not uncommon when they refuse to take into account recommendations of anonymous experts.

Establishing a culture of the peer review seems to be the most important task for academic journals in Russia. The elaboration of structured peer-review tools is becoming an important step in this direction. In some cases, questionnaires developed by Russian journals (such as "Polis" and "International Processes"), are even more sophisticated than similar instruments used by their foreign colleagues.

However, the introduction of the practice of peer review as a basic tool of the quality control of academic production means prolongation of the editorial cycle. Currently, the leading international journals struggle with a lag between the submission and publication of articles, which becomes a painful issue for the authors. The practice of electronic publishing has developed as a response. A number of traditional publishers posts on their website the final version of the article before the release of the printed issue. The distribution of articles through "open access," which are published in the Internet exclusively and ensure dissemination without any charge for readers, becomes another alternative. In this case, all the publi-

<sup>43</sup>The interview with K. Inglis, J. Urdal

<sup>44</sup>The interview with K. Inglis, S. Lynn-Jones, S. Chugrov

<sup>45</sup>The interview with S. Lynn-Jones, H. Urdal

cation and editorial costs are borne by the authors in the form of a manuscript processing fee, which in the leading British and American journals can range from several hundreds to several thousands of dollars.

The desire to expand free access to research publications is very much present in the Russian research community as well. A significant part of the Russian editions post some or all of their materials in the public domain. Meanwhile, for them even more than for their Western colleagues, the search for a sustainable financial model remains urgent.

\* \* \*

The current Russian policies to strengthen research activities placed the journals in the center of the debate on the quality control of scholarly publications. Incorporation of international academic and editorial practices accelerated significantly in the last several years. This process, which gained so intense and rapid momentum, itself requires scholarly assessment, as well as adequate theoretical and methodological support.

This study represents one of the first systematic attempts in this regard. It shows a significant asymmetry in the adaptation of research and editorial standards and behaviors based on international experience. It also confirms that the current introduction of foreign norms often is not conducive to the practical integration of the national research community in the global academic discourse.

The Russian and foreign communities of IR scholars still continue to exist in a fundamentally different frame of references, which is reflected in the main product of their work – academic publications. At the heart of the problem is diverging principles of evaluation of articles in Russia and abroad, where manuscripts are "rejected" by the double-blind peer review. Reviewers often put an emphasis not on a depth of findings and observations, but on the quality of methodological tools, adequacy of the empirical data, and compliance with the established "normative" structure of an academic article.

Many authors, especially European ones, preferring a discursive style of presentation of scholarly research, acknowledge that there is a

virtual monopoly of Anglo-Saxon journals in the methodology of publications. For international relations experts not only from Russia but also from France, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Germany, it is difficult to structure an article as it is expected in the Anglo-American journals: as they have not been taught to write this way neither in school, nor at University.

The globalization of the scientific space, however, has increased the competition for ideas, researchers, students. Therefore, the need to adapt to long-established international best practices is beyond doubt. It is important that this process be not spontaneous, but conscious and manageable. So a model of academic catching-up development should be avoided. This model is very much present in a number of research communities, who were naturally drawn into the orbit of the Anglo-Saxon academic discourse.

However, changing the attitudes on several levels would contribute to a greater representation of Russian scholarly community in a global discourse. In order to achieve this, more attention should be paid to methodological aspects of postgraduate training. In particular, it would make sense to introduce specialized courses on preparation of academic publications, inviting foreign specialists. The recent reforms included attempts to introduce the practice of structured educational post-graduate programs in Russia. However, except for a small number of the leading Universities, the majority of schools do not give priority to the methodological aspects of training young professionals in the field of Political Science.

The expectations regarding the productivity of academic production should be changed on national and University levels. It should seek to reduce the number of published materials while increasing their quality. It is important to ensure the possibility of placing major research articles, 10 to 15 thousand words long, which could incorporate a detailed analysis of the available literature, the justification for methodological tools, and would contain a detailed analysis of the empirical material. This would be the best training for the preparation of manuscripts for international publications, and at the same time; it would enhance the



Annex 1. Thematic monitoring preferences of the leading international publications								
No	Journal Title	Founder of the Journal	Publisher of the Journal	Editorial Team	Description of the objectives of the Journal	Slant of the published materials	Preferred Methodology	Page Count (maximum number of words)
1	European Journal of International Relations	European Consortium for Political Research	Sage	University of Sussex (UK)	independent voice in international scientific discussions on the research of international relations	development of the theory; empirical research; improving the methodology	nil	12,000
2	International Organization	International Organization Foundation	Cambridge University	University of Wisconsin-Madison (USA)	the publication of the best works on the international political and economic relations	development of the theory; empirical research; improving the methodology	nil	14,000
3	International Security	Harvard University	MIT Press	Harvard University (USA)	the publication of works that reflect different approaches to issues of international security, including both professional materials, and those which may have political significance	development of the theory; empirical research;	qualitative	20,000
4	International Studies Quarterly	The Association of International Studies	Wiley-Blackwell	Georgetown University (USA)	analysis of theoretical, empirical and normative issues of the international interactions	development of the theory; empirical research; improving the methodology	nil	11,000
5	Journal of Conflict Resolution	—	Sage	University of Maryland (USA)	interdisciplinary journal of the social sciences research and theories of conflict, focusing primarily on inter-state conflicts	empirical research	quantitative	11,000
6	Journal of Peace Research	Institute of Peace Research, Oslo	Sage	Institute of Peace Research (Norway)	studies of the peace in a broad sense, with priority to the causes of violence and conflict resolution	empirical research	quantitative	10,000
7	World Politics	Princeton University	Cambridge University Press	Princeton University (USA)	the publication of articles on theoretical and empirical issues of international relations, comparative politics, national development and political economy	development of the theory	Nil	12,500

value of Russian journals as sources of original academic research.

A significant resource to improve the quality of Russian publications can be found in revision of peer review standards and its transformation from a restrictive mechanism to the component of academic debate that allows to correct the committed errors in methodology and to fill the gaps left in the arguments. Such transformation would require nurturing a culture of tolerance to external criticism.

Adaptation to advanced international standards by the Russian research community

should not undermine its traditional strengths, such as commitment to a broad and nuanced understanding of reality, epistemological openness and lack of "paradigmatic fundamentalism", orientation of academic production towards significant applied issues. The integration of the best forms the international practices requires understanding their inherent limitations. A formalistic approach built on the assimilation of foreign experience can lead to excessive bureaucratization of research with a substantial depletion of its actual value.

## References

- Arifiev P. (2014). Mekhanizmy rosta publikatsionnoj aktivnosti universitetov [Mechanisms of growth of publication activity of the University]. In *Materialy seminarov-konferentsii po vypolneniyu planov meropriyatiy po realizatsii vuzami-pobeditelyami programm povysheniya konkurentosposobnosti ("dorozhnykh kart")*. Vypusk 2. Pp. 95–103.
- Acharya A., Buzan B. (eds.) (2010). *Non-Western international relations theory: perspectives on and beyond Asia*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Altman M., King G. (2007). A Proposed Standard for the Scholarly Citation of Quantitative Data. *D-Lib Magazine*, 13 (3–4).
- Jentleson B. (2002). The Need for Praxis: Bringing Policy Relevance Back In. *International Security* (4).
- Batalov E.Ya. (2014). *Amerikanskaya politicheskaya mysl' XX veka* [American political thought of the 20<sup>th</sup> century]. Moscow: Progress Traditsiya. 616 p.
- Bennett A., Checkel J.T. (eds.) (2015). *Process tracing: from metaphor to analytic tool*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bogaturov A.D. (2004). Ponyatie mirovoj politiki v teoreticheskom diskurse [The notion of World Politics in the theoretical discourse]. *Mezhdunarodnye protsessy*. No. 1.
- Bogaturov A.D. (2006). Liderstvo i detsentralizatsiya v mezhdunarodnoj sisteme [Leadership and decentralization in the international system]. *Mezhdunarodnye protsessy*. No. 3. Pp. 5–15.
- Bogaturov A.D. (2008). Kontrevolyutsiya tsennostej i mezhdunarodnaya bezopasnost' [Counterrevolution of values and international security]. *Mezhdunarodnye protsessy*. No. 2. Pp. 4–15.
- Bourdieu P. (1994). *Nachala. Choses dites* [Choses dites]. Moscow: Socio-Logos.
- Brady H.E., Collier D. (eds.) (2010). *Rethinking social inquiry: diverse tools, shared standards*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publisher.
- Clark C. (2012). *The Sleepwalkers: How Europe Went to War in 1914*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Clarke R., Primo D. (2012). *A model discipline: political science and the logic of representations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Snyder T.D., Dillow S.A. (2015). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2013*. Washington D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Elman C., Elman M. F. (2003). *Progress in international relations theory: Appraising the field*. MIT Press.
- Finnemore, M. S. (1998). International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization*, 52(4), 887–917. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/002081898550789>
- George A. B. (2005). *Case Study and Theory Development in the Social Science*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Giddens A. (2008). Ustroenie obschestva: Ocherki teorii strukturalizatsii [The constitution of society: An outline of the theory of structuration]. Moscow: Akademicheskij proekt.
- Gratchikov E. (2014). Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya v sovremennom Kitye [International relations in the modern China]. *Mezhdunarodnye protsessy*. No. 4.
- Grigorieva E.I. (2014). Kakim dolzhen byt' sayt nauchnogo zhurnala [How the web-site of the scientific journal should look like]. *Polis*. No. 5. Pp. 177–187.
- Ish-Shalom, P. (2006). Theory as a Hermeneutical Mechanism: The Democratic–Peace Thesis and the Politics of Democratization. *European Journal of International Relations*(4).
- Istomin I.A. (2012). *Nauchnoye obespecheniye vneshnej politiki SSHA. Dissertatsiya na soiskanie stepeni kandidata politicheskikh nauk* [Analytical support in the U.S. foreign policy. PhD Dissertation]. Moscow: MGIMO University.

- Ivanova N.A. (2012). Nauka v zerkale sotsial'nykh issledovanij Bruno Latoura i Stevena Woolgara [Science in the mirror of the social studies of Bruno Latour and Steven Woolgar]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filosofiya. Sotsiologiya. Politologiya*. No. 2.
- Jesson, J. (2011). *Doing Your Literature Review: Traditional and Systematic Techniques*. London: Sage.
- Khrustalev M.A. (2006). Dve vetvi teorii mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenij v Rossii [Two branches of international relations theory in Russia]. *Mezhdunarodnye Protsessy*. No. 2.
- King, G. K. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kirsanov A. (2014). Kak sdelat' sait zhurnala bystro i nedorogo [How to make a web-site of the academic journal quickly and cheap]. *Vlast'*. No. 7. Pp. 220–224.
- Kosolapov N.A. (2002). Ideologiya i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya na rubezhe tysyacheletij [Ideology and international relations in the beginning of the millenium]. Bogaturov A.D., Kosolapov N.A., Khrustalev M.A. *Ocherki teorii i metodologii politicheskogo analiza mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenij*. Moscow: NOFMO.
- Kosolapov N.A. (2008). Porogovyy uroven' i veroyatnost' konflikta SSHA s Rossiej [Threshold and the probability of conflict of the U.S. with Russia]. *Mezhdunarodnye protsessy*. No. 3.
- Lakatos I. (2008). *Izbranniye proizvedeniya po filosofii i metodologii nauki* [Selected works on philosophy and methodology of science]. Moscow: Akademicheskij proekt.
- Lane J., Owen-Smith J., Rosen R., Weinberg B. (2014). *New Linked Data on Research Investments: Scientific Workforce, Productivity, and Public Value*. IZA DP No. 8556. URL: <http://ftp.iza.org/dp8556.pdf>
- Latour B., Woolgar St. (1986). *Laboratory Life. The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton, New Jersey.
- Latour B. (2013). *Nauka v dejstvii: sleduya za uchenymi i inzhenerami vnutri soobschestva* [Science in action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society]. St. Petersburg: European University in St. Petersburg.
- Lebedeva M.M. (2003). *Mirovaya politika* [World Politics]. Moscow: Aspekt Press. 352 p.
- Lepgold, J. (1998). Is Anyone Listening? International Relations Theory and the Problem of Policy Relevance. *Political Science Quarterly*(1).
- Lepgold, J. N. (2001). *Beyond the Ivory Tower: International Relations Theory and the Issue of Policy Relevance*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Levine, D. B. (2014). The closing of the American mind: 'American School' International Relations and the state of grand theory. *European Journal of International Relations*, 20(4).
- Lupia, A. E. (2014). Openness in Political Science: Data Access and Research Transparency. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47(1).
- Maliniak, D. P. (2012). *TRIP Around the World: Teaching, Research, and Policy Views of International Relations Faculty in 20 Countries*. Williamsburg: The College of William and Mary.
- Marshakova-Shaikovitch I.V. (2008). *Rossiya v mirovoj nauke* [Russia in the global science]. Moscow: IFRAN.
- Mearsheimer, J. W. (2013). Leaving theory behind: Why simplistic hypothesis testing is bad for International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(3).
- Moravcsik, A. (2014a). Transparency: The Revolution in Qualitative Political Science. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47(1).
- Moravcsik, A. (2014b). Trust, but Verify: The Transparency Revolution and Qualitative International Relations. *Security Studies*, 23(4).
- Nair, P. N. (2014). *Scientific Writing and Communication in Agriculture and Natural Resources*. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-03101-9\_2
- Popper K. (1983). Logika nauchnogo issledovaniya [Logic of scientific inquiry]. In *Logika i rost nauchnogo znaniya*. Moscow: Progress.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*(5).
- Schatzki, T. (1996). *Social Practices. A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and the Social*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Shakleina T.A. (2012). *Rossiya i SSHA v mirovoj politike* [Russian and the U.S. in world politics]. Moscow: Aspekt Press. 272 p.
- Shugal'skij S.S. (2012). Sotsial'nye praktiki: interpretatsiya ponyatiya [Social practices: interpretation of the notion]. *Znanie. Ponimanie. Umenie*. No. 2.
- Taleb N.N. (2009). *Chernyj lebed'*. Pod znakom nepreskazuemosti [Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable]. Moscow: Kolibri.
- Tickner, A. W. (2009). *International relations scholarship around the world*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Tickner, J. T. (2008). Risks and Opportunities of Crossing the Academy/Policy Divide. *International Studies Review*(1).
- Torkunov A.V. (2012). Sovremennaya istoriya Rossii v mezhdunarodnom kontekste [Modern Russian history in international context]. *Vestnik MGIMO University*. No. 5. P. 45–48.

- Tsygankov A.P., Tsygankov P.A. (2005a). Postsovetskie issledovaniya mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenij v Rossii: plyuralizatsiya, vesternizatsiya, izolyatsionizm [Post-Soviet studies of international relations in Russia: pluralization, westernization and isolationism]. In *Rossiyskaya nauka mezhdunardonykh otnoshenij: novie napravleniya*. Moscow: PER SE.
- Tsygankov A.P., Tsygankov P.A. (eds.) (2005b). *Rossiyskaya nauka mezhdunardonykh otnoshenij: novie napravleniya* [Russian studies in international relations: new directions]. Moscow: PER SE.
- Tsygankov A.P., Tsygankov P.A. (2006). *Sotsiologiya mezhdunardonykh otnoshenij: analiz rossijskikh i zapadnykh teorij*. Moscow: Aspekt Press. 238 p.
- Tsygankov A.P., Tsygankov P.A. (2014). Rossijskie mezhdunarodniki–teoretiki: opyt autoportreta [Russian international relations theorists: experience of self-assessment]. *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya*. No. 9. P. 92–102.
- Tsygankov P.A. (2013). "Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya i mirovaya politika". Konsolidatsiya uchebno-nauchnoj distsipliny. *Mezhdunarodnye Protsessy*. No. 3–4.
- Tyulin I.G. (2002). Issledovaniya mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenij v Rossii: vchera, segodnya, zavtra [Study of international relations in Russia: yesterday, today and tomorrow]. In *Vneshnyaya politika i bezopasnost' sovremennoj Rossii. 1991–2002. Khrestomatiya v chetyrekh tomakh. Tom III. Issledovaniya*. Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Voitolovskij F.G. (2006). "Proizvodstvo" intellektual'nogo prostranstva mirovoj politiki [Production of the intellectual landscape of global politics]. *Mezhdunarodnye protsessy*. No. 2.
- Voskresenskij A.D. (2006). "*Bol'shaya Vostochnaya Aziya*": mirovaya politika i energeticheskaya bezopasnost' [Greater East Asia: world politics and energy security]. Moscow: Leland. 124 p.
- Voskresenskij A.D. (2013). Sotsial'nie proyadki i prostranstvo mirovoj politiki [Social orders and the space of world politics]. *Polis*. No. 2. Pp. 6–23.
- Waever, O. (1998). The sociology of a not so international discipline: American and European developments in international relations. *International Organization*, 52(4), 687–727.
- Walt, S. (2005). The Relationship between Theory and Policy in International Relations. *Annual Review of Political Science*.
- Wittgenstein L. (1985). Filosofskie issledovaniya [Philosophic Studies]. *Novoye v zarubezhnoj lingvistike*. XVI. Pp. 79–128.
- Zhang Ruizhuang, Korolev A. (2010). Teoriya mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenij s kitajskoj spetsifikoj: sovremennoe sostoyanie i tendentsii razvitiya [International Relations Theory with Chinese Characteristics: State of the Art and Tendencies of Development]. *Problemy Dal'nego Vostoka*. No. 3. Pp. 96–110.