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Abstract: The transition to democracy in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) has affected the study of politics in these countries. In some cases, Political Science at large was established as a completely new discipline. In others, it was built on the legacy of a previous academic transition. Yet in others, continued a tradition of Political Sociology or Marxism-Leninism (Eisfeld & Pal, 2010a, 2010b). In almost all countries, Comparative Politics (CP) has been established as a new discipline within Political Science. This paper offers a new empirical assessment of the state of the art of CP in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) twenty years after its inception in the region. For this aim, we analyze a novel and original dataset that contains information on CP articles published in the most relevant national journals from eleven countries in the region. The paper analyses the authors, methods and epistemology of CP articles published in CEE. Several of the variables replicate those used in similar studies of CP the US (Munck & Snyder, 2007a, 2007b) and Germany (Dethloff, Erdmann, & Pickel, 2007), thus allowing for (future) comparison of the discipline across world regions. The major finding of our study is that CP is rather marginal in the CEE political science, both in terms of articles published and citation indices. Furthermore, CP articles tend to focus on the authors’ country of origin. Finally, most CP articles off-the-shelf data rather than generating novel data, and if any discernible data analysis technique is applied, it is mostly qualitative rather than quantitative.
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Introduction

In the early 1990s, the discipline of Political Science in CEE departs from rather different starting points. For instance, the general opening of the Hungarian social sciences to Western influence starting the late 1970s, early 1980s (Szabó 2002) fostered extensive data collection exercises¹, and thus created an opportunity for later broad comparisons. Similarly, Slovenian scholars benefited from the early establishment of Departments of Political Science (1960s) and a very low ideological control compared to other countries in the region (Klingemann 2002; Fink-Hafner 2002). In sharp contrast, Romanian political science never gained autonomy from the Communist Party’s official dogma, not even in the short liberalization period of the mid-sixties (Barbu 2002). With CP being at the core of Political Science at large and given these different starting points, it is reasonable to expect meaningful cross-country variation along various dimensions regarding the state of CP in the region.

We first introduce the data we have gathered for this purpose over the last years. Then we analyze various dimensions along which the state of CP in the region can be assessed. First, we analyze the quantitative dimension, i.e. we assess how many of the articles in major Political Science journals are CP and what the trend over time is. Second, we focus on the content of CP articles, analyzing the topics studied. Third, we differentiate CP articles in terms of their data and methods used. Fourth, and related, we investigate the temporal scope, wondering how much of history is taken into account by CP authors in CEE. Fifth, we analyze the geographical scope of CP articles. And, sixth, we aim at unraveling who the authors of CP articles are and what their publications strategies consist of.

We find, in the order of these topics, that only a small fraction of published Political Science articles in CEE can be classified as CP. Second, this scholarship is dominated by a neo-institutionalist perspective, the most studied topics being political parties, elections, voting and electoral rules, followed by citizens’ attitudes and political culture. Third, CP articles are predominantly performed on off-the-shelf data which tends to be analyzed in a

¹ One was the replication of the World Values Survey in 1982-1983 (Tóka 2000: 13).
methodologically loose manner. Fourth, CP articles rarely exhibit a historical dimension, most of them focusing on momentous events or short periods of time. Fifth, despite the fact that the majority of countries studied are small and arguably heavily interdependent the geographic scope of studies is rather narrow, with few regional comparative studies. Sixth, studies published in CP in the region are mainly dominated by nationals, with very little regional and international cooperation.

The Data Set on CP in CEE

The data set was compiled in two waves, between the end of June 2010 and mid January 2011 by eleven coders. All are native speakers studying political science (MA and PhD level at CEU) or teaching it. The study surveys the evolution of Comparative Politics in four Central European countries (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia), four states of the Former Yugoslavia (Croatia, Macedonia, Serbia and Slovenia), a Former Soviet Republic (Moldova) and in Bulgaria and Romania.

The coders were asked to list all relevant political science journals in their country and to rate their importance so as to identify the main journal, which should have published a minimum of 20 issues, preferably covering the entire 1990-2009 period. This selection was cross-checked in several countries by consulting further country experts. The journals selected were: ‘Sociologicheski Problemi’ (Bulgaria), ‘Politička Misao’ (Croatia), ‘Politologický časopis’ (Czech Republic), ‘Politikatudomanyi Szemle’ (Hungary), ‘Godishnik’ (Macedonia), ‘Moldoscopie’ (Moldova), ‘Studia Polityczne’ (Poland), ‘Romanian Journal of Political Science/ Revista Română de Știință Politică’ (Romania), ‘Politické vedy’ (Slovakia), and ‘Teorija in praksa’ (Slovenia). Because of an insufficient initial number of observations our Serbian coder analyzed articles from two journals: ‘Srpska Politička Misao’ and ‘Nova Srpska Politička Misao’.

Then coders were asked to identify all comparative politics articles in the respective journal, starting from 1990 until 2010 and to code each of them in every second year.

---

2 Those countries are Bulgaria, Moldova, Poland, Romania and Serbia.

3 The data will be soon made available on DISC's web site, disc.ceu.hu (access conditional upon registration).
The Marginality of CP in CEE

One of the most important findings of our study is that comparative politics only plays a marginal role in major political science journals in the region. In four of the countries analyzed (Bulgaria, Moldova, Slovakia and Slovenia) the percentage of comparative politics articles was smaller than 10%. The proportion was slightly higher in other five countries (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Serbia) where approximately one in five articles could be considered comparative. The exception to this rule is represented by the case of Macedonia. One tentative explanation could be the higher level of specialization of political science publications in this former Yugoslav Republic.

Table 1: Share of Comparative Politics articles in the major national journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BU</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>MK</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>SV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total nr. articles</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% comparative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rather dismal picture of CP in the region needs to be somewhat put in perspective. Some CP scholars from CEE might publish neither in their home country journals nor in that of neighboring CEE countries but rather prefer to aim at higher-ranked international outlets that are listed in the Social Science Citation Index, ISI Thompson. Only one of the journals in our sample - RJPS in Romania - has been recently indexed by the ISI.

In order to check for this problem, i.e., to control for the international involvement of political scientists we gathered information on the number of APSA members for each of the countries studied. Table 2 below presents not only the raw figures, but also the numbers standardized by thousand of inhabitants so as to avoid a large country bias.

Table 2: The international inclusion of Comparative Politics scholars, 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BU</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>MK</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>SV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APSA members as of 2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Our coder identified four other political science journals besides Godishnik.
The mere quantity of publications is one issue. Yet another is the impact of these publications. Arguably, a few publications with a high impact factor would provide a better picture of CP in CEE than many articles that are not read and referenced by others. One way of (imperfectly) assessing the impact of CP publications consists in looking at their citation indices.

Figure 1: How cited is CEE comparative politics scholarship?

Also this perspective does not improve the assessment of CP in CEE. More than three quarters (75.5%) of the articles in our sample are never cited. The overall mean of citations of all CP articles across all countries and time periods is 0.69. This number varies very little across time. The majority of the CP articles is written in local language, which, in turn, is often spoken only in the (small) country where the journal and the author are based. Hence, the low citation indices might due to simple language barriers. However, and somehow surprisingly, articles written in English do not receive more citations than those written in native language (R=.003, p=.94).

Journals from two countries stand out as being the most cited from the sample: the Czech Politologický časopis with a mean of 3.1 citations per article and the Serbian Srpska Politička Misao’ and Nova Srpska Politička Misao with an average of 2 citations per article.5

5 In both cases most of the references are self-citations.
The comparative articles published in the Romanian and Croatian journals enjoy also more citations than the regional average, which is slightly higher than the mean number of citations received by the Hungarian ‘Politikatudomanyi Szemle’ and the Slovenian ‘Teorija in praksa’. The hierarchy is similar with regard to the proportion of articles that are cited at least once. Thus, half or more than half of the Czech and Serbian articles belong to this category, this being true only for approximately 40% of the observations from Romania, Slovenia and Croatia.

In sum, both the number and citation of CP publications indicate that CP scholarship, which is published in domestic journals, is rather marginal in CEE. It should be mentioned, though, that these are only two (arguably crucial) measures of importance and relevance. Other indicators can be thought of, such as, for instance, the number of departments and faculty members within CP and the number of CP courses taught. And, indeed, here studies find that within Political Science departments,\(^6\) Comparative Politics was the single most taught ‘subject’ (Klingemann 2002).\(^7\)

**Topics of CP Publications**

What are the topics studied in CP publications? In order to address this question, we classify the topics applying the widely used scheme by David Easton (1965), who differentiates between topics addressing the input, the throughput (the form of political system), and the output of political systems.

*The rising interest in types of democracies*

Easton (1965) groups topics related to political science into three categories: input, political system, and output. Each of our 26 items can be attributed to one of these three categories (Table 3). In the following, we analyze the frequency of topics from these three categories over time.

---

\(^6\) The investigation covered 37 of the 41 departments in the region, granting Political Science diplomas.

\(^7\) For another study on the state of CP in CEE, see Eisfeld (2010b).
Table 3: A Classification of Topics Studied Comparatively in CEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Political System</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td>Varieties of political regimes</td>
<td>State formation and state collapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Elections, voting and electoral rules</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen attitudes and political culture</td>
<td>Political parties</td>
<td>Revolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social movements and civil society (includes social capital, strikes and protests)</td>
<td>Democratic institutions (executive and legislative branches of government)</td>
<td>Ethnicity and ethnic conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups (includes business and labor studies)</td>
<td>Federalism and decentralization</td>
<td>Democratization and democratic breakdowns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization (includes cross-national migration)</td>
<td>Judiciary</td>
<td>Clientelism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military and police, including secret services</td>
<td>Economic policy and reform (includes the welfare state, the developmental state, neoliberalism and varieties of capitalism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy making in general</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Communication</td>
<td>Supranational integration and processes (eg. EU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 displays the number of articles dealing with input, output, or political system topics respectively. It reveals that in the beginning of the 1990s, CPP in CEE focused in types of political regimes, thus taking a predominantly (neo-)institutionalist perspective. This is in line with findings from others who found that '[f]unctionalist, institutionalist and neo-institutionalist approaches predominate in Central-Eastern European political science’ (Eisfeld and Pal 2010a: 228; see also: Klingemann et al 2002).

This focus is in decline, though. Since the beginning of the new millennium, the interest in political regimes is being replaced by studying the consequences of political processes. A
disaggregated look at the output category reveals that this shift in focus is largely driven by an increased interest in policy making, economic development, and supranational integration. To us, this empirical pattern makes sense, as it coincides with a general increase in interest into whether or not democracies in the region are able to deliver what citizens (rightly or not) had expected from them in terms of economic and social progress.

Figure 3 explores the distribution of topics over time in each country. In several countries (Slovenia, Romania, Serbia, and to a lesser extent, Slovakia), there is a remarkable balance between the three grand categories.

**Figure 3: National Choices**

In other countries, however, one topic dominates – and it is always the focus on political systems. This is the case in Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. The gaps in the pace of democratic consolidation between the four countries (Croatia vs. the other three), but also within the whole sample, do not seem to be related to the cross-country differences in choice of the topics. Once again, our findings are in line with the existing literature on political science in the region (Eisfeld and Pal 2010a: 228).
Disaggregating the topics

The single most studied topics belonged to the ‘political system category’: political parties (11.5%) and elections, voting and electoral rules (11.3%). They were followed by citizens’ attitudes and political culture (9.6%), part of the ‘input’ grouping and by democratization and democratic breakdown (6.8%) from the ‘output category’. Especially the prominence in elections comes somewhat as a surprise. This field of political science is by now dominated by highly powered statistical analysis. As we show below, in CEE, the percentage of publications using more sophisticated quantitative methods is very low, though (see Figure 7). Nevertheless, roughly one third of all articles that used statistical techniques were electoral studies, while another third was represented by articles looking at citizens’ attitudes, yet another field that lends itself to large N studies and thus statistical analyses.

Figure 4 reveals several interesting, if not counterintuitive insights. First, in the early 1990s, that is, precisely when democratization and democratic breakdown were most relevant for citizens and elites in the East (and, incidentally, also academics in the West), the percentage of publications in CEE on these topics is strikingly low. Second, interest in the topics of political parties, on the one hand, and elections, voting behavior and electoral rules, on the other, both remain constant over time. Finally, there is a slight increase in publications on mass attitudes. Without over-interpreting these small numbers, this might be partially a result of a greater integration of scholars and institutions from CEE into those networks that produce mass survey data, such as the World Values Survey, the European Values Study or the Eurobarometer series (Tóka 2000; Mochmann et al 2010).
Data and Methodology of CP Publications

The Data used
Comparative Politics, perhaps more than any other sub-discipline, depends on the availability of good data, which, however, is usually hard to get by. Data gathering is time consuming, expensive, or both. The lack of good data seems to be exacerbated in CEE. Studies of political science in the region often report frustration of scholars with the difficulty to get access to comparative data (Klingemann et al 2002, Eisfeld and Pal 2010a). Either data on young democracies simply does not exist, is not reliable, or difficult to obtain, especially in the case of archives and governmental data for which sometimes Kafkaesque bureaucratic hurdles have to be overcome. In addition, intra-regional networks of cooperation have not (yet) developed sufficiently (for a partial exception - the collaboration within the Central European Political Science Association, CEPSA see Eisfeld and Pal 2010a: 239-240), depriving scholars from the help of colleagues in order to get access to data from countries other than their own.

Generally, only one in five CP articles uses data that was either new (17%) or came from updated datasets (4%). As Figure 5 reveals, the situation lightly improves starting from the early 2000s onwards but then stagnates again towards the end of the last decade. In
contrast, as it can be seen from Figure 5, the use of off-the-shelf data was constantly increasing, although not in a linear manner.\(^8\) For a stunning 22% of the articles, our coders were unable to discern which data was used at all. This is worrisome, as this bars readers from any possibility to cross-check, let alone reproduce the findings. It also bars such articles from being published in journals of international standing, which, by now, all require that supporting material, such as data, is made available to the public.

Figure 5: The Use of New or Updated Datasets

![Graph showing the use of new or updated datasets from 1990 to 2009.](image)

**The Research Designs employed in CP Publications**

Very few articles can be classified as large N studies\(^9\) (9.3%). Most of these few appear in the Croatian and the Polish journal, respectively. The journals in Moldova, Romania, Serbia, and Slovenia did not publish a single CP article using a large N approach, and the Romanian journal only one such article.

With large N studies being so rare, it comes as no surprise that qualitative research designs heavily dominate CP publications in CEE. From the early 1990s to the present, qualitative designs were virtually always in the majority, and for some periods even represent more than 75% of all CP publications in the region. The percentage of studies deploying

\(^8\) The use of empirical data in CP in CEE might also be scarce because of the strong tradition of critical theory-oriented scholarship, such as in the Ljubljana Institute for Social Sciences (Zajc 2010) and the Zagreb University’s Political Science Department (Kasapovic et al 2010).

\(^9\) Defined as analyses where N>35.
descriptive or multivariate inferential statistics has unevenly increased throughout the period.

Figure 6: The Evolution of Research Designs

Additionally there is a slight but noticeable increase in the percentage of studies adopting a mixed methods research design, which are becoming fashionable in political science, mainly in the US.

Figure 7 seems to indicate that the comparative politics scholars publishing in journals from the Visegrad countries and Croatia are the most trained in quantitative methods in the region. Nevertheless, even in these cases the percentage of articles deploying OLS or more sophisticated techniques is quite small as the highest values are 15.2 in Croatia and 10 in Poland.

Figure 7: National Methodological Differences in Comparative Scholarship
How Much History is Dealt with in CP Publications?

When it comes to the time periods analyzed, the most frequent category in all countries (except Croatia) is represented by articles that deal with a period ranging from 5 years to 2 decades. This predominance is in line with what one would expect, given the general agreement that the 1989 Revolutions opened a momentous epoch, with societies being challenged by triple transitions: to a new state, to democracy and market economy. However, the research taking a historical, *longue durée* approach is not completely missing from our sample, being more visible in the Czech, Slovak, Slovenian and Hungarian journals than in the others. We speculate that this is due to the fact that in these countries several political scientists were originally trained as historians who then switched to political science affiliations after the fall of the socialist regimes.
Is Comparative Politics in CEE a Self-obsessed Discipline?

The Geographic Scope of Topics Chosen

Regarding the geographical scope, the first relevant pattern is that the most studied region is the one to which the country where the journal is published belongs to. The Czech journal represents the sole exception, i.e. the states most present in the comparisons are from Western Europe (above 68%, compared to 41% that look at either the Czech Republic or Slovakia). However, for many journals including the ‘region of origin’ seems nearly mandatory in order to have a CP article published. This is true for 90% of the articles in the Polish sample, for 95% of the Moldovan sample and for 84% of the Slovenian articles. In Hungarian, Romanian, and Macedonian these numbers are also above 75%.
The second most studied countries are either the immediate neighbors (usually in the West or North) or Western democracies.

We find that the formerly united federal countries (Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Soviet Union) still constitute important units of analysis, especially in the successor states. Almost in every successor state (Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Serbia), the former confederates are the single most important category of countries used in comparative analysis. Often even more than half of the cases studied are the former confederates. One reason for this case selection strategy might be that for many CP analyses, formerly united countries can be used as very similar cases with common political legacies, thus "holding constant" for a range of potentially relevant country characteristics.

Depending on the specific country, specific cases are frequently used for comparison. In Croatia, for example, most articles take as reference points the Visegrad countries; many Polish articles include the Czech Republic and Slovakia; and the Romanian and Slovenian journals often include Hungary and Poland. The Czech, Hungarian, Slovenian\textsuperscript{10} Serbian,\textsuperscript{10} Equal proportions of the Slovenian sample include in their comparisons Western European states and Hungary or Poland.
Slovak, and to a lesser extent of the Macedonian and Moldovan journals are characterized by a higher number of comparisons involving Western democracies.

Outside Europe, the region most present in the analyses is North America. Comparisons with Latin American countries are mostly missing, with the notable exception of the Hungarian journal. This finding is somewhat surprising given the strong emphasis of the democratization literature in the 1990s (Karl and Schmitter 1991; Linz and Stepan 1996; Greskovits 1998) on the analytically fruitful similarities and differences between the two regions, which could have well created a propensity towards an inter-regional comparative scholarship.

Who are the Authors of CP in CEE?

So far, our analysis has focused on CP articles. Now, we shift perspective and investigate who the authors of these CP articles are. We do so by looking at various aspects, such as the practice of co-authorship, the choice of language for publication, and, in a special section, the strategies of international cooperation.

Strategies of Co-Authorship

There are big differences with regards to the practice of co-authorship in the region. While in some of the analyzed journals (Croatia, Slovakia, Serbia, Romania) mainly single-authored articles are published, the rate of co-authored articles is considerably larger in countries such as Moldova or Slovenia (see Figure 10). Overall, however, the rate of co-authored articles is not significantly lower than in journals published in other regions. The number of co-authored articles in top international CP journals, such as Comparative Politics, Comparative Political Studies, or World Politics (Munck and Snyder 2007a)(Munck and Snyder 2007b) is roughly the same as that in our sample.
Where do authors come from? Our data shows that national journals in CP remain a field of national dominance. Articles by foreign authors are rare. Out of 355 analysed articles, only 71 (20%) include at least a foreign co-author. The Romanian Journal of Political Science is an outlier, with 80% of the articles (co-)authored by foreign-based authors.

The low percentage of non-national authors is similar to those reported in the US, where about 22% foreign authors are reported to publish in leading journals (Munck and Snyder 2007b). However, we need to consider that the size of the CP community in CEE is negligible compared that in the US and that it is supposedly much more difficult to get published in leading US journals. Hence, the percentage of foreign based authors should be (much) higher in CEE.

This leads to a picture of academic isolation. This is little astonishing, however, considering that the overwhelming majority of the comparative politics articles in this journal, also the few by domestic scholars, are in English. In all other analysed journals, English-language articles are rather an exception. The elevated rates of foreign authors in the Polish "Studia Polityczne" (45%) and the Bulgarian 'Sociologicheski Problemi' (Социологически проблеми) (30%) are mainly due to articles being translated into Polish or Bulgarian.
Figure 11: Share of articles in comparative politics written by foreign authors.

Co-authorships between domestic and foreign authors are extremely rare. The 71 articles with foreign (co-)authors are mainly written exclusively by foreign-based authors. We find only 5 co-authorships between locals and foreign co-authors in Western Europe or in Northern America. Perhaps even more surprising is our finding that scholars from different countries in CEE do not tend to collaborate. We only detect a meagre two intra-regional co-authorships (a Polish-Bulgarian and a Slovenian-Czech team of authors).

With regards to the provenience of foreign-authored articles, we were particularly interested in geographical and regional patterns of academic exchange. We find that in the national journals of political science, a regional exchange of scholarship in comparative politics is almost absent. Noteworthy exceptions are the journals in Slovakia and in Moldova (see below). Two thirds (48 out of 71) of the foreign (co-)authored articles come from researchers affiliated with an institution beyond the regional borders – mainly Western Europe (31), North America (14), but also from East Asia, Oceania or the Caribbean countries (each 1 or 2).
Only some of the journals in CEE publish English-language CP articles. The language policy of the journals might also explain the low degree to which foreign authors publish in those journals. The Romanian journal, which is most open to authors from abroad, publishes mainly in English, whereas we could not detect any English-language article in the Czech, Macedonian, Slovenian, or Hungarian journal.

Despite the multi-linguistic character of quite a few countries of the region, apart from English-language publications, most journals only publish CP articles in one local language. The only exception is the Moldavian 'Moldoscopie', which publishes CP articles both in Romanian (or Moldavian, how the language is called in the Republic of Moldova) and in Russian, the second most frequent language in Moldova.

Consider, however, that in most multi-linguistic countries, either there are no Universities or at least no Political Science departments working in minority languages. Or, if they exist, they have their own journals, which were not subject to this analysis.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{11}For instance, there is a journal edited at an Albanian-speaking University in Macedonia (SEEU Review, which is published in English though), and a Hungarian-language journal in Romania, which publishes mainly articles in Political Science ('Magyar Kisebbseg').
Patterns of academic exchange between breakaway states

Not only within-CEE cooperation is rare. Also, and perhaps even more noteworthy is the isolation of the academic journals towards their new neighbours and former compatriots, in those countries which emerged from former federal Republics. One would expect that the shared political legacy, mix-marriages and internal migration, and in many of these countries also the same (or at least perfectly mutually intelligible) languages would create the opportunity for regional academic exchange across new borders. According to our data, it does not.

Little to no academic collaboration in terms of co-authorship or cross-country publication seems to be happening between scholars from countries of former Yugoslavia. The empirical picture that emerges can rather be described as academic isolation. In our sample, we did not find a single article from another former Yugoslav country, which was published in the Serbian or the Slovenian journals, and only one each in the Macedonian and the Croat journals. This lack of academic cooperation might be overcome in the near future, as several projects of cooperation, both in teaching and in research, have been launched in recent years, and a new, peer-reviewed journal of political science, Političke Perspektive, which is edited jointly by scholars from Croatia, Serbia, and should be extended to Bosnia, has just been launched in 2011, when this analysis was written.

To some degree, the common federal legacy creates a common academic area of the Czech and the Slovak Republic. In the Czech and Slovak case, the pattern of exchange is very asymmetric, though: almost all foreign-authored articles published in the Slovak 'Politické vedy' come from the Czech Republic, but not a single of the four foreign-authored articles that were published in the Czech 'Politologický časopis' was written by a Slovak-based author. Note, however, that this asymmetry corresponds to a more general pattern of the state of political science in former Czechoslovakia: The discipline is considered to be stronger and has more international reputation in Universities in the Czech Republic, and teaching is partly done by faculties from neighbouring countries (Rybář 2010, 274). The Political Science Department at the Masaryk University in Brno (Czech Republic), located a 90-minutes train ride from Bratislava, is known for numerous enrolments of students from Slovakia.
A joint past also had its impact in Moldova. The Moldova based journal 'Moldoscopie' published several articles from scholars from neighbouring Ukraine. (Moldova is the only post-Soviet country included in our analysis.) We could not find, however, any traces of academic exchange between Moldova and Romania, which many see as the new kin state for the Moldavian/Romanian-speaking majority of Moldova.

**The Rank of Authors**

What is the rank of authors who publish CP articles in CEE? Here we find interesting cross-country differences. CP articles published in the Slovenian journal 'Teorija in praksa', and to a lesser degree in the Croatian 'Politička Misao' and the Serbian 'Nova Srpska Politička Misao', are mainly written by full professors. In contrast, no full professor has published any CP article in the Slovak journal 'Politické vedy'. Eye-springing is further the very elevated rate of articles written by graduate students in the 'Romanian Journal of Political Science (RJPS)'. One reason for the latter finding might be that RJPS regularly publishes calls for papers in (international) academic forums, which, in turn, seem to be frequently followed by graduate students.
Figure 13: Academic rank of article authors (co-authored articles: first author considered).

There might be several plausible explanations for the cross-country variation in terms of the rank of authors. In some of the countries, the discipline 'Comparative Politics' is young, so that there might be only few full professors in this field. Also, if the national flagship journal of Political Science has an open procedure of paper submission, graduate students might be more likely to submit and publish their work there, than if papers are acquired based on personal networks and opaque acceptance procedures. To ascertain the reasons for the cross-country differences, an analysis of the structure of academic staff in comparative politics, and of the journal submission procedures might be useful.

Conclusions
The most important finding of our study is that CP is rather marginal in the CEE political science journals. This marginality of CP is reflected both internally, in its very low share of articles in the political science journals and externally, as articles published in domestic journals are rarely cited by other academic works. Based on our data, we cannot establish,
however, which sub-discipline is dominating Political Science in CEE. Most of the CP articles exhibit a strong focus on the authors’ respective countries. This might happen because the respective journals target mainly national audiences. Another important finding is that the discipline is dominated by scholars who use off-the-shelf data – a rather unsurprising situation given the scarcity of resources available for research, and the under-development of data sharing networks within the region. We also found that the use of (advanced) statistical tools of analysis are rare. There is relatively little collaboration of authors from different countries in the region. We find this particularly striking for those authors that come from countries that less than a quarter of a century belonged to the same state.

Much further research on the state of CP in CEE can and should be done. Ours was a first attempt at presenting some descriptive findings from our novel data set. Further research could go into tackling more rigorously the question of why differences between countries exist and why trends over time develop. Of interest would also be a more systematic comparison with similar data from the US and Western Europe. Also, merging our data with that of others, focusing more on institutional aspects of CP in CEE, such as the departments in which CP is taught and the CP curricula might reveal further information on the over-arching question of the state of CP in CEE in the early 21st century.
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Appendix A: Coding scheme

The aim is to collect information on all articles published in the field of comparative politics since 1990 in the major journal(s) of each country in the region of Central and Eastern Europe. Before turning to the detailed set of questions outlined below, this requires the following steps:

(1) Compile a list of political science journal in the country that you investigate, and identify the major journal for political science in this country. We endeavour to code articles from the major political science journal, selecting articles from the period of 1990-2009, and from every second year (1990, 1992, 1994, etc.).

(2) Overall, the selected journal shall include a minimum 20 journal issues over 20 years (1990-2009), and cover the whole period during which the journal has been published. If the main journal does not appear regularly, or not over the whole period, re-discuss the case selection with us.

(3) In case this major journal is NOT simultaneously a purely comparative politics journal – a quite likely scenario – identify all articles that fall into the field of comparative politics*, starting with 1990 and in every second year to follow (1992, 1994, etc).

(4) After that, answer the questions for each identified article.

* As comparative politics, we understand any study that attempts at answering a question by using empirical evidence from at least two different cases. Cases can be very different things but in most cases it will be countries. We also count as comparative those studies that investigate sub-national units (e.g. regions). Do include as comparative those studies that only engage in rather loose, informal comparisons.

Coders

[HERE CODE IDENTIFYING EACH CODER]

BK = Bojana
CS = Carsten
DB = Daniel
DS = Daniela
DT = Dane
GF = George
LD = Lenka
MC = Mihail
MH = Martina
ZT = Zbigniew
MP = Milos
BK = Blagoy

First step: country and journal information

Country
Country in which journals are published.

Country_code
Two letter code.
Journal_No
Total number of political science journals in that country at the end of 2009.

Journal_name - in original language
List the name of the identified journals. (If the name changed over the period, indicate the current name, and earlier names in [brackets].) If there are major journals specialised in the politics of the country, but edited abroad, list them, identified with an asterix. (For instance, the Journal of Baltic Studies, edited in the US, is one of the main journals for Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian politics.) Do not include journals with a large regional focus that occasionally include articles on your country.

Journal_code
Four-letter-code, consisting of country code and journal code (Use country-two-letter-code plus your own two-digit code).

Journal_major
Identify the journal (or several journals) that are considered to be the major political science journal in the country.

Journal_field
Mention the specialisation/field of the journal. (For instance, political philosophy, public policy, comparative politics, legislative studies, election studies, etc. – or general politics).
Non-major journals: only if field is generally known, or obvious from the title of the journal. Leave open if a non-major journal is not attached to a specific field, or attachment unknown.

Journal_school
Only for major journal(s): mention if the journal is known* to belong to a certain philosophical / methodological school (i.e. only covers quantitative analyses, critical thought, etc.)
* Only if information is widely known. No need for in-depth research.

Journal_editor
Only for major journal(s): identify the teaching/research institution of the current editor(s).

Journal_affiliation
Only for major journal(s): Is this journal particularly linked to this institution? If yes, name the type of link. (Journal belongs to institution; editors are regularly linked to this institution, etc.).
* Only if information is widely known. No need for in-depth research.

Journal_years
Only for major journal(s): In the period of 1990-2009, year(s) in which the journal was published.

Journal_changes
Only for major journal(s): List, if there are known* major changes to the journal, for one of the above questions (institutional link, specialisation, etc.).
* Only if information is widely known. No need for in-depth research.

**Article Identification and Placement**

**Year**
Year of publication of article (Eg. 1992, 2004, etc.)

**Journal code**
Short code identifying each journal. (Use country-two letter-code plus own two-digit code)

**Title** *(in original language)*
The first four words of the title of the article, at least

**Lead Article**
Is the article the lead article in the journal?
1 = Yes
2 = No

**Author/s**

**Surname**
The surname of the first author

**Initial**
The initial of the first author

**N_Authors**
The total number of authors contributing to the publication

**Gender**
The sex of the author or authors. (If there is more than one author, select multiple values separated by a comma. Eg. F, M)
1 = Female
2 = Male

**Discipline**
The discipline of the author or authors. (If there is more than one author, select multiple values separated by a comma. Eg. 1, 1)
1 = Political science
2 = Sociology
3 = Economics
4 = History
5 = Other

**Affiliation**
The affiliation of the author or authors. (If there is more than one author, select multiple values separated by a comma. Eg. CEU, Corvinus)
Name of university or college, etc.

**Affiliation_Type**
The type of institution with which the author or authors are affiliated (If there is more than one author, select multiple values separated by a comma. Eg. 2, 5)
1 = local universities
2 = local non-university
3 = Foreign based

**Foreign_Location**
If an author or authors is/are foreign based, what is their location? (If there is more than one foreign-based author, select multiple values separated by a comma. Eg. 2, 5)
1 = Western Europe
2 = Visegrad countries, not Czech or Slovak Republic (Hungary, Poland))
3 = former Soviet Republics, excluding Baltic states (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan)
4 = Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania)
5 = Czech or Slovak Republic or former Czechoslovakia
6 = former Yugoslav Republics (Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo, Macedonia)
7 = South-East Europe, not former Yugoslav (Albania, Bulgaria, Romania)
8 = East Asia (China, Hong Kong, Japan, Koreas, Taiwan, Tibet)
9 = South East Asia (Bali, Brunei, Burma, Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam)
10 = South Asia (Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka)
11 = Oceania (Australia, New Zealand)
12 = Middle East and North Africa
13 = Sub-saharan Africa
14 = Latin America
15 = Caribbean
16 = North America (Canada, USA)
17 = Other
98 = Global

Rank
The rank of the author or authors (If there is more than one author, select multiple values separated by a comma. Eg. 2, 5)
1 = Full professor
2 = Associate professor
3 = Assistant professor
4 = Graduate Student
5 = Other

Funding
Does the author(s) acknowledge funding in support of the research?
1 = No funding acknowledged
2 = Funding acknowledged from local funding authority
3 = Funding acknowledged from EU funding authority
4 = Funding acknowledged from foreign-based funding authority

Scope and Objectives

Question
What is the question or topic that is addressed? (If more than one question is addressed, select multiple values separated by a comma and present them in order of importance. For example, if an article focuses primarily on democratization and secondarily on social movements, write 9, 13.)
1 = State formation and state collapse
2 = War
3 = Revolutions
4 = Nationalism
5 = Civil wars and violence
6 = Ethnicity and ethnic conflict
7 = Religion
8 = Varieties of political regimes
9 = Democratization and democratic breakdowns
10 = Elections, voting and electoral rules
11 = Political parties  
12 = Citizen attitudes and political culture  
13 = Social movements and civil society (includes social capital, strikes and protests)  
14 = Interest groups (includes business and labor studies)  
15 = Clientelism  
16 = Democratic institutions (executive and legislative branches of government)  
17 = Federalism and decentralization  
18 = Judiciary  
19 = Bureaucracy  
20 = Military and police, including secret services  
21 = Policy making in general  
22 = Economic policy and reform (includes the welfare state, the developmental state, neoliberalism and varieties of capitalism)  
23 = Economic development  
24 = Globalization (includes cross-national migration)  
25 = Supranational integration and processes (eg. EU)  
99 = Other (write in)

**Theory_Empirical**  
Is theory generation and/or empirical analysis the goal? (A theory is understood here to consist of a proposition or set of propositions about how or why the world is as it is. An empirical analysis is understood here to consist of an inquiry based on observable manifestations of a concept or concepts.)

1 = Theory generation  
2 = Both theory generation and empirical analysis  
3 = Empirical analysis  
4 = Translation of an article/chapter into local language  
5 = Review of published literature
(If 1, 4, 5, skip the section on empirical analysis; if 3, 4, 5, skip the section on theory generation.)

**Descriptive_Causal**  
Is the goal to offer descriptions and/or causal account?

NB: Descriptions answer the question, what is the state of the world? Causal accounts answer the question, what explains the outcomes we see in the world? (Hence, what is relevant is whether the research question is causally oriented, not whether the method really allows for a causal account.)

1 = Descriptive  
2 = Both, but primarily descriptive  
3 = Both, but primarily causal  
4 = Causal

**Theory Generation**  
**Method_Theory**  
What method is used to generate theory? (If more than one method is used, select multiple values separated by a comma and present them in order of importance. For example, if an article relies primarily on an inductive, qualitative method and secondarily on a deductive, semiformal, method, write 1, 3.)

1 = Inductive, qualitative (e.g. open ended interviews, observation, analysis of primary and secondary materials)  
2 = Inductive, quantitative (e.g. data set mining)  
3 = Deductive, semiformal or informal  
4 = Deductive, formal (e.g. game theory)  
5 = Simulations (e.g. agent-based modeling)
### Testable Hypothesis
Does the theorizing result in a testable hypothesis?
- 1 = Yes (explicit causal model, including a specification of the variables and the relationship among the variables, i.e., the functional form)
- 2 = Not exactly (some discussion of variables but unclear what association is posited)
- 3 = No (unclear what variables are)

### Empirical Analysis

#### Data New
Are new data for one or several variables presented?
- 1 = Yes (new dataset / new data generated for at least one variable)
- 2 = Previous dataset employed, but updated (for instance, additional country added or additional year, certain variables are partly corrected)
- 3 = No (old data)
- 99 = Data not directly addressed

#### Data Formal
Are the analyzed data a formal data set? (A formal data set is a data set with values for all the variables and all the units.)
- 1 = Yes (Though some data may be missing, the analyzed data are listed in the journal, and values are readily apparent), and consist of values for all the units and all the variables.)
  - or the analysis is carried out quantitatively on a database, which is not publicly accessible.
- 2 = Partial (The analyzed data are accessible (i.e., the values are readily apparent), and consists of values for most of the units and variables.)
- 3 = No (The analyzed data are not accessible (i.e., the values are not readily apparent), or consist of values only on select units and variables.)
- 9 = The analysis does not include variables that are operationalized.

#### Method Data new
If new data is used, what method is used to generate the data? (If more than one method is used, select multiple values separated by a comma and present them in order of importance. For example, if an article relies primarily on a mass survey and secondarily on government sources and official documents, write 8, 3.)
- 1 = Analysis of secondary sources
- 2 = Analysis of newspapers and news sources
- 3 = Analysis of government sources and official documents (includes constitutions, laws, electoral returns, roll call information
- 4 = Analysis of non-official documents
- 5 = Interviews
- 6 = Focus group
- 7 = Targeted surveys and questionnaires
- 8 = Mass surveys and questionnaires
- 9 = Experiment
- 98 = Analysis relying on different data sources, without systematically naming them.
- 99 = Other (write in)
- NA = no new data

#### Method Data
In general (old and new data), what method is used to generate the data? (If more than one method is used, select the data generation method used for the most central variable(s) in the model.)
- 1 = Analysis of secondary sources
2 = Analysis of newspapers and news sources
3 = Analysis of government sources and official documents (includes constitutions, laws, electoral returns, roll call information
4 = Analysis of non-official documents
5 = Interviews
6 = Focus group
7 = Targeted surveys and questionnaires
8 = Mass surveys and questionnaires
9 = Experiment
98 = Analysis relying on different data sources, without systematically naming them.
99 = Other (write in)

Language
In which language is the article written?
   1 = English
   2 = German
   3 = French
   4 = Spanish
   5 = Russian
   6 = Hungarian
   7 = Polish
   8= Czech
   9 = Slovak
  10 = Romanian
  11 = Bulgarian
  12 = Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrinian, Serbian (former Serbo-Croatian)
  13 = Slovenian
  14 = Macedonian
  15 = Albanian
  16 = Ukrainian

99 = other – write in

Foreign Language
Are non-native language sources used?

1 = English
2 = German
3 = French
4 = Spanish
5 = Russian
6 = Hungarian
7 = Polish
8= Czech
9 = Slovak
10 = Romanian
11 = Bulgarian
12 = Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrinian, Serbian (former Serbo-Croatian)
13 = Slovenian
14 = Macedonian
15 = Albanian
16 = Ukrainian

99 = other – write in
17 = Italian
18 = Portuguese
19 = Swedish
98 = no other languages
99 = other – write in

**N_Countries**
How many countries are included in the study?
NB: If the cases are not identified, counted, and dealt with in a formal, then please report the number of countries that are addressed explicitly in the study.
1, 2, 3 .... N

**1, 2, 3 .... N Region**
From what region or regions of the world are the countries included in the study? If the countries are drawn from more than one region, select multiple values separated by a comma. (Eg. 1, 4, 6 or, if the scope is global, select 14.)

1 = Western Europe
2 = Visegrad countries, not Czech or Slovak Republic (Hungary, Poland))
3 = USSR or former Soviet Republics, excluding Baltic states (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan)
4 = Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania)
5 = Czech or Slovak Republic or former Czechoslovakia
6 = former Yugoslav Republics (Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo, Macedonia), or former SFRJ
7 = South-East Europe, not former Yugoslav (Albania, Bulgaria, Romania)
8 = East Asia (China, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Tibet)
9 = South East Asia (Bali, Brunei, Burma, Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam)
10 = South Asia (Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka)
11 = Oceania (Australia, New Zealand)
12 = Middle East and North Africa
13 = Sub-saharan Africa
14 = Latin America
15 = Caribbean
16 = North America (Canada, USA)
17 = Other
98 = Global

**Time**
How many years are covered by the study?
1 = n = < 1 year
2 = 1 ≤ n < 5
3 = 5 ≤ n < 20
4 = 20 ≤ n < 50
5 = n ≥ 50 years
6 = not made explicit / not relevant for the study

**Unit_Observation**
If observations are made on a unit other than the country, what is this unit of observation? (If there is more than one response is applicable, select multiple values separated by a comma [Eg. 1, 7]) and offer the corresponding N in the following variable (N_Observations).
1 = country
2 = Country-time period (Eg. Year)
3 = Subnational jurisdiction (Eg. state, provincial government, village)
4 = Subnational jurisdiction-time period (Eg. Year)
5 = combines subnational jurisdiction with country
6 = Group or organization (Eg. political party, business, trade union)
7 = Group-year or organization-time period (Eg. Year)
8 = Individual
9 = Individual-time period (Eg. Year)
10 = combines individual with subnational jurisdiction or country
98 = not made explicit / not relevant for the study
99 = Other (write in)

**N_Observations**
How many observations?
1, 2, 3 .... N
NA = not made explicit / not relevant for the study

**Universe**
What is the universe of cases to which the findings are extended?
1 = article remains silent on this issue
2 = only to cases under which, thus, are defined as representing the full universe
3 = a specific world region
4 = universal/global

**Method_Analysis**
What methods are used to analyze the data? (Quantitative methods are those that rely on numbers, qualitative are those that rely on words.)
1 = Qualitative
2 = Mixed method, dominantly qualitative
3 = Mixed method, dominantly quantitative
41 = Quantitative, descriptive statistics (comparison of means, factor analysis, etc.)
42 = Quantitative, OLS regression
43 = Quantitative, multivariate statistical techniques beyond OLS

**Variables_involved**
How many variables are involved in the analysis?
1,2,3, ...N
NA = not relevant / variables not explicitly identified

**Total_number_articles**
What is the total amount of articles in the journal you have coded

**Percentage_comparative_articles**
What is the percentage of comparative articles in the journal(s) that you identified as the main journal in your country? i.e., articles you identified as comparative in nature and thus subjected to the coding procedure.
Appendix B: Descriptive information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Share of co-authored articles</th>
<th>Avg number of authors per article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>1.136363636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>25.93%</td>
<td>1.296296296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>30.56%</td>
<td>1.388888889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>1.095238095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>1.021276596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>1.40625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>15.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table B1: Co-authored articles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Authorship</th>
<th>Only domestic authors</th>
<th>foreign authors</th>
<th>foreign share</th>
<th>foreign authors, without translations</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.15%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.37%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.24%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.47%</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table B2: Articles written by foreign authors*