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**SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

**APPENDIX A. Codebook & Variables List**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable Code |  | Variable |  |
| impact |  | Latent quality items |  |
| SECS |  | Political Ideology |  |

**APPENDIX B. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA**

**Table B1. General demographics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Percentage |
| *Gender* |  |
| Female | 32.10 |
|  |  |
| *Age* |  |
| 25-34 | 12.00 |
| 35-44 | 33.80 |
| 45-54 | 28.70 |
| 55-64 | 15.60 |
| 65- above | 10.00 |
|  |  |
| *Education* |  |
| MA / MPhil | 2.40 |
| MA / MPhil (in progress) | 0.70 |
| PhD | 90.20 |
| PhD (in progress) | 6.60 |
|  |  |
| *Employment* |  |
| Assistant Professor | 23.40 |
| Associate Professor | 27.90 |
| Contract Instructor / Researcher | 0.70 |
| Full Professor | 31.00 |
| Government | 2.60 |
| Graduate Student | 3.80 |
| Independent Scholar | 3.70 |
| Postdoc | 3.50 |
| Private or NGO Sector | 3.40 |
|  |  |
| *N* | 820 |

**Table B2. Sample nationality distribution**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Country | Percentage | Absolute numbers |
| Albania | 0.1 | 1 |
| Algeria | 0.1 | 1 |
| Angola | 0.1 | 1 |
| Argentina | 1.7 | 14 |
| Australia | 1.8 | 15 |
| Austria | 0.5 | 4 |
| Azerbaijan | 0.1 | 1 |
| Bahrain | 0.1 | 1 |
| Bangladesh | 0.1 | 1 |
| Belarus | 0.2 | 2 |
| Belgium | 0.1 | 1 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 0.1 | 1 |
| Brazil | 11.1 | 91 |
| Bulgaria | 0.1 | 1 |
| Burkina Faso | 0.1 | 1 |
| Cameroon | 0.1 | 1 |
| Canada | 3.9 | 32 |
| Chile | 0.6 | 5 |
| China | 1.3 | 11 |
| Colombia | 0.5 | 4 |
| Costa Rica | 0.2 | 2 |
| Croatia | 0.2 | 2 |
| Cyprus | 0.2 | 2 |
| Czech Republic | 0.7 | 6 |
| Denmark | 0.7 | 6 |
| Estonia | 0.1 | 1 |
| Finland | 0.4 | 3 |
| France | 1.1 | 9 |
| Georgia | 0.2 | 2 |
| Germany | 6.2 | 51 |
| Ghana | 1.0 | 8 |
| Greece | 0.9 | 7 |
| Haiti | 0.1 | 1 |
| Hong Kong (S.A.R.) | 0.2 | 2 |
| Hungary | 0.1 | 1 |
| Iceland | 0.4 | 3 |
| India | 6.2 | 51 |
| Indonesia | 0.4 | 3 |
| Iran | 0.4 | 3 |
| Ireland | 0.5 | 4 |
| Israel | 0.7 | 6 |
| Italy | 2.9 | 24 |
| Japan | 0.9 | 7 |
| Kazakhstan | 0.4 | 3 |
| Kenya | 0.2 | 2 |
| Libyan Arab Jamahiriya | 0.1 | 1 |
| Malaysia | 0.1 | 1 |
| Mexico | 1.5 | 12 |
| Morocco | 0.1 | 1 |
| Mozambique | 0.1 | 1 |
| Nepal | 0.1 | 1 |
| Netherlands | 1.0 | 8 |
| New Zealand | 0.5 | 4 |
| Nigeria | 1.1 | 9 |
| Norway | 0.6 | 5 |
| Pakistan | 0.5 | 4 |
| Peru | 0.2 | 2 |
| Philippines | 0.2 | 2 |
| Poland | 1.8 | 15 |
| Portugal | 0.9 | 7 |
| Romania | 0.6 | 5 |
| Russian Federation | 3.5 | 29 |
| Saint Lucia | 0.1 | 1 |
| Senegal | 0.1 | 1 |
| Serbia | 0.5 | 4 |
| Singapore | 0.2 | 2 |
| Slovakia | 0.5 | 4 |
| Slovenia | 0.2 | 2 |
| South Africa | 1.1 | 9 |
| South Korea | 0.9 | 7 |
| Spain | 2.0 | 16 |
| Sri Lanka | 0.1 | 1 |
| Sweden | 2.4 | 20 |
| Switzerland | 0.6 | 5 |
| Thailand | 0.4 | 3 |
| The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | 0.1 | 1 |
| Turkey | 8.8 | 72 |
| Ukraine | 0.2 | 2 |
| United Kingdom | 5.1 | 42 |
| United States of America | 14.0 | 115 |
| Uruguay | 0.5 | 4 |
| Venezuela | 0.1 | 1 |
| Zimbabwe | 0.4 | 3 |

**Figure B1. Political orientation distribution**
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**APPENDIX C. THE ‘ANATOMY’ OF IMPACT**

The original six-factor model in Sternberg and Gordeeva (1996) are:

Factor 1. *Quality of Presentation*. Clarity and coherence in writing are essential for ensuring that the target audience grasps the significance of the research. High-quality (and influential) articles must be well-crafted, written in a clear language, contain a clear conceptualisation of the problem, present arguments, and results in a concise and internally consistent manner, and have a logical flow and organization of ideas.

Factor 2. *Theoretical significance*. Quality articles are distinguished by their ability to present results of theoretical importance, be it by challenging existing theory, providing a more comprehensive explanation of existing phenomena than previous work, and/or offering valuable recommendations for changes or modifications in accepted theoretical constructs.

Factor 3. *Practical significance*. Results of practical significance and useful implications for professional practice and policy, as well as ideas that are applicable to many areas across the discipline rather than in a narrow niche are markers of high-quality manuscripts.

Factor 4. *Substantive Interest*. Articles that make a significant impact and are regarded as high-quality ones often tackle urgent or emerging topics within a field and capture readers’ attention. Crucially, these articles emerge precisely when the audience is ready to assimilate their conveyed messages.

Factor 5. *Methodological interest*. New methodologies, novel tests and techniques, or new data that has the potential to or influence the field of study are also characteristics present in high-quality articles.

Factor 6. *Value for future research*. High-quality articles are characterised by the presence of implications or recommendations for future research, whether related to methodology or substance —as a marker of high-impact/quality.

**APPENDIX D. RESEARCH QUALITY SCALE (RQS)**

**Table D1. Basic statistics on item ratings**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rank | Mean | *SD* |  | Item |
| 1 | 6.21 | .97 |  | The problem is clearly stated and well conceptualised |
| 2 | 6.19 | .99 |  | Arguments are presented clearly and discussed carefully with tight, logical, reasoning |
| 3 | 6.15 | 1.05 |  | Well written, well structured, and well organised |
| 4 | 6.15 | 1.01 |  | Has a logical flow and organization of ideas |
| 5 | 6.08 | 1.07 |  | Results are presented clearly and discussed carefully with tight, logical, reasoning |
| 6 | 5.81 | 1.09 |  | The writing is succinct and internally consistent |
| 7 | 5.74 | 1.17 |  | Topic is interesting and important |
| 8 | 5.73 | 1.20 |  | Makes an obvious contribution to IR knowledge, adding something new and substantial |
| 9 | 5.73 | 1.07 |  | Contains useful implications for a scholarly understanding of the field |
| 10 | 5.71 | 1.19 |  | There is adequate reference made to other work in the field (N) |
| 11 | 5.69 | 1.14 |  | Provides new and exciting ideas |
| 12 | 5.69 | 1.05 |  | Provides a better explanation of existing phenomena |
| 13 | 5.59 | 1.14 |  | Presents a new viewpoint on a problem |
| 14 | 5.58 | 1.26 |  | The language meets acceptable academic standards (N) |
| 15 | 5.53 | 1.19 |  | Opens up a new problem (research question) for investigation |
| 16 | 5.53 | 1.15 |  | Clarifies existing problem(s) |
| 17 | 5.51 | 1.13 |  | Contains useful implications for future research studies |
| 18 | 5.44 | 1.20 |  | Generates new research |
| 19 | 5.39 | 1.28 |  | Captures reader’s interest |
| 20 | 5.39 | 1.28 |  | Includes concrete examples |
| 21 | 5.33 | 1.36 |  | Starts and ends strongly, attracting attention and interest from the first paragraph and ending with clear take-home message |
| 22 | 5.28 | 1.30 |  | Presents an unambiguous and creative interpretation of results |
| 23 | 5.25 | 1.39 |  | Is clearly understandable to a broad cross-section of scholars |
| 24 | 5.22 | 1.35 |  | Considers different alternative interpretations of the data and then arrives at a clear final, unambiguous interpretation |
| 25 | 5.21 | 1.23 |  | Contains useful recommendations for further research or for changing research methodology |
| 26 | 5.18 | 1.28 |  | Proposes alternatives to existing theoretical and conceptual framework (N) |
| 27 | 5.16 | 1.31 |  | Presents results of major theoretical significance |
| 28 | 5.15 | 1.26 |  | Contains useful implications for theory building |
| 29 | 5.15 | 1.34 |  | Critiques existing knowledge (N) |
| 30 | 5.14 | 1.36 |  | Presents useful new concept or theory (N) |
| 31 | 5.09 | 1.69 |  | Tone is unbiased and impartial |
| 32 | 5.05 | 1.26 |  | Contains useful recommendations for changes or modifications in accepted theoretical constructs |
| 33 | 5.04 | 1.44 |  | Contains interesting generalizations, which are clearly stated, confirmed, and based upon results |
| 34 | 5.02 | 1.76 |  | Hypotheses are clearly stated and testable |
| 35 | 5.00 | 1.38 |  | Presents a useful new theory or theoretical framework |
| 36 | 4.92 | 1.32 |  | Contains some surprising results that make sense in some theoretical context |
| 37 | 4.85 | 1.38 |  | Integrates many different areas of data previously thought to be unrelated or poorly explained |
| 38 | 4.83 | 1.54 |  | Results are of major practical significance |
| 39 | 4.73 | 1.56 |  | Contains useful implications for policy and professional practice |
| 40 | 4.70 | 1.48 |  | Develops a new and useful methodology (N) |
| 41 | 4.66 | 1.41 |  | Integrates into a new, simpler framework data that had previously required a complex and possibly unwieldy framework |
| 42 | 4.63 | 1.52 |  | Is applicable to work in many other research areas (N) |
| 43 | 4.62 | 1.58 |  | The length of article is adequate (N) |
| 44 | 4.57 | 1.53 |  | Debunks an existing theory or way of thinking |
| 45 | 4.41 | 1.49 |  | Provides evidence that fails to support an existing influential theory (N) |
| 46 | 4.34 | 1.36 |  | Results are intriguing but do not fit any existing theory |
| 47 | 4.06 | 1.46 |  | Presented findings are general ones |
| 48 | 4.02 | 1.77 |  | Appears at the right moment, when people are ready to hear the message |
| 49 | 3.88 | 1.52 |  | Presented theory is a general one |

Note: Means are on a scale from 1 (low) to 7 (high). (N) indicates an item added to or modified from the original questionnaire.

**Table D2. Factor extraction**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| impact3 | 0.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact2 | 0.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact29 | 0.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact43 | 0.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact46 | 0.69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact24 | 0.62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact19 | 0.61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact27 | 0.57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact33 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact21 |  | 0.74 |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact14 |  | 0.72 |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact10 |  | 0.71 |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact18 |  | 0.71 |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact44 |  | 0.70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact9 |  | 0.62 |  | 0.41 |  |  |  |
| impact48 |  | 0.59 |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact47 |  | 0.56 |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact23 |  | 0.48 |  |  |  |  |  |
| impact41 |  |  | 0.72 |  |  |  |  |
| impact31 |  |  | 0.68 |  |  |  |  |
| impact34 |  |  | 0.55 |  |  |  |  |
| impact36 |  |  | 0.54 |  |  |  |  |
| impact42 |  |  | 0.48 |  |  |  |  |
| impact26 |  |  | 0.43 |  | 0.42 |  |  |
| impact17 |  |  |  | 0.74 |  |  |  |
| impact37 |  |  |  | 0.64 |  |  |  |
| impact25 |  |  |  | 0.56 |  |  |  |
| impact40 |  |  |  | 0.47 |  |  |  |
| impact20 |  |  |  | 0.46 |  |  |  |
| impact7 |  |  |  | 0.45 |  |  |  |
| impact4 |  |  |  |  | 0.64 |  |  |
| impact8 |  |  |  |  | 0.63 |  |  |
| impact16 |  |  | 0.40 |  | 0.46 |  |  |
| impact15 |  |  |  |  | 0.44 |  |  |
| impact30 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.63 |  |
| impact12 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.60 |  |
| impact22 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.52 |  |
| impact32 |  | 0.44 |  |  |  | 0.49 |  |
| impact5 | 0.41 |  |  |  |  | 0.48 |  |
| impact39 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.72 |
| impact35 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.54 |
| impact38 |  |  |  | 0.44 |  |  | 0.47 |
| impact45 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.45 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Rotation converged in 11 iterations

Cut-off point: factor loadings lower than .40 were excluded

**Table D3. Extraction sums of squared loadings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Factor | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total |
| 1 | 27.72 | 27.72 | 11.92 |
| 2 | 9.41 | 37.13 | 4.05 |
| 3 | 5.11 | 42.24 | 2.20 |
| 4 | 4.35 | 46.60 | 1.87 |
| 5 | 2.91 | 49.50 | 1.25 |
| 6 | 2.52 | 52.03 | 1.09 |
| 7 | 2.44 | 54.47 | 1.05 |

**APPENDIX E. Question wording**

**RESEARCH QUALITY SCALE (RQS)**

Adapted from (Sternberg & Gordeeva, 1996)

[Display] This questionnaire seeks your views on what importance the parameters below hold when evaluating the **quality of work** in International Relations—and more broadly Social Sciences. Each statement represents an attribute contributing to high-quality levels of a **journal article** studying world politics. Your task is to rate on a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 indicates that you do not believe that the attribute is of any real importance in determining the quality of an article, and 7 indicates that you believe that the attribute is of extreme importance.

1 = not at all important / 4 = neutral / 7 = extremely important

1. Makes an obvious contribution to IR knowledge, adding something new and substantial (\*)
2. Presents results of major theoretical significance
3. Presents a useful new theory or theoretical framework
4. Generates new research
5. Provides new and exciting ideas
6. Integrates many different areas of data previously thought to be unrelated or poorly explained
7. Integrates into a new, simpler framework data that had previously required a complex and possibly unwieldy framework
8. Opens up a new problem (research question) for investigation
9. Results are presented clearly and discussed carefully with tight, logical, reasoning
10. The problem is clearly stated and well conceptualised
11. Presents an unambiguous and creative interpretation of results
12. Topic is interesting and important
13. Presents a new viewpoint on a problem
14. Well written, well structured, and well organised
15. Provides a better explanation of existing phenomena
16. Contains useful implications for future research studies
17. Hypotheses are clearly stated and testable
18. The writing is succinct and internally consistent
19. Contains useful recommendations for changes or modifications in accepted theoretical constructs
20. Considers different alternative interpretations of the data and then arrives at a clear final, unambiguous interpretation
21. Has a logical flow and organization of ideas
22. Appears at the right moment, when people are ready to hear the message
23. Contains useful implications for a scholarly understanding of the field
24. Contains some surprising results that make sense in some theoretical context
25. Contains interesting generalizations, which are clearly stated, confirmed, and based upon results
26. Contains useful recommendations for further research or for changing research methodology
27. Debunks an existing theory or way of thinking
28. Clarifies existing problem(s)
29. Contains useful implications for theory building
30. Captures reader’s interest
31. Results are of major practical significance
32. Starts and ends strongly, attracting attention and interest from the first paragraph and ending with clear take-home message
33. Develops a new and useful methodology (N)
34. Is applicable to work in many other research areas (\*)
35. Provides evidence that fails to support an existing influential theory
36. Is clearly understandable to a broad cross-section of scholars (\*)
37. Tone is unbiased and impartial
38. Presented findings are general ones
39. Results are intriguing but do not fit any existing theory
40. Presented theory is a general one
41. Contains useful implications for policy and professional practice (\*)
42. Includes concrete examples
43. Presents useful new concept or theory (N)
44. Arguments are presented clearly and discussed carefully with tight, logical, reasoning (N)
45. Critiques existing knowledge (N)
46. Proposes alternatives to existing theoretical and conceptual framework (N)
47. There is adequate reference made to other work in the field (N)
48. The language meets acceptable academic standards (N)
49. The length of article is adequate (N)

[Scale score]

Factor 1. Theoretical Significance: 2, 3, 19, 24, 27, 29, 33, 43, 46

Factor 2. Logical Style and Structure: 9, 10, 14, 18, 21, 23, 44, 47, 48

Factor 3. Practical Significance: 26, 31, 34, 36, 41, 42

Factor 4. Methodological Rigor: 7, 17, 20, 25, 37, 40

Factor 5. Contribution and Value for Future Research: 4, 8, 15, 16

Factor 6. Interest and Topicality: 5, 12, 22, 30, 32

Factor 7. Challenge to Existing Knowledge: 35, 38, 39, 45

[Note]

Items marked with (\*) received minor textual modifications to the questions originally referring to Psychology, merely rephrasing them to International Relations or even removing such specificities to make them broadly applicable to other areas of science.

Items marked with (N) were additions to the original measurement, ensuring the scale is as inclusive as possible.

**12 ITEM SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSERVATISM SCALE (SECS)**

(Everett, 2013)

[Instructions] Participants will rate how positive or negative they feel about each issue using a 100-point scale, where scores of 100 indicate greater positivity (i.e., high-levels of conservatism) and scores of 0 indicate greater negativity (i.e., low-levels of conservatism) on socio-cultural and economic items.

[Display] Please indicate the extent to which you feel positive or negative towards each issue. Scores of 0 indicate greater negativity, and scores of 100 indicate greater positivity. Scores of 50 indicate that you feel neutral about the issue.

1. Abortion (reverse scored) (S)
2. Limited government (E)
3. Military and national security (S)
4. Religion (S)
5. Welfare benefits (reverse scored) (E)
6. Gun ownership (E)
7. Traditional marriage (S)
8. Traditional values (S)
9. Fiscal responsibility (E)
10. Business (E)
11. The family unit (S)
12. Patriotism (S)

[Scale score]

To score political ideology from the SECS, create a composite with the average score for all items.

To score each scale subdimension (Social or Economic), create a composite with the average score respective (S or E) items listed above.
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