

Kapeller, Jakob; Aistleitner, Matthias; Steinerberger, Stefan

Working Paper

Citation Patterns in Economics and Beyond: Assessing the Peculiarities of Economics from Two Scientometric Perspectives

ICAE Working Paper Series, No. 60

Provided in Cooperation with:

Johannes Kepler University Linz, Institute for Comprehensive Analysis of the Economy (ICAE)

Suggested Citation: Kapeller, Jakob; Aistleitner, Matthias; Steinerberger, Stefan (2017) : Citation Patterns in Economics and Beyond: Assessing the Peculiarities of Economics from Two Scientometric Perspectives, ICAE Working Paper Series, No. 60, Johannes Kepler University Linz, Institute for Comprehensive Analysis of the Economy (ICAE), Linz

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/171435>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Citation Patterns in Economics and Beyond: Assessing the Peculiarities of Economics from Two Scientometric Perspectives

**Matthias Aistleitner, Jakob Kapeller
and Stefan Steinerberger**

Citation Patterns in Economics and Beyond: Assessing the Peculiarities of Economics from Two Scientometric Perspectives[★]

Matthias Aistleitner^{*}, Jakob Kapeller^{**} and Stefan Steinerberger^{***}

Abstract

In this paper we explore three claims concerning the disciplinary character of economics by means of citation analysis. The three claims under study are: (1) economics exhibits strong forms of intellectual stratification and, as a byproduct, a rather pronounced internal hierarchy, (2) economists strongly conform to institutional incentives and (3) modern mainstream economics is a highly self-referential intellectual project mostly inaccessible to disciplinary or paradigmatic outsiders. The validity of these claims is assessed by means of an interdisciplinary comparison of citation patterns aiming to identify the peculiar characteristics of economic discourse. In exposing and discussing these peculiarities of economics, we emphasize the availability of two competing scientometric perspectives for assessing and interpreting our findings.

Keywords: citation patterns, economics, interdisciplinary, scientometrics, sociology of economics

JEL-Codes: A10, A12, A14

^{*} The authors want to thank Chenglin Lu for excellent research assistance as well as Ernest Aigner and Florentin Glötzl for their generous provision of large-scale data on citations in economics. We also want to thank Matthew L. Wallace, Vincent Larivière and Yves Gingras for their kind provision of large-scale data on citations in economics and other disciplines. Financial support from the *Institute for New Economic Thinking (INET)* under grants INO1500038 & INO1500039 is gratefully acknowledged.

^{*} Johannes Kepler University Linz, Institute for Comprehensive Analysis of the Economy (ICAE), matthias.aistleitner@jku.at

^{**} Johannes Kepler University Linz, Department of Philosophy and Theory of Science and Institute for Comprehensive Analysis of the Economy (ICAE), jakob.kapeller@jku.at

^{***} Yale University, Department of Mathematics, stefan.steinerberger@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Scientometrics is the attempt to better understand the nature of scientific discourse by employing and analyzing quantitative data as it emerges from scientific exchanges (Mingers & Leydesdorff 2015). Analysis of citation data has achieved an especially prominent role, as it can not only be used to describe characteristic patterns within scientific conversations, but also serve as a means for assessing the impact and quality of contributions, outlets, authors or departments.

In this paper we take different ways of utilizing citation data as starting points to better understand the idiosyncratic character of the discipline of economics: more precisely, we compare citation patterns in economics to those of other academic disciplines and ask how different conceptual understandings of citation data also lead to differing interpretations with regard to the nature and comparative development of academic disciplines. More specifically, we make use of two basic, but different, ways of interpreting citation data: on the one hand, we follow what is a standard routine in many academic contexts, namely to interpret citations as an *indicator for the quality* of the cited publication. We call this the *evaluative* use of citation data (see also Moed et al. 2012 and, for specific examples in economics, Arrow et al. 2011 and Diamond 1989). The second approach we suggest is to interpret the act of mentioning a scientific publication in another scientific publication as an *indicator for some form of 'communication'* between researchers: in such an interpretation, the act of citing a paper is understood as a key element in scientific conversation. Citation analysis can then be used to assess the properties of scientific conversation, that is, to answer questions like 'who talks to whom', 'what are the intellectual foundations of a certain field of research' or 'how do scientists distribute their attention across the whole universe of scientific papers'? Such uses of citation data have traditionally been labeled as *cognitive scientometrics* (Price 1965; Rip & Courtial 1984 and, for examples in economics, Hamermesh 2015 and Kim et al. 2006), which serves as a second and alternative frame of interpretation applied to our quantitative findings.

In what follows we evaluate and compare citation data from five academic disciplines and analyze the respective citation patterns. We are especially interested in differences between citation patterns in economics and other disciplines, as economics is typically understood as a highly idiosyncratic field of research. There are several reasons for this peculiar character of economics: this peculiarity resides in the fact that economists often consider their field as most advanced and, hence, superior compared to the other social sciences (e.g. Lazear 2000). This attitude is at least partly due to the origin-story of modern economics, which is strongly influenced by the archetype of the natural sciences – this has had repercussion on both the historical positioning of the discipline (Samuelson 1972) as well as the evolution of its prevailing practices (Mirowski 1989).

We take these three alleged peculiarities of economics as a starting point for understanding interdisciplinary differences in citation patterns. Specifically, we relate to findings that (a) modern mainstream economics shows greater signs of stratification compared to other fields of research (Bayer & Rouse 2016; Fourcade et al. 2015; Han 2003; Hodgson & Rothman 1999), (b) that economists are more prone to conform to institutional incentives due to their conceptual focus on instrumental rationality (Bauman & Rose 2011; Etzioni 2015; Frank et al. 1993; 1996; Frey et al. 1993; Yezer et al. 1996) and (c) that mainstream economic research is largely autonomous in the sense that it only rarely relies on external input (Fourcade et al. 2015; Pieters & Baumgartner 2002) and, hence, is largely inaccessible to paradigmatic or disciplinary outsiders (Dobusch & Kapeller 2009, Fourcade et al. 2015, King 2003, Leijonhufvud 1973). We aim to provide an empirical evaluation of

these claims about the peculiarity of economics by comparing scientometric data on the nature of scientific conversation in economics with those found in some companion social sciences (sociology, political science and psychology) as well as different branches of physics. The main rationale for selecting these fields is that they either cover related subjects and questions (the social sciences) or serve as a historically important conceptual archetype for conducting economic research and composing economic theory (physics).

Additionally we argue that economics is of special interest when it comes to the question of distributing attention, citations and resources, as economics is typically understood as a paradigmatically and politically contested field of research (Lee & Elsnar 2011). This contested character makes economics not only a peculiar but also an especially interesting case for interdisciplinary comparisons of citation patterns: it raises the question whether the alleged ‘contestedness’ of economics has consequences on its discursive properties, that is, in the way it organizes and reproduces scientific conversations.

In what follows we will look at these three aspects (disciplinary stratification, compliance with incentives and conceptual isolation) in Sections 2 to 4. Section 5 offers a summary of our findings as well as some concluding thoughts. All data used on this paper is available from the journal’s website.

2. Concentration

The purpose of this section is to subsume the comparatively high level of self-reference and the strongly hierarchical character of economics under the heading *concentration* to signify that important authors, contributions, departments and outlets are more strongly concentrated in terms of their spatial distribution and personal as well as professional relations. We argue that one of the main roots of concentration in economics is the highly stratified tertiary education system comprised of a very small number of high-profile schools in economics, which in turn have a tight grip on the most important outlets and professional associations¹. The hierarchical structure within the economic discipline has been confirmed empirically in various ways. Medoff (2006), for instance, finds evidence of a “positive institutional Matthew effect” (Medoff 2006, 485) for *Harvard University* and the *University of Chicago* leading to a disproportionate amount of peer recognition devoted to contributions by economists affiliated with these institutions. On a more general level, Baghestanian & Popov (2014) find a strong association between the reputation of an economists PhD granting institution and the probability of publishing in a top economic journal² which they call the ‘Alma mater’-effect.

¹ For example, the prestigious economics departments at the *University of Chicago* and *Harvard University* both publish also high regarded journals in the profession, the *Journal of Political Economy* (JPE) and the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (QJE). Three further high-profile outlets, the *American Economic Review* (AER), the *Journal of Economic Literature* (JEL), and the *Journal of Economic Perspectives* (JEP) are published by the leading professional organization in the field, the *American Economic Association* (AEA). Within the AEA Leadership, in turn, also a clear dominance of economists affiliated with one of those departments can be observed: A closer look at the past presidents of the AEA (1886-2016) reveals that a third of them were affiliated with either the *University of Chicago* or *Harvard University* (a further quarter at least with one of four other prestigious U.S. universities: Princeton University, Yale University, M.I.T., and Stanford University) (data retrieved from aeaweb.org). These short examples do not only indicate the dominant position of a specific set of actors, but also shows how prestigious universities, important associations and major journals in economics are institutionally intertwined.

² Additionally they find, that “‘in-house’ journals favor ‘in-house’ graduates” (Baghestanian & Popov 2014, 23) which obviously leads to a further reinforcement of the stratification mentioned above.

“The Alma mater effect is large in size: if a top-10 graduate has a 30% chance of publishing in a top-5 journal, graduating instead from a top-30 institution lowers his chances to 17%, and lowering his Alma mater ranking further to 100+ lowers his chances to 10%.” (Baghestanian & Popov 2014, 23)

Another finding on ‘concentration’ in economics is due to Hodgson & Rothman (1999) who analyze the institutional background and affiliation of the editors and authors of a set of thirty ‘top’ economic journals. They identify a strong dominance of U.S. located institutions, and, within that subset, again dominance by the smaller group of elite universities. For instance, in 1995 more than half (54%) of the authors of articles published in these ‘top thirty’ journals obtained their PhD at one of twelve prestigious U.S. universities³, while at the same time more than one fifth (21%) of authors in said journals were also affiliated with one of these universities.

A partial replication of the analysis of Hodgson & Rothmann (1999) with data from 2014 suggests that this level of “institutional oligopoly” has remained fairly constant over time: Just looking at the subsample consisting of three major journals, the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (QJE), the *American Economic Review* (AER)⁴ and the *Journal of Political Economy* (JPE) reveals that a majority of authors (55%) publishing in these outlets received their PhD at one of the twelve universities mentioned above. In 2014, more than one third (38%) of these authors were affiliated with one of these universities at the time of publication (see also Wu 2007).

Similar tendencies of concentration can also be found in large-scale analyses of the economic literature. Laband (2013), for instance, analyzes the structure of journal representations in the reference sections of the 409 most cited economics papers published between 2001-2005: more than half (55%) of the references cited by these top-papers came from a group of only twenty journals. Even more strikingly, the proportion of citations devoted to the three journals mentioned above – QJE, JPE and AER – is greater than one fifth (20,6%) of the total references (cf. Laband 2013, F250-F251). In light of this, it comes as no surprise that an analysis of the recent development of economic ‘top-journals’, which has been published in the *Journal of Economic Literature*, was limited to the observation of only five journals, adding only *Econometrica* (EMA) and the *Review of Economic Studies* (RES) to the set of three journals mentioned above (Card & DellaVigna 2013).

Our empirical application takes a closer look at the ‘Big 5’, i.e. the five core journals covered by Card & DellaVigna (2013), to gain potential insights on tendencies of concentration within economic discourse similar to those already observed in the context of editor- and authorships in top-journals (Hodgson & Rothman 1999) or the recruitment of officers for academic associations (Fourcade et al. 2015). Specifically, we measure the concentration of attention and prestige within top-journals by assessing the degree of self-referentiality within this group of journals to compare the relative openness of top-journals across fields. Figure 1 plots the share of journal self-citations as well as the share of citation flows originating from within the ‘Big 5’ relative to total citations in these journals for the period 2009-2013. Figure 1 conveys our first finding: more than a quarter of all sources cited by the top five economic journals originate are self-referential – they stem from the very same set of journals.

³ The respective universities are: Harvard University, M.I.T., University of Chicago, Stanford University, University of Michigan, University of California Berkeley, Princeton University, Yale University, University of Wisconsin, Columbia University, University of Pennsylvania, and Northwestern University (Hodgson & Rothman 1999, F173)

⁴ For a more detailed analysis of the AER authorship see Torgler & Piatti (2013).





Figure 1: The intra-group citation behavior of five core economic journals. (authors' own calculation based on data from *Thomson Scientific*).

In addition to this key observation - that one out of four citations made in this journal sample also originates from within this sample – it can also be inferred from Figure 1, that the average share of self-citations within a top-journal plus the share of citations imported from its four 'best buddies' is fairly stable across the top five journals with individual values ranging from 23.8% (QJE) to 31.7% (EMA).

When comparing the citation pattern found across economics' top journals to the degree of self-reference in top journals located in other fields – e.g. the 'top five' journals in psychology, sociology, political science and physics (Figure 2) – there is the difficulty of selecting appropriate sets of top journals for these fields to advance a sensible comparison across disciplines. To enhance comparability of the respective 'top' samples in each discipline we first harmonized our selection criteria across all fields under study. Specifically, we selected every journal, which was ranked in the top 20 of Thomson Reuters' annually published *Journal Citation Reports* (JCR) for ten consecutive years (2006-2015) to account for the relative long-term position of outlets – a condition inspired by the ranking patterns in economics, where the 'Big 5' are constantly within the Top 20 of journals as ranked by the JCR. In the case that more than five journals fit those criteria, the five on average best ranked journals (within the top 20) were selected.






Figure 2: Concentration and interdisciplinary comparisons – the intra-group citation behavior of five core journals in psychology (multidisciplinary), sociology, political science, and physics (multidisciplinary). (authors' own calculation based on data from *Thomson Scientific*).

In comparison with Figure 1 the results shown in Figure 2 reveal two remarkable findings. Firstly, in the other social science disciplines considered here the degree of concentration measured as the share of journal self-citations plus the citation flow within top journals is – with average values ranging between 7,9% and 12,4% of total citations – pending between a third and a half of what we found for economics (27,5%). This finding reinforces the diagnosis that economics exhibits a much more pronounced hierarchy, or “pecking-order” (Leijonhufvud 1973, 328), compared to other social science disciplines. Secondly, this relative high degree of concentration in economics also exceeds the degree of concentration measured within our sample of (multidisciplinary) physics journals (20,3%). Hence, although the difference between economics and physics as its conceptual archetype is much less pronounced than the one between economics and the other social sciences with whom economics shares its subject matter, there remains a substantial gap even in comparison to the much different and often much more narrow discourses in the realm of the natural sciences.

In response to the finding about concentration in physics documented in Figure 2 and the associated ramifications already discussed, we acquired data for analyzing a second example in the realm of physics, but, this time, focusing on top journals in very specific research areas to better validate our intuition that more specialized discourses in physics could provide a closer fit to the situation in economics. In doing so, we found a strikingly similarity between our novel sample from physics consisting of specifically chosen *field* journals (*Physical Review A-E*, see Figure 3) and economics. Although the network structures differ markedly between these two cases – the *Physical Reviews* are huge journals with an average publication output of more than 3.000 papers/year focusing on very different subfields, the degree of concentration is nearly as high (27,3%) as in the economics sample. Hence, while the stronger content-based separation of the respective journals into subfields (designated with letters A-E⁵) provides an explanation for much higher share of self-citations, the very same fact implies that – given only minimal network effects – also the average amount of self-citations within theses journals (24,1%) is eventually rather close to the average share of attention the ‘Big 5’ in economics devote to themselves (27,5%). In sum, the top five journals in economics taken together behave very similar to specific field journals within physics – exhibiting a sizeable share of reciprocal citations within a (network of) top journal(s).

⁵ The respective letters stand for specific research fields in physics: (A) atomic, molecular, and optical physics and quantum information, (B) condensed matter physics, materials physics, (C) nuclear physics, (D) particles, fields, gravitation, and cosmology, and (E) statistical, nonlinear, biological, and soft matter physics.




Figure 3: Concentration and interdisciplinary comparisons – the intra-group citation behavior of five core (field) journals in physics. (authors’ own calculation based on data from *Thomson Scientific*).

The result that the ‘Big 5’ in economics behave similar to more specialized subfields in physics and exhibit correspondingly high rates of concentration is especially striking in the face of an overall decrease in the concentration of cited sources within the academic literature over the past decades (Larivière et al. 2009). Beside this anachronism, it is quite remarkable that a multi-faceted discipline such as economics, which deals with mathematical, game-theoretical, sociological, historical, philosophical and psychological components, behaves in the same concentrated manner as, say, *Physical Review B*, which focused on condensed matter and material physics. The fact that the relative citation patterns of top multidisciplinary journals in physics (as documented in the lower right panel of Figure 2) shows much less regularity and, hence, gives an indication for the tight conceptual and theoretical commitments established in contemporary economics.

While the findings presented above are interesting in themselves, it is worthwhile to further explore their implications from two scientometric perspectives. In terms of an evaluative approach, the relevant problem is to explain the comparatively strong agglomeration of high-quality articles in such a small number of outlets. An obvious conclusion from this perspective is that the editorships of the journals do excellent work and manage to concentrate most high-quality research in economics in their outlets, which, in turn, makes it easier to locate said contributions. Hence, top economic journals are simply exceptionally successful in identifying high-quality research. While a cognitive approach to scientometrics could take such reasoning into account it would be forced to ask a broader set of questions: quite naturally – given the impressive degree of concentration observed – a cognitive approach would ask for diversity in authors, readers and institutional backgrounds. In a similar vein, a cognitive approach would ask which reputational concerns drive this close-knit citation structures. In comparison with physics (Figure 3) a cognitive approach would necessarily go beyond asserting that economics editors are simply superior, but rather ask which properties make economics discursively similar to subfields in modern physics.

Under such premises of cognitive scientometrics, the outcome looks quite different: here the findings above reveal that the economic discourse at the very top is to a large extent self-contained and exhibits a strong hierarchical character while the discourse in sociology and political science can be characterized as more diverse and less hierarchical. The interpretation and associated valuation of citations is, as we will see in several instances, highly flexible as it depends on the conceptual frames we choose to use for channeling these numbers into words.

3. Reactivity

The second aspect in this paper relates to the phenomenon of *reactivity*, specifically in connection with scientific research evaluation. Our basic argument is that the introduction of journal rankings in economics in particular and in academia in general has led to a change in and a refinement of the institutional incentives governing the academic sphere. Notwithstanding the fact that rankings have a long tradition in economics (see, for instance, Diamond 1989; Fushfeld 1956; Graves et al. 1982; Liebowitz & Palmer 1984; or the rankings hosted by RePEc on repec.org), we argue that the importance of journal rankings received a significant boost within the last two decades (see also Kalaitzidakis et al. 2011; Stern 2013; Zimmermann 2013). The journal rankings produced by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), whose database is today widely known as Thomson Reuter's *Web of Science*, proved to be pivotal for the ascension of journal rankings in academic assessment and evaluation, which eventually led to visible changes in the disciplinary trajectory of economics at the national level (Lee 2007; Bloch 2010; Corsi et al. 2010). As these rankings are imposed onto the scientific field for means of assessment and evaluations of researchers and institutions they do not come without an impact on the institutional incentives individual researchers face.

“There is a powerful feedback between the ranking systems used to assess scientific productivity and the actions of scientists trying to further their careers via these ranking systems.” (Nature 2010, 871)

In short, the introduction of journal rankings for purposes of evaluation causes reactive behavior invoked by the ‘authority of numbers’.

“Casting reactivity as a threat to validity of measures draws attention to the dynamic nature of quantitative authority and its capacity to intervene, sometimes dramatically, with other forms of authority.” (Espeland & Sauder 2007, 6-7)

The notion of reactivity is a well-known concept in the methodology of the social sciences and refers to instances, in which the application of some instrument of investigation triggers a change in the behavior of the investigated subjects or institutions. Such behavioral changes are conceived as a source of bias, which may arise in the course of data-acquisition (especially in circumstances, where data is collected repeatedly). While it is methodologically correct to speak of a bias here in the sense that such a behavioral change is considered an artifact created in the course of observation, it seems important to note that the change in behavior is, eventually, real: although induced by observation, such changes in behavior can be profound and have far-reaching effects.

In the case of methodologically guided evaluations in general and evaluative scientometrics in particular, reactivity induces actors to anticipate evaluation criteria. This anticipation in turn affects the behavior of the subjects or institutions evaluated

according to these criteria (Ferraro et al. 2005, Ghoshal 2005). Such forms of ‘evaluation bias’ has been confirmed empirically, especially for evaluation procedures such as rankings, where Espeland & Sauder’s (2007) seminal study about the reactivity of a US law schools to the introduction of the U.S. News law school rankings ranking stands out (see also Rafols et al. 2012; Willmott 2011). Another prominent example of ranking-induced reactivity is the so called *ease of doing business* country-ranking developed by the World Bank, which also induces reactive behavior of government institutions in favor of the defined ranking criteria.

“The main message is that many countries may find it easier to change their ranking in ‘Doing Business’ than changing the underlying business environment.” (Høyland et al. 2008, 12)

Against this backdrop, it does not come as a surprise that journal rankings do trigger similar effects when used for large-scale institutional evaluation: Italy, for instance, has recently introduced a quantitative standard for supporting decisions on appointment and promotion within the academic system. While the official purpose of this reform is to serve as an objective way to decrease the amount of nepotism in hiring, one cornerstone is the number of scientific publications as indexed by either *Scopus* or *Web of Science*. This has lead to various attempts of Italian scholars to have past publications that are not covered by Scopus/WoS included into Scopus/WoS and created strong incentive to only publish in journals covered by these two indices (Abatemarco & Dell’Anno 2012). While we also observe more blunt forms of reactivity taking the form of simple gaming strategies (Kapeller 2010; Wilhite & Fong 2012; Necker 2014), in this paper we want to ask a more nuanced question: how would the introduction of journal rankings and their rise to institutional authority change existing patterns of scientific recognition to impact citation behavior in economics? Taking the classic Mertonian view (1968) that the future recognition depends on past recognition already received (see also Haucap & Muck 2015), we argue that the introduction of journal rankings as evaluative device affects the self-reinforcing routines governing the distribution of academic attention, by raising the relative importance of journals as compared to specific authors or contributions. As journals gain in visibility in the course of the introduction and utilization of journal rankings, some attention is redistributed from the actual producers and products of scientific activities to their (most important) outlets. And, indeed, Attema et al. (2014), found that U.S. economists, on average, would give half of a thumb for a publication in the AER.

So far, we have introduced two hypotheses on reactivity, namely that the introduction of journal rankings redistributes prestige in the favor of journals (see also McDonald & Kam 2007; Larivière & Gingras 2010) and that economists intuitively and/or deliberately consider this redistribution of prestige leading to a change in recorded citation patterns. Specifically, our theoretical argument implies that we should see the share of citations received by the top fraction of articles *within* a journal decrease, while the share of citations going to the least considered fraction of papers is expected to rise as all papers in a given outlet draw on the latter’s prestige (see Figure 4 for a stylized illustration of the expected effect).




Figure 4: Expected effect of a relative increase in journals' prestige on observed citation patterns.

We would assume to find effects as envisaged in Figure 4 – an increase in the share of the bottom two thirds of articles with a corresponding decrease in the share of top-cited papers – across all disciplines. However, we also expect these effects to be most pronounced in economics as we assume a higher degree of conformity to institutional incentives in economics as compared to other fields.

In what follows, Figures 5 to 7 show our empirical findings on this question. In acquiring these results we analyzed the citation history of all (top-)journals sampled so far⁶ and further extended our sample by acquiring corresponding data for *Nature* and *Science*. More specifically, we compare the distribution of citations to papers published between 1981 and 1985 (counting received citations till 1990) to the distribution of citations to all articles published between 2004 and 2008 (counting citations till 2013) for all analyzed journals to look for changes in aggregate citation patterns.

Figure 5 shows the results so obtained by providing individual estimates for all disciplines under study. The resulting pattern is in close correspondence with our theoretical expectations – a decrease in the share of citations dedicated to the upper limit of the distribution is complemented by a corresponding increase in lower deciles. The discipline of economics indeed shows the biggest effect with an effective decline in the share of the top decile of papers by roughly 9%. Only the generalist top journals *Science* and *Nature* (as shown in Figure 6) as well as top journals in psychology come close to this pattern, while the same effect for the other social science journals – as well as the physics journals under study – is much less pronounced.

⁶ Due to some minor data limitations (data for the 1980s does not exist for *Sociology of Health and Illness*, *Political Geography*, *Annual Review of Political Science*, *Political Analysis*, *Nature Physics*, and *Physical Review E*) only 24 of the 30 journals discussed in section 2 enter this analysis.




Figure 5: Change of citation patterns in top journals: 1980s vs. today (authors' own graph based on data from *Thomson Scientific*)

Figure 6 provides a different perspective on the same data by further aggregating results across disciplines: it shows, that the intensity of the expected pattern is much greater in economics than for the average social science or physics paper in our sample. Indeed, the journals coming closest to the pattern found for economics are multidisciplinary journals with great visibility (which surely command a considerable amount of prestige). Hence, it seems that, in terms of reactivity induced by journal prestige, economics really plays in the league of the world's most prolific journals, while leaving the mundane world of ordinary research well behind.




Figure 6: Citation patterns in the 1980s and today: An aggregated comparison. (authors' own graph based on data from *Thomson Scientific*).

But joking aside, what to make of this result? Although the alignment between expected citation behavior and actual patterns retrieved is close and the supposed pattern non-trivial, how can we assure that our inter-temporal comparisons are due to the role of journal rankings and not, lets say, due to other factors, like different research cultures⁷ or simply the rising size of the academic literature in general? While such alternative explanations are indeed appealing and, at the same time, the possibilities to quantitatively assess qualitative differences across fields are limited, we can confront the most obvious argument in this context, namely the growth of the academic literature in general. Figure 7 compares the overall output of scientific publications between the two periods, which has increased significantly in all disciplines under consideration. However, the similarity between the citation patterns in economics and the multidisciplinary journals shown in Figure 6 stands here somewhat in contrast to different growth rates in these disciplines (+187% in economics vs. +51% in multidisciplinary sciences). Conversely, the two remaining disciplines which experience growth rates more similar to economics (+88% in the social sciences and +103% in physics) – although differing fundamentally in terms of absolute numbers – exhibit both a similar citation pattern (see again Figure 6) which is, in turn, quite different to the citation pattern in economics. Therefore, it is obvious that these specific differences in citation patterns in economics cannot be simply explained by pointing to the growing literature in the field.




Figure 7: Publication output in the 1980s and today: An aggregated comparison. Authors' own graph based on data from *Thomson Scientific*. Note: Published document types such as editorials, book reviews, bibliographies or biographic items were excluded in this analysis. *Includes sociology, political science and psychology (multidisciplinary). **Includes physics multidisciplinary, physics nuclear, physics atomic molecular chemical, physics condensed matter, and physics particles fields.

While our argument – that the difference in responsiveness to incentives across disciplines contributes to the differences in citation patterns – is surely of a cognitive origin, the evaluative alternative would have to explain observed changes by underlying changes in paper quality. One obvious possibility would be to assume that the average quality of papers in top journals has grown faster over time than the quality of top-cited papers in said journals – and that the very same process is going on faster in economics than in other fields, potentially due to greater scrutiny imposed by editors and referees of top journals. As so often in social research, our interpretation of empirical patterns is strongly dependent on our theoretical frames. In

⁷ For example, Tsay (2009) analyzes scientometric data between journals of physics, chemistry and engineering and finds some evidence for differences in citation behavior among scientists in these disciplines, although this comparison is restricted to a period of one year (2002).

short, any of our two interpretations will eventually find its followers as the data hardly put us in an appropriate position to differentiate between different theoretical perspectives – especially if one of these perspective is flexible as the evaluative view, which, by the way, would also have been able to devise an explanation for any other possible pattern found in the data.

4. Diversity

Our final section deals with an alleged lack of diversity in economics. Diversity is a concept that can be approached from a variety of angles, as, for instance, demographic, disciplinary or theoretical diversity. While a lack of diversity in terms of demography is well documented in economics (e.g. Bayer & Rouse 2016), Fourcade et al. (2015) recently studied the matter of intellectual diversity in economics from a disciplinary angle. By analyzing both, attitudes towards interdisciplinary research as well as interdisciplinary citation patterns in economics, sociology and political science, Fourcade et al. (2015) show that economists are comparatively less inclined to import findings from other disciplines and also have less trust towards interdisciplinary approaches and research strategies. These findings are highly consistent with past results from data-driven research on citation patterns, which document the solitary character of economics in terms of disciplinary location and age of imported references. Relative to other disciplines from the natural and the social sciences papers in economics refer with a higher probability to their own specialty (see Figure 8) and are, on average, older than papers cited in other disciplinary contexts (Wallace et al. 2012). These results not only point to the comparatively strong imprint of traditional approaches and findings on current research, but also signify the intellectual autarky in current economics.




Figure 8: Citation patterns in economics and other disciplines: a large scale sample. Authors' own graph based on data from Wallace et al. (2012)⁸.

Against this backdrop it does not come as a surprise, that also Fourcade et al. (2015) summarized their findings under the heading of 'insularity' to signal an absence of theoretical and conceptual diversity. And indeed, economists often conceive interdisciplinary interaction as a competition rather than cooperation, where disciplines are to be judged with regard to their relative 'performance'.

"What is interesting to think about are the terms of trade between economics and all these other disciplines. We are clearly a net exporter to political science and sociology." (Wolfers 2010, 30)

In what follows, we want to add to this picture by supplying a perspective on conceptual diversity in economics. This question is especially peculiar as economics can be regarded as a 'contested discipline' (Lee & Cronin 2010, Lee & Elsner 2011). The character of scientific discourse in economics differs from that found in other social sciences, because economics is dominated by a single paradigm – neoclassical economic theory – which significantly shapes academic teaching and economic research.⁹ A thus resulting exclusion of alternative economic approaches, like institutional microeconomics, evolutionary analysis of economic change or Keynesian macroeconomics, from the 'official' economic discourse in further consequence led to the foundation of – nowadays eminent – heterodox economic journals, like the *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, the *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics* or the *Journal of Economic Issues* in the late 1960s and 1970s (King 2003, 134-136). Notwithstanding these efforts for providing alternative economic approaches with adequate institutional foundations, alternative or 'heterodox' schools of thought nowadays only constitute a small fraction inside the economics discipline. While heterodox economists are confronted with a series of exclusionary practices and routines (Dobusch & Kapeller 2009, King 2012), their works also draw on a broader variety of sources and inputs and, hence, exhibits a distinctive, more interdisciplinary communicative pattern (Glötzl & Aigner 2015). Moreover, Glötzl & Aigner (2015) provide additional evidence for this contestedness of economics by pointing to a 'mainstream core - heterodox periphery structure' (see also: Dobusch & Kapeller 2012a) in the citation networks of two major Austrian universities, the *Vienna University of Economics and Business* and the *University of Vienna*, which differ markedly with respect to their openness for alternative and heterodox approaches in economics.

The resulting lack of diversity within the economic discipline has been studied empirically, in particular by analyzing the relative citation flows between 13 high-ranked mainstream and 13 high-ranked heterodox economic journals in two different periods: before (1989-2008; Dobusch & Kapeller 2012b) and after the recent financial and economic crisis (2009-2013; Aistleitner et al. 2016). The results indicate that the monistic and closed citation behavior exhibited by (highly-ranked) mainstream economic journals remained stable after the crisis, as the mainstream journals continue to devote only minimal attention to heterodox inputs (as is evidenced by the small share of citations – less than 3% – imported from heterodox sources¹⁰; see Figure 9). On the contrary, the heterodox journals themselves exhibit

⁸ We are grateful to Matthew L. Wallace, Vincent Larivière and Yves Gingras for providing the large-scale data necessary to build this figure.

⁹ We recommend Backhouse (2005) or Dobusch & Kapeller (2009) for a discussion of the historical roots of this paradigmatic dominance.

¹⁰ A more detailed analysis of the data from 1989-2008 furthermore shows that the percentage of citations from the top thirteen heterodox journals exported into mainstream journal literature considered here (2,85% of total references) is driven heavily by statistical outliers: about 80% of these references are caused by only three journals that hold a special position within the economic discourse: On the heterodox side of the sample, the *Journal of*

a more balanced citation pattern with import shares from the mainstream sample of 47,6% (pre-crisis) and 24,6% (post-crisis). In the context of the crisis, this result lends support to Kuhn's (1962) prediction, that a dominant paradigm that faces a significant anomaly (the crisis) will react with adapting already established theses, models and methods instead of turning to more fundamental revisions.

To further assess the robustness of these results, Figure 9 additionally shows results derived from data on a control group and on a large-scale sample. The first robustness-check uses a control group to ask whether the comparative neglect of heterodox inputs in mainstream outlets can be explained by the lower ranks of heterodox journals, which supposedly signify a lower overall quality. In composing the control group we used a group of mainstream journals with similar ranking positions than the heterodox sample. The second robustness check analyzes data of a large-scale sample acquired from the *Web of Science* database to scrutinize the robustness of the observed differences.




Figure 9: Diversity and the interaction pattern between economic mainstream and heterodox journals. Top left: the discourse between a sample of top 13 orthodox and top 13 heterodox journals (1989-2008; taken from Dobusch & Kapeller 2012b); Top right: replication with a corresponding control group (1989-2008; author's own calculation based on data from *Thomson Scientific*). Bottom left: replication for the post-crisis period (2009-2013; author's own calculation based on data from *Thomson Scientific*); Bottom right: Analysis of a large-scale journal sample (1969-2013; author's own calculation based on data from *Thomson Scientific*)¹¹

By comparing these results to other recent findings on the 'insularity' of the economics discipline (Fourcade et al. 2015) one notices several similarities between an interdisciplinary and an intradisciplinary view on conceptual openness in economics. For once, we do not only find that economics is comparatively closed to outside disciplines, but also to theoretical outsiders within itself. For another, we

Economic Behavior and Organization, on the mainstream side of the sample, the *Journal of Economic Geography* and *Economic Geography*.

¹¹ We are grateful to Ernest Aigner and Florentin Glötzl for providing the data necessary to perform this analysis.

observe that these theoretical outsiders do share close ties to other branches of the social sciences (e.g. Glötzl & Aigner 2015), thereby not resembling the disciplinary isolation practiced by the economic mainstream. A possible, tentative conclusion to be drawn from this is that the interdisciplinary insularity of economics as diagnosed by Fourcade et al. (2015) or Gingras and Schinckus (2012; with respect to econophysics) is not primarily due the idiosyncracies and peculiarities of the subject matter in economics, but rather an outgrowth of the dominant economic approach which seems to discount external inputs a priori.

Empirical examples for illustrating the above line of argument qualitatively are easily found. One instance is provided by the ‘Economics of Identity’ – a stream of research based on a well-received paper by Akerlof & Kranton (2000), which gathered well more than 800 citations in *Web of Science*, most of them from the field of economics. In this context, it is interesting to note that the conceptual core of ‘identity’ as introduced in economics – that people have ideas about who they are and try to conform to these ideas in their behavior – overlaps strongly with the meaning of identity as used by social psychologists since, at least, the 1950s. While Akerlof & Kranton (2000) obviously import this idea into economics and thereby attract much interest within their profession, this interest does not spill over to the realm of social psychology: Classic contributions on social identity in other fields, e.g. Tajfel (1974) or Ashforth & Mael (1989), remain largely neglected in the economic discourse, although they are widely cited in general. In sum, these two papers have more than 2,500 documented citations in *Web of Science*, where only 35 of those stem from economics. Hence, while the contribution of Akerlof & Kranton (2000) has provided much legitimacy to the psychological concept of identity within economics, this newly gained legitimacy does not increase the importance of the extra-disciplinary origins of said concept. In this vein, this example on the economics of identity tells us something about the identity of economics, namely that the legitimacy and attractiveness of a given idea or concept strongly depends on the availability of past rationalizations of this idea within the economics discourse – regardless of the quality or usefulness of the underlying idea in question. If such a routine applies, the relative ‘superiority’ of economics in terms of citation-trade balances – as mentioned by Wolfers (2010) in our introductory quotation – is not to be explained by a higher quality of research outputs, but rather by a higher degree of group-think within the economics profession. Yet again, we find that the two ways of looking at and interpreting citation data lead us to very different implications.

As the interpretation offered here – that the framing of an idea in a mainstream economic context raises its legitimacy within the economic field – makes use of a cognitive approach to citation data, it can be challenged from an alternative perspective focusing on an evaluative use of the very same data. What if, economists do not primarily ‘legitimize’, but rather ‘improve’ ideas taken from other disciplines and, hence, manage to achieve higher citation statistics by providing a superior treatment of the underlying subject? While arguments of this kind have motivated the introduction of a control group in Figure 9, they also point to a broader stream of argument, namely that research outside of the dominant economic approach is per se of inferior quality – no matter, whether it originates from within our outside of economics.

In further assessing this possibility – that contributions outside the dominant paradigm are generally of less quality – we suggest to inspect the second-order effect arising from heterodox linkages in the mainstream economic literature. Specifically, we compare the performance of individual contributions in terms of citation impact between two distinct groups of mainstream economic papers. In the first group we collect all those articles that do not cite any heterodox literature at all, whereas the second group considers all those mainstream economic papers that

actually do cite heterodox articles. In short, we compare the ‘performance’ of mainstream papers ignoring heterodoxy altogether with those mainstream papers, which do consider at least one paper published in a heterodox outlet. Our underlying hypothesis is that, if heterodox research is indeed of lower intrinsic quality than mainstream research, also those papers within the mainstream literature that refer to and build on heterodox ideas should exhibit lower quality and, hence, less citation impact. In doing so, we actually test the evaluative view on citation data for its internal consistency: as this view attributes lower quality to heterodox publications based on their citation impact, we would argue that mainstream research referring to these heterodox works of low quality, will receive less attention than those papers, which abstain from making such references. If, on the other hand, openness to heterodoxy and citation impact are statistically unrelated, it is more plausible to assume that the relative neglect of heterodox contribution is driven by prejudice, group-membership and associated stereotypes.

In empirically assessing this question we make again use of the large-scale sample introduced in Figure 9. As already indicated we focus solely on mainstream economic journals and divide all the papers published in these journals into two groups: those, which make at least one reference to heterodox journals, and those, which do not. In our sample, the former group comprises roughly 11.5% of all papers, whereas the latter group makes up the rest of the sample. The left panel of Figure 10 plots our core result and shows the relative increase or decrease in citation impact for those articles incorporating heterodox references across all journals. It indicates that, although the specific impact of heterodox references varies considerably across our sample, the average impact of these papers is roughly equal to their pure-mainstream counterparts (average impact increases by 0,005 citations for papers referencing heterodox work). The right panel of Figure 10 analyzes the robustness of this relationship with regard to the number of heterodox articles referenced and shows that the asserted relationship does not break down, but rather, that a higher number of heterodox references makes papers more attractive in future work. Against this backdrop, it seems, thus, difficult to sustain a purely evaluative interpretation of the patterns illustrated in Figures 9 and 10, as the allegedly lower quality of heterodox reference does not translate into a lower citation impact for those mainstream papers, which make use of these sources.




Figure 10: The impact of heterodox references in mainstream articles on future reception of articles (data from 1969 to 2013)

In turn, these findings imply that the differences in ‘terms of trade between economics and all these other disciplines’ are not driven by the ‘superiority’, but

rather by the ‘insularity’ of standard economics. It’s effectively not about export performance; it is, rather, all about openness for importing novel ideas.

5. Conclusion

Most scientometric studies up to now are mainly committed to a certain perspective – either cognitive or evaluative – which in turn frames our understanding of the relevant data and has a strong imprint on the interpretation of results and the lessons drawn from these outcomes. In this paper we use the peculiar case of economics as an example for illustrating the partially stark differences arising from this two competing points of view.

In this paper we have shown how citation patterns in current economics systematically differ from patterns found in other disciplines. We suggested explaining these differences with reference to specific characteristics of economics, namely that economics exhibits a more intense disciplinary stratification (leading to and reinforcing concentration of attention within economics), that economists show greater awareness for institutional incentives (leading to reactive citation behavior) and, finally, that economics is a contested discipline dominated by a single approach (leading to a lack of openness for external inputs). While we found that the data does really provide some support to these arguments, all of these findings can be subjected to different interpretations. Higher concentration of attention might be due to more precise instruments for detecting the quality of manuscripts before publication, what seems like reactivity might be emerging from an invisible shift in patterns of quality in the underlying literature and openness and ignorance in economic thinking might simply reflect differences in quality located at the level of more fundamental ideas. While we pointed to some complications arising from the latter view when it comes to maintaining consistency across different applications, our main message in this regard is to think carefully about one’s preconceptions on what citations really signify, because, as we have shown, these preconceptions eventually determine, which results are to be expected from such an exercise.

References

- Abatemarco, A. & Dell’Anno, R. 2012. ‘The Italian Reform of the academic recruitment system: an appraisal of ANVUR and CUN benchmarks for assessing candidates and commissioners.’ *Rivista Italiana degli Economisti* 3: 441-480.
- Aistleitner, M., Kapeller, J. & S. Steinerberger. 2016. ‘The Power of Scientometrics and the Development of Economics.’ ICAE Working Paper (Johannes Kepler University Linz), no.46, March 2016.
- Akerlof, G. A. & R. E. Kranton. 2000. ‘Economics and Identity.’ *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* CXV, no. 3: 715-753.
- Arrow, K. J., Bernheim, B. D., Feldstein, M. S., McFadden, D. L., Poterba, J. M., & R. M. Solow. 2011. ‘100 Years of the American Economic Review: The Top 20 Articles.’ *The American Economic Review* 101, no. 1: 1-8.
- Ashforth, B. E. & F. Mael. 1989. ‘Social Identity Theory and the Organization.’ *The Academy of Management Review* 14, no. 1: 20-39.

- Attema, A. E., Brouwer W. B. F., & J. Van Exel. 2014. 'Your Right Arm for a Publication in AER?' *Economic Inquiry* 52, no. 1: 495-502.
- Backhouse, R. E. 2005. 'The Rise of Free Market Economics: Economists and the Role of the State since 1970.' *History of Political Economy* 37, no. 5: 355-392.
- Baghestanian, S., & S. V. Popov. 2014. 'Alma mat(t)er(s): Determinants of early career success in economics.' Technical report, Goethe University.
- Bauman, Y., & E. Rose. 2011. 'Selection or indoctrination: Why do economics students donate less than the rest?' *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 79, no. 3: 318-327.
- Bayer, A., & C. E. Rouse. 2016. 'Diversity in the Economics Profession: A New Attack on an Old Problem.' *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30, no. 4: 221-242.
- Bloch, H. 2010. 'Research Evaluation Down Under: An Outsider's View from the Inside of the Australian Approach.' *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 69, no. 5: 1530-1552.
- Card, D., & S. DellaVigna. 'Nine facts about top journals in economics.' *Journal of Economic Literature* 51, no. 1: 144-161.
- Corsi, M., D'Ippoliti, C., & F. Lucidi. 2010. 'Pluralism at Risk? Heterodox Economic Approaches and the Evaluation of Economic Research in Italy.' *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 69, no. 5: 1495-1529.
- Diamond, A. M. 1989. 'The Core Journals of Economics.' *Current Contents*, 1: 4-11.
- Dobusch, L. & J. Kapeller 2009. 'Why is Economics not an Evolutionary Science? New Answers to Veblen's old Question.' *Journal of Economic Issues* 43, no. 4: 867-898.
- Dobusch, L. & J. Kapeller 2012a: 'Heterodox United vs. Mainstream city? Sketching a framework for interested pluralism in economics.' *Journal of Economic Issues* 46, no. 4: 1035-1057.
- Dobusch, L. & J. Kapeller 2012b: 'A guide to paradigmatic Self-marginalization - Lessons for Post-Keynesian Economists.' *Review of Political Economy* 24, no. 3: 469-487.
- Espeland, W. N. & M. Sauder. 2007. 'Rankings and Reactivity: How Public Measures Recreate Social Worlds.' *American Journal of Sociology* 113, no. 1: 1-40.
- Etzioni, A. 2015. 'The Moral Effects of Economic Teaching.' *Sociological Forum* 30, no. 1: 228-233.
- Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. 2005. 'Economics language and assumptions: How theories can become self-fulfilling.' *Academy of Management Review* 30, no. 1: 8-24.
- Fourcade, M., Ollion, E., & Y. Algan. 2015. 'The superiority of economists.' *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 29, no. 1: 89-114.
- Frank, R. H., Gilovich, T., & Regan, D. T. 1993. 'Does Studying Economics Inhibit Cooperation?' *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 7, no. 2: 159-171.
- Frank, R. H., Gilovich, T. D., & Regan, D. T. 1996. 'Do Economists Make Bad Citizens?' *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 10, no. 1: 187-192.
- Frey, B. S., Pommerehne, W. W., & Gygi, B. 1993. 'Economics Indoctrination or Selection? Some Empirical Results.' *The Journal of Economic Education* 24, no. 3: 271-281.

- Fusfeld, D. R. 1956. 'The Program of the American Economic Association Meetings.' *The American Economic Review* 46, no. 4: 642-644.
- Ghoshal, S. (2005). 'Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices.' *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4, no. 1: 75–91.
- Gingras Y., & C. Schinckus. 2012. 'The Institutionalization of Econophysics in the Shadow of Physics.' *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 34, no. 1: 109-130.
- Graves, P. E., Marchand, J. R., & R. Thompson. 1982. 'Economics Departmental Rankings: Research Incentives, Constraints, and Efficiency.' *The American Economic Review* 72, no. 5: 1131-1141.
- Glötzl, F., & E. Aigner. 2015. 'Pluralism in the Market of Science? A citation network analysis of economic research at universities in Vienna.' *Ecological Economic Papers*, 5. WU Vienna University of Economics and Business, Vienna
- Hamermesh, D. S. 2015. 'Citations in Economics: Measurement, Uses and Impacts.' NBER Working Paper Nr. 21754.
- Han, S.-K. 2003. 'Tribal regimes in academia: a comparative analysis of market structure across disciplines.' *Social Networks* 25: 251-280.
- Haucap, J., & J. Muck. 2015. 'What Drives the Relevance and Reputation of Economics Journals? An Update from a Survey among Economists.' *Scientometrics* 103, no. 3: 849–877.
- Hodgson, G. M., & H. Rothman. 1999. 'The editors and authors of economics journals: a case of institutional oligopoly?' *Economic Journal* 109, no. 453: F165-F186.
- Høyland, B., Moene, K., & F. Willumsen. 2008. 'Be careful when Doing Business.' Report commissioned by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Kapeller, J. 2010. 'Citation Metrics: Serious drawbacks, perverse incentives and strategic options for heterodox economics.' *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 69, no. 5: 1376-1408.
- Kalaitzidakis, P., Mamuneas, T. P., & T. Stengos. 2011. 'An Updated Ranking of Academic Journals in Economics.' *Canadian Journal of Economics* 44, no. 4: 1525-1538.
- Kim, E. H., Morse, A., & L. Zingales. 2006. 'What Has Mattered to Economics Since 1970.' *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20, no. 4: 189-202.
- King, J. E. 2003. *A History of Post-Keynesian Economics since 1936*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Kuhn, T. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Laband, David N. 2013. 'On the use and abuse of economics journal rankings.' *The Economic Journal* 123: F223-F254.
- Larivière, V. & Y. Gingras. 2010. 'The Impact Factor's Matthew Effect: A Natural Experiment in Bibliometrics.' *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 61, no. 2: 424-427.
- Larivière, V., Gingras, Y., & Archambault, É. 2009. 'The decline in the concentration of citations, 1900–2007.' *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 60, no. 4: 858–862.

- Lazear, E. 2000. 'Economic Imperialism.' *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 115, no. 1: 99-146.
- Lee, F. S. 2007. 'The Research Assessment Exercise, the state and the dominance of mainstream economics in British universities.' *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 31, no. 2: 309-325.
- Lee, F. S., & B. C. Cronin. 2010. 'Research Quality Rankings of Heterodox Economic Journals in a Contested Discipline.' *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 69, no. 5: 1409-1452.
- Lee, F. S., & W. Elsner. 2011. *Evaluating Economic Research in a Contested Discipline: Ranking, Pluralism, and the Future of Heterodox Economics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Leijonhufvud, A. 1973. 'Life among the Econ.' *Economic Inquiry* 11, no. 3: 327-337.
- Liebowitz, S. J., & J. P. Palmer. 1984. 'Assessing the Relative Impacts of Economics Journals.' *Journal of Economic Literature* XXII: 77-88.
- Mcdonald, S. & J. Kam. 2007. 'Ring a Ring o' Roses: Quality Journals and Gamesmanship in Management Studies.' *Journal of Management Studies* 44, no. 4: 640-655.
- Medoff, M. H. 2006. 'Evidence of a Harvard and Chicago Matthew Effect.' *Journal of Economic Methodology* 13, no. 4: 485-506.
- Merton, R. K. 1968. 'The Matthew Effect in Science.' *Science* 159, no. 3810: 56-63.
- Mingers, J. & L. Leydesdorff. 2015. 'A review of theory and practice in scientometrics.' *European Journal of Operational Research* 246: 1-19.
- Mirowski, P. 1989. *More heat than light*. Cambridge University Press.
- Moed, H. F., Colledge, L., Reedijk, J., Moya-Anegón, F., Guerrero-Bote, V., Plume, A., & M., Amin. 2012. 'Citation-based metrics are appropriate tools in journal assessment provided that they are accurate and used in an informed way.' *Scientometrics* 92: 367-376.
- Nature. 2010. 'How to improve the use of metrics.' *Nature* 465, no. 7300: 870-872. doi:10.1038/465870a.
- Necker, S. 2014. 'Scientific Misbehavior in Economics.' *Research Policy* 43, no. 10: 1747-1759. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2014.05.002.
- Pieters, R., & H. Baumgartner. 2002. 'Who Talks to Whom? Intra- and Interdisciplinary Communication of Economics Journals.' *Journal of Economic Literature* 40, no. 2: 483-509.
- Price, D. J. De Solla. 1965. 'Networks of Scientific Papers.' *Science* 149, no. 3683: 510-515.
- Rafols, I., Leydesdorff, L., O'Hare, A., Nightingale, P., & A. Stirling. 2012. 'How journal rankings can suppress interdisciplinary research: A comparison between Innovation Studies and Business & Management.' *Research Policy* 41: 1262-1282.
- Rip, A., & J. Courtial. 1984. 'Co-Words Maps in Biotechnology: An Example of Cognitive Scientometrics.' *Scientometrics* 6, no. 6: 381-400.
- Samuelson, P. A. 1972. 'Maximum Principles in Analytical Economics.' *The American Economic Review* 62, no. 3: 249-262.

- Stern, D. I. 2013. 'Uncertainty Measures for Economics Journal Impact Factors.' *Journal of Economic Literature* 51, no. 1: 173-189.
- Tajfel, H. 1974. 'Social identity and intergroup behaviour.' *Social Science Information* 13, no. 2: 65-93.
- Torgler, B. & Piatti, M. 2013. *A century of American Economic Review*. London: Palgrave.
- Tsay, M.-H. 2009. 'An analysis and comparison of scientometric data between journals of physics, chemistry and engineering.' *Scientometrics* 78, no. 2: 279–293.
- Wallace, M. L., Larivière, V., & Gingras, Y. 2012. 'A Small World of Citations? The Influence of Collaboration Networks on Citation Practices.' *PLoS ONE* 7, no. 3, e33339.
- Wilhite, A. & E. A. Fong. 2012. 'Coercive Citation in Academic Publishing.' *Science* 335, no. 6086: 542-543.
- Willmott, H. 2011. 'Journal list fetishism and the perversion of scholarship: reactivity and the ABS list.' *Organization* 18, no. 4: 429-442.
- Wolfers, J. 2010. Interview in Region Focus, Second Quarter 2010, Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, online available at https://www.richmondfed.org/~media/richmondfedorg/publications/research/region_focus/2010/q2/pdf/interview.pdf (accessed 13.03.2017).
- Wu, S. 2007. 'Recent publishing trends at the AER, JPE and QJE.' *Applied Economics Letters* 14, no. 1: 59-63.
- Yezer, A. M., Goldfarb, R. S., & Poppen, P. J. (1996). 'Does Studying Economics Discourage Cooperation? Watch What We Do, Not What We Say or How We Play.' *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, no. 1, 177–186.
- Zimmermann, C. 2013. 'Academic Rankings with RePEc.' *Econometrics* 1: 249-280.