Waldenström, Daniel

Working Paper
Should Swedish economic history pay more attention to historical economics?


Provided in Cooperation with:
EFI - The Economic Research Institute, Stockholm School of Economics


This Version is available at:
http://hdl.handle.net/10419/56196

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.
Is Swedish Research in Economic History Internationally Integrated?

First version: October 10, 2004
This version: August 12, 2005.

Daniel Waldenström
Department of Economics
Stockholm School of Economics
Box 6501, SE-11383 Stockholm
Daniel.Waldenstrom@hhs.se

Abstract

This paper presents empirical evidence of the international integration of Swedish economic historians. Contrary to the claims of a recent national evaluation of the discipline, the Swedish shares of international publications and conference presentations are robustly below available cross-country and cross-discipline benchmarks. Also considering levels of research inputs, the relative underperformance of the Swedish field is alarming. Four main explanations to this situation are forwarded: 1) Being among the largest economic history communities in the world, Sweden has become self-sufficient and almost independent of the international arena. 2) The dominating research language is Swedish. 3) The dominating publication format is monographs (in Swedish). 4) Swedish economic historians are reluctant to use modern economic theories and statistical analysis to complement the traditionally dominant qualitative research methods.
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1 Introduction

During 2002–2003 a commission appointed by the Swedish Agency for Higher Education (Högskoleverket) conducted a comprehensive evaluation of economic history in Sweden.1 Its primary objective was to audit the quality of the educational programs at Swedish universities, but the evaluation commission also made several judgments about the quality of the research in the discipline. It described the research in highly positive terms as being of “high international standards” as shown by the “very high activity at international conferences and in international publications since the 1960’s”.2 This favorable characterization influenced the Agency’s official comments and the University Chancellor’s final statement about the overall status of the discipline.3

A closer look at the evidence underlying the claims of the commission revealed, however, an almost complete lack of empirical backing of any kind. The commission presents no compilations of international publications or cites other studies that contain such. While this lack of empirical evidence is remarkable, any conclusions from that about the true output levels cannot be drawn. These unfounded claims are though cited uncritically by the highest public authority for the quality supervision of Swedish university education and this easily make them the “working truth” among academic scholars, students and policymakers for a long time.

The purpose of this study is to fill this information gap by presenting comprehensive data on the international publication and conference activities of Swedish economic historians from 1970 to the present. To my knowledge, this evidence has never before been systematically compiled or analyzed before. Following the explicit focus in the national evaluation, I only examine the output Swedish economic historians active at Swedish economic history departments, leaving out the Swedish researchers active in other disciplines (predominantly in economics) that have published in international economic history journals and books. My analysis starts with a count of article authorship in eighteen of the largest international economic history journals, covering more than 9200 articles, which consti-

---

1 The evaluation commission consisted of the following Nordic scholars: Lars Engwall (chair), Per Boje, Kristine Bruland, Riita Hjerppe, Hans Christian Johansen, Eva Lindgren and Daniel Nyberg.
3 Utvärdering av ämnet ekonomisk historia pp. 5 and 9.
stitute the bulk of (mostly) peer-reviewed international economic history research. Publication in any of these journals is therefore the single most important evidence of internationally viable research production. To broaden the assessment, I also examine journal publications in other fields such as history, economics, sociology, political sciences as well as the complete list of all international publications (journal articles, books and chapters in books) by the 40 currently active professors and associate professors of economic history at Swedish universities. Conference participation is examined by checking the programs of 23 large international economic history conferences in recent years. 

To put the observed output shares into perspective, I compare them with other countries, especially the Nordic ones and the U.K. and the U.S., and with other Swedish academic disciplines. Most of these comparisons are based on newly assembled information due to the general lack of benchmark data from previous studies.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the methods used, data and some important methodological problems. Sections 3 and 4 present the findings for publications and conference attendance, respectively. In section 5, all results are related to various benchmarks. Section 6 offers some explanations to the observed patterns. Section 7 concludes.

2 Method, data and problems

The overall empirical method used in this study is counting the number of appearances of Swedish economic historians in either various international journals and books or as presenters at conferences. These numbers are then compared with their equivalents for other Nordic and foreign economic historians or scholars in other academic disciplines. Citations and other impact-related data are left out of the analysis since they are only available for a small amount of publications in the field.

To qualify the analyses, I classify the journals and books in groups to roughly distinguish between higher and lower ranked publications. The economic history journals are divided into one “top-4” group and one “others” group based on available rankings and listings (see further below). Books and book chapters are similarly classified in three groups: “ranked international”, “other international” and “Swedish” (mostly university-
associated publishers). I define the first group generously by including publications at Cambridge, Oxford and MIT University Presses, Edward Elgar (not reprints in the “Reference Collection” series), Routledge, Sage, Kluwer, Macmillan and Springer. Given the broad subject nature of economic history research, I also broaden the journal coverage by including several journals from other academic disciplines in human, natural and social sciences. I define journal articles as including shorter papers and comments but not debate articles, conference proceedings, book reviews or editorial notes as articles. I also separate between non-invited and invited articles, which are basically two different kinds of publications. Co-authorship is weighted when possible by giving an author \( \frac{1}{n} \) publications for articles with \( n-1 \) co-authors. The Appendix lists all journal articles (both invited and non-invited) by Swedish and Nordic economic historians for the period 1970–2004.

Data on international journal publications come to a large extent from the well-known Science Citation Index, Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) and Arts and Humanities Citation Index. These databases contain primarily English-written journals and cover the period since 1986. Unfortunately they do not cover most economic history journals, why the bulk of my data (including books and book chapters by Swedish faculty members) are collected manually from other disparate sources.

Some problems with the analysis need special attention. First, it is well-known that most journal article databases are dominated by English-written publications largely ignoring the sizeable literature in other languages (e.g., French or German). Although this study indeed predominantly examines publications in English, the journal sample actually contains several journals that either belong to a clearly non-English sphere or are simply not

---

4 These were the publication houses that appeared in the Swedish data, but naturally there are other university presses and private publishers belonging to the high-ranked group, but Swedes never published there.
5 Invited articles in special issues can at times be preceded by more restrictive and critical selection procedure than non-invited articles in normal issues, but the opposite is arguably the more typical case.
7 Sources were Econlit (EBSCOhost), LIBRIS (the Swedish library catalogue), homepages of journals, departments and scholars as well as the internet sites of Stuart Jenks and Dieter Rübsamen (eds.) Magazine stacks at http://www.phil.uni-erlangen.de/~p1ges/zihm/zihm_na.html and Istituto internazionale di storia economica “Francesco Datini” at http://www.istitutodatini.it/biblio/riviste/htm/elenco.htm (both on 2005-03-04).
written in English.\textsuperscript{9} Besides, nothing in my coverage of all non-Swedish publications of Swedish higher faculty (section 3.4 below) indicates a structural propensity to publish relatively more in non-English foreign languages. Finally, recent bibliometric research shows that scholars from small countries with English as second language (i.e., Nordic scholars) are relatively well represented in the English speaking literature, both in science and many social sciences.\textsuperscript{10}

A second problem concerns the dominant focus on journal articles, especially in databases such as SSCI, while books and chapters in books receive much less attention. According to recent estimates by Diana Hicks, books may comprise about 50\% of the relevant literature in social and human sciences. This suggests severe sample selection biases when evaluating total output based on only article sources.\textsuperscript{11} In my study, I try to circumvent parts of this problem by examining the all publications of the higher faculty in Sweden. Moreover, if publication patterns within disciplines are the same across countries, my output shares for economic history are not affected by this problem at all. Hicks and others also note that the increasing globalization of social science research steadily increases the share of articles over books, which means that the articles databases become more and more representative.\textsuperscript{12}

Thirdly, merely presenting output numbers and shares without linking them to impact-related information or measures of inputs (number of faculty, size of research budgets etc) makes interpretation difficult. Due to a lack of data for all journals outside the Thomson ISI universe this problem cannot be solved without massive database building efforts. I do incorporate some reference points in terms of publications by foreign economic historians and other Swedish scholars and section 5 also presents some tentative input estimates of both Swedish economic history and economics. One must though bear

\textsuperscript{9} As for economic history journals, both Journal of European Economic History and History of Economic Ideas are published in Italy and clearly dominated by Italian authors. The history journal sample (from SSCI) contains the French Mouvement Social and the German Zeitgeschichte.

\textsuperscript{10} See Sandelin and Sarafoglou, Language and scientific publication, and Ingwersen, Peter “The international viability and citation impact of Scandinavian research articles in selected Social Science fields: The decay of a myth”, Scientometrics, vol. XLIX, 2000:1, 39–61.

\textsuperscript{11} Hicks, Diana “The difficulty of achieving full coverage of international social science literature and the bibliometric consequences”, Scientometrics, vol. XL, 1999:2, 193–215.

in mind that this study is a first attempt to explore and analyze Swedish and international research production in economic history.

The fourth problem is to adequately evaluate past research carried out under different historical contexts and institutional prerequisites. In the Swedish case, much of the research in economic history was conducted under large-scale projects run by a few leading professors. These projects primarily aimed at exploring central themes and institutions in Sweden’s industrialization such as the iron industry (in the so-called “Fagersta project”) or the standard of living (in the “the Welfare project”). Counting the number of international journal articles produced by these projects could be a problematic evaluation method if these projects never aimed at publishing abroad at all. On the other hand, already the founding father of Swedish economic history, Eli F. Heckscher, published actively in international economics and economic history journals in the 1930’s and 1940’s. Judging from his undisputed reputation among past and present economic historians that was hardly a neglected or disrespected publication alternative.

3 International publications by Swedish economic historians

3.1 Articles in the “top-4” economic history journals

Among the most important arenas for international economic history publications are the large international journals with a general subject focus. Based on the available citation-based journal rankings I have selected the following four journals with such focus for a group called “top-4”: *Journal of Economic History* (JEH), run by the Economic History Association in the U.S.; *Explorations in Economic History* (EEH), published by Elsevier; *Economic History Review* (EHR) run by the Economic History Society in the U.K. and *European Review of Economic History* (EREH), run by the European Historical Economics Society. The first three have long publishing traditions and always appear in the top group of economic history journals. Several persons have advocated EREH as a strong contestant in recent years. Since it is also publishing all sub-fields I include it in this top group as well. Note that the selection relies on an economics-based ranking and

---


using a more history-related ranking (if such one exists) could well include other journals (but also most of the ones in the “top-4”).

The results for Sweden and the other Nordic countries are shown in Figure 1 and 2 and Table 1 and 2. At a first glimpse, the absence of publications in the 1970’s and 1980’s for all Nordic countries and also the 1990’s for Sweden is remarkable. Over the entire period since 1970 Swedes wrote 8.33 of the more than 3,800 non-invited articles in the “top-4” journals, representing 0.22%. Including invited articles does not change this result (the share is 0.24%). The other Nordic countries, primarily Denmark and Norway, wrote 19 (0.5%) non-invited articles. The situation improved in the late 1990’s, particularly thanks to the launching of EREH. Swedish output shares in 1998–2004 increased to 1.07% (1.23%) whereas other Nordic scholars wrote 1.9% (not disclosed in the table).

Table 2 presents an explicit comparison for many Western countries for 1986–2004 both counting the “top-4” shares and when the Business History Review and Business History (also in SSCI) are also included. Only for the “top-4”, the Swedish share is 0.6% whereas Denmark (0.5%), Norway (0.3%) and Finland (0.1%) have smaller shares. Anglo-Saxon countries, particularly the U.S. the U.K., vastly outperform all others while continental Europe lags behind. Adding the business history journals flattens the distribution somewhat, but not significantly. Overall, these figures confirm the bibliometric findings of Sandelin and Sarafoglou in their analysis of article authorship and nationality.

3.2 Swedish articles in other economic history journals

The Swedish output in other international economic history journals besides the “top-4” group modifies the picture somewhat. The journals are selected to cover most sub-fields, e.g., history of economic ideas, financial history, business history, labor history or transport history, and it is my impression that they represent some of the most well-known journals in all of economic history. Adding journals would perhaps improve the representativity but it would not affect the analysis of the Swedish output shares, if so probably only downward. Included in this group are also the two Scandinavian journals, Scandinavian Economic History Review (SEHR) and Economy and History (EH, ceased in

---

15 See, e.g., Clausen, Aage R. “Social Science History: Citation Record, 1976–1985”, Social Science History, vol. XII, 1988:2, 197–215, showing that the SSCI-based journal rankings of “History of Social Sciences” and “History” contain quite different journals.
16 Sandelin and Sarafoglou, Language and scientific publication.
1980), which both publish articles from all sub-fields. They were at times explicitly aiming to publish predominantly Nordic research.

Table 1 lists the Swedish output in the eighteen economic history journals in the full sample (including the “top-4”) divided on two time periods, 1970–2004 and 1998–2004, and between excluding and including special issues. Over the longer period, Swedes wrote 0.28% of all non-invited articles and 0.54% of all articles, disregarding SEHR and EH. In the recent period, these shares were 0.48% and 0.41%, respectively, which indicates both an increased activity over time but also that many publications before 1998 appeared in special issues. Comparing the output shares in different sub-fields, the history of economic ideas-field seems to be the most active one whereas business history produced above average only over the long period and when including special issues (and not at all when the all-Swedish Business History issue in 1993 is excluded). These results, however, are driven by a change in only a handful of articles which is too small numbers for allowing firm conclusions to be drawn. The two Scandinavian journals represent, as expected, vast outliers both in terms of number and share of Swedish articles. There is no tendency of increasing shares. A somewhat surprising fact, however, is that Swedes only wrote a sixth of all SEHR articles since 1970 despite that roughly 95% of all SEHR’s articles during this period were written by Nordic scholars.

### 3.3 Swedish articles in the journals of other disciplines

Since economic historians often relate their research to various neighboring academic disciplines, it is reasonable to search for articles by Swedish economic historians in other field journals. Specifically, I first examine the 28 journals listed in SSCI’s two categories “History” and “History of Social Sciences” between 1986 and 2004. Of the in total 8,543 articles in these journals, 29 (0.34%) were written by Swedish scholars and of them 3 (0.04%) were by economic historians. When I add the coverage of four journals in which I knew beforehand that Swedish economic historians had published in, the shares increase to 1.06% and 0.14%, respectively.17 Finally, searching in all other human, natural and social science journals in the entire Thomson ISI databases, I found 20 articles by Swedish economic historians, primarily in economics and medicine journals. These searches clearly shows no signs of relatively large publication activity of Swedish eco-

---

17 All journals are listed on the Thomson ISI homepage. The four added journals are *Continuity and Change, Journal of Family History, Scandinavian Journal of History* and *Technology and Culture.*
nomic historians in journals outside their core field, which I interpret as corroborating the overall findings of the study.

### 3.4 International publications by current Swedish professors

Based on the well-known critique of the journal article-bias prevalent in the SSCI and other similar sources, this section analyzes all international publications (articles as well as books and book chapters) of the 40 current professors and associate professors (*docent*) of economic history at Swedish universities. The group is selected for practical reasons but it naturally is biasing the results to pick the arguably most productive subset of scholars. Table 3 presents the results in aggregate form.

On average, Swedish higher faculty have published 2.35 non-invited, refereed articles throughout their career (0.90+1.17+0.28) which when dividing by the number of years as a graduated scholar (second last row) gives 0.14 articles per year, i.e., one article every 7 years (*including* articles in SEHR and EH). Adding invited articles in “special issues” does not change this picture (with numbers 2.85 and 0.17, respectively) and counting medians give even lower numbers. Including non-edited books and chapters in books (including editorial introductions) increases the average annual output per year as Ph.D. to 0.36 (with median 0.24), corresponding to one international publication every three (four) years.

The distribution of publications across faculty is significantly skewed towards the top end, meaning that there is a small group of scholars with relatively many publications whereas several have not a single one in some categories. Furthermore, the parentheses in the right column of Table 3 show that ten scholars (nine when including special issue-articles) have never published an international journal article whereas four of them have never published internationally at all in their entire career!

### 4 Swedish activity at international economic history conferences

Participating in the international research community also concerns attending and organizing conferences. Based on the claim of the evaluation commission that Swedish eco-

---

18 The sample is based on lists at departmental web pages at the universities of Gothenburg, Linköping, Lund, Stockholm, Umeå, Uppsala and SLU (in Ultuna) and Stockholm School of Economics.

19 The skewness of the average publications across scholars is 1.848, corresponding to 4.4 “standard errors of skewness”. This confirms that a few large observations at the top end greatly dominate the average.
nomic historians have since long been highly active at international conferences, this section examines conference programs from 23 large international conferences in recent years, counting the number of papers presented by Swedish, (non-Swedish) Nordic and (non-Nordic) European scholars. The sample was selected to span both general meetings and most sub-fields, both in the Americas and Europe. Local Swedish or Nordic meetings were left out since their focus is purely local and attract exclusively domestic scholars presenting in local languages.20

According to the results in Table 4, Swedes wrote 31 (1.7%) of the 1811 papers presented but only in 7 of the 23 conferences examined. Scholars from the other Nordic countries presented 2.8% of all papers and other Europeans presented 50%. This last number also shows that the sample seems fairly balanced between the two continents in terms of participant nationalities. Not disclosed in the table, but still notable, is that almost all Swedish papers were written by faculty, suggesting even lower participation rates for Swedish graduate students which is worrisome in the long run.

5 Relating the output shares with others and with input levels

To be able to interpret the descriptive statistics presented thus far as being “high” or “low”, one must relate them to some kind of benchmarks or input measures for other countries and/or disciplines. This section does this in two steps: first by comparing them with world output shares of other Swedish disciplines and then by relating them to input levels and comparing both U.K. and U.S. economic history and with Swedish economics. At the first step, recent figures from the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet) shows that Swedish scientific publications as shares of the total European output in the 1980’s and 90’s was for social sciences about 3.5%–4%, medicine 7%–8% and technology 4%–5%.21 Economic history was not presented separately, but using the data underlying Tables 1 and 2 shows an increase from 0% in the 1980’s to about 1%–2% in the late 1990’s. Another source is Thomson ISI’s National Science Indicators which recently presented data on Swedish shares of the world journal articles during 1999–2003.22 Swe-

20 Naturally, these local meetings may still fulfill many important duties within the local context. According to Ulf Olsson they attract many scholars (Olsson, Fluctuat nec mergitur, p. 81).
21 The Swedish share of social science publications by Western European countries were around 4% during this period, and with the U.S. this should be approximately half that level (Vetenskapsrådet, En stark grundforskning för Sverige.Vetenskapsrådets forskningsstrategi 2005–2008, Stockholm, 2004, pp. 14f).
den’s overall share was 2.03% and among the few disciplines presented separately, immunology had the lead with 3.60%, economics and business had 1.86%, and social sciences had 1.79%. Again economic history was not presented separately, but if one only takes the economic history journals in the SSCI databases also examined here in Table 1 (i.e., BH, BHR, EEH, EHR and JEH), the Swedish share is 0.46% (2 of 432). When considering all economic history journals in Table 1, for the slightly longer period 1998–2004, the shares are 1.47% (1.34%) or 0.71% (0.69%) depending on whether SEHR and only non-invited (all) articles are counted. Note that none of these studies included human sciences but if that was done their output shares would surely have been even lower than those of economic history. Altogether, when comparing output shares with other countries and scientific disciplines, Swedish economic history is a little or much below the rest of the social science community (but maybe not below many of the human sciences), regardless of time period and sample size.

Turning to research inputs, perhaps the most relevant way to assess relative research performance, I use two of the most relevant measures of inputs: numbers of practicing scholars (with a Ph.D.) and sizes of research funds (in annual budgets) and compare the first of them with U.K. and the U.S. economic history and both with Swedish economics. Swedish economic history has today 126 researchers with a Ph.D. at economic history departments.23 The three largest are Uppsala, Lund and Stockholm with about 30 scholars each. At the most recent Swedish national economic history meeting in 2003, 73 papers were presented and about 120 participants were registered.24 As for the U.K., I have not found aggregate numbers of all economic historians active at the universities, but looking at the three largest economic history departments, LSE tops with 18 researchers with a Ph.D., followed by Glasgow with 16 and Edinburgh with 14. The EHS conference in 2003 had 76 papers (including student papers) and about 220 participants.25 Hence, Swedish economic history is almost as large as in the U.K. and U.S. in terms of department size (the three largest economic

23 This listing also includes Linköping University and Stockholm School of Economics.
24 I thank Joakim Appelquist at Lund University for supplying me with these numbers.
25 These numbers were collected from the conference organizers directly.
history departments in the world are probably Swedish!) and number of practicing scholars (in seven Swedish departments there are almost 1.5 times more economic historians than in 50 high-ranked U.S. economics departments!). Naturally, some of these numbers are not perfectly comparable (e.g., the meetings vary in frequency). Still, it is my conjecture that if one would take any other European country, in particular another Nordic one, the relative size of Sweden would stand out even stronger.

In a comparison with Swedish economics departments, the picture is roughly the same. There are 254 graduated economists at the large universities, which is about twice as many as equivalent economic historians. Similarly, looking at the research financing received in three large universities in 2003, economic history got about half as much total funding as did economics.\textsuperscript{26} Publicly available publication statistics of international journal articles and non-Swedish working papers from the same departments show that the economics departments produced more than 20 times the output of economic history department, despite enjoying only 2 times the relevant inputs (funding and number of scholars).

6 Explaining the observed patterns

So far the paper has dealt with compiling, presenting and comparing empirical data and the main message is that the past international research output of Swedish economic historians is low, both internationally and domestically. The next step is to understand why this arguably undesirable situation has emerged. In the following, I present four explanations that all describe how the incentives of Swedish economic historians are tilted towards writing thick books, free from explicit economic modeling or econometrics, for a local, history-dominated readership. Most of these explanations are coupled with supportive empirical evidence.

a) Abundant research resources: As already argued at length, Swedish economic history is a well-supplied discipline in terms of both absolute and relative financial resources for research.\textsuperscript{27} Ulf Olsson argues that two important explanations for this relative abundance

\textsuperscript{26} I only found complete statistics for the universities of Stockholm, Umeå and Uppsala. The comparisons concern unweighted averages of the ratio economic history/economics (0.45 for internal (i.e., university) funding, 1.80 for external (foundation) funding and 0.60 for total funding).

\textsuperscript{27} The extremely successful track record in attracting funding is discussed by the evaluation commission (\textit{Utvärdering av ämnet ekonomisk historia}, pp. 47–48).
are a long-standing political support from social democratic government authorities throughout sympathizing with this “progressive” academic discipline and also that many economic historians, while trying to survive outside the established core subjects, have developed “considerable expertise in applying for external funds to finance research projects and secure the own livelihood”. In terms of research output, the Swedish relative wealth has allowed the discipline to become nationally self-sufficient and almost independent of the international arena, which has reduced the incentives to publish in the international journals. Secondly, along successes in fund raising comes a diminished competitive pressure within the rich field, which also could lead to lower research output.

b) Writing in a local language (Swedish): Although Swedish history may be most easily written in Swedish, anyone interested in reaching out beyond the tiny group of local scholars is forced to write in a foreign language. Specifically, English has since decades become the undisputed international science language and since Sweden is a “language taker” on the international research market English is arguably the foreign language to use. Writing in English would then imply no extra costs of translation and re-writing when submitting research papers to international conferences and journals. Despite these advantages, however, Swedish economic historians write predominantly in Swedish as evidenced by the dissertations published since 1970, listed in Table 5. The shares of English-written theses have been about a fourth for the whole time and the listings of ongoing dissertation projects indicate no changes on this issue. Comparing with the neighboring economics field, however, it has gone from equal shares of Swedish- and English-written theses in the 1970’s to being solely written in English today. These different degrees of internationalization and the lack of convergence suggest that economic historians both seem uninterested in and provide little incentives for international publications. This persistent lingual provincialism also risks influencing the choice of research topics, analytical tools or even background literature, which in turn creates a narrow domestic focus and an overall depreciated explanatory power. In a recent study of dissertations in Swedish business administration, education, sociology and psychology, Len-

28 Olsson, Fluctuat nec mergitur, pp. 69, 72.
29 This development is well-known (Ranki, Sinimaaria and Bo Sandelin, “Internationalization or Americanization of Swedish economics”, European Journal of the History of Economic Thought, vol. IV, 1997:2, 248–257.
nart Sjöberg finds a similar lack of lingual provincialism as well as little improvement over time in internationalization for all of them except the last one.\textsuperscript{31} Altogether, the urge to write in local language could well explain much of the low rates of international publications.

c) \textit{Writing monographs}: Examining all 68 Swedish dissertations in economic history finished in 2000–2004 reveals that 87\% were monographs (62\% in Swedish and 25\% in English) and 13\% article collections (3\% in Swedish and 10\% in English). Sjöberg found roughly the same numbers for three of his four analyzed behavioral sciences.\textsuperscript{32} Given the costs of transforming a monograph into separate articles (rewriting, rearranging) the observed numbers indicates another likely reason for the low rates of international publications of Swedish economic history.

d) \textit{Different method and theory approaches}: Swedish economic history was founded by people from the history discipline, which strongly influenced the research approach and methodological focus on qualitative methods, inductive reasoning, source-criticism and so forth.\textsuperscript{33} Today the historical emphasis is evident in Swedish graduate programs in economic history with practically no training in quantitative and economic theoretical skills (apart from some course at the very basic level).\textsuperscript{34} This dominance emanated in the mid-century as the first professors of the field were themselves trained as historians and saw historical “source-criticism” as the most viable empirical approach. In the 1960’s and 1970’s, most Swedish economic historians accordingly dismissed the historical economics, or New Economic History, that Robert Fogel, Douglass North and others started in the U.S. with an emphasized use of economic modeling and econometric testing alongside the traditional qualitative and contextual historical approaches. Besides being critical against what was perceived as a “relaxed attitude to source-criticism”, the Swedish resistance was perhaps most contingent on the strong Marxist currents influencing

\textsuperscript{31} Sjöberg, Lennart “How international is Swedish behavioral science?”, mimeo, Center for Risk Research, Stockholm School of Economics, 2004.

\textsuperscript{32} Sjöberg finds that the share of monograph theses in Business Administration, Education and Sociology were 97\%, 93\% and 88\%, respectively (Sjöberg, How international is Swedish behavioral science?).

\textsuperscript{33} This draws on Olsson, Fluctuat nec mergitur; Olsson, Ulf, Att skriva historia eller pröva teorier? Ett trettioårigt perspektiv på ekonomisk historia i Sverige, Kungl. Vitterhets och Antikvitetets Akademiens Årsbok 1995, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International and Hettné, Björn, Ekonomisk historia i Sverige: En översikt av vetenskaplig produktion och forskningsinkitning, Forskarutbildningen resultat, 1890–1975. UHÅ 1980

\textsuperscript{34} The courses are listed in Utvärdering av ämnet ekonomisk historia, pp. 109ff.
much of the field. The emancipatory ideologies have since the Marxist entry in the 1960’s been an integral part of Swedish economic history.\textsuperscript{35}

The contrast with economic history in many other countries is stark, with much less obvious ideological preconceptions and different balances between economics and history. For example, in the U.S. and Canada the field has since decades been practically equivalent to economics, albeit with much of the context-based historical approaches retained.\textsuperscript{36} The situation in Europe is different with more equal balance between economics and history, although the Europeans publishing most actively in the “top-4” journals in recent years are clearly more of economists than historians. There are also other active strands in European economic history research, e.g., business history, but these scholars are more active in their own specific journals than in the general “top-4” journals. Regardless of the relative activities, however, it is my personal view that many in the younger generations of European economic historians are today increasingly requiring training in economics and quantitative skills.

There is hence a methodological discrepancy between Swedish and much of international economic history, but can it explain the low degree of Swedish international publications? The answer depends partly on which international journals one looks at. For example, in the social or business history journals the need for explicit economic reasoning and use of quantitative analyses may not be acute. Looking at the JEH, EEH, EHR, EREH and some other journals, however, the vast majority of the submitting authors must be able to at least read the historical economics literature, since this is what these journals mostly publish (but far from all the time!). The lack of individual data on journal submissions, acceptance rates and method use makes it unfeasible to fully explore this issue, but of the 8.33 Swedish papers published in the “top-4” journals the majority (6) clearly practices quantitative methods and most of them also explicitly relate to economic concepts.

\textsuperscript{35} Some of these efforts are discussed by Olsson, Fluctuat nec mergitur, pp. 70, 75ff.
Another piece of evidence is that preliminary comparisons across Swedish departments suggest a positive correlation between use of economic theory and quantitative analyses and publications of international journal articles and books.\(^{37}\) Somewhat surprising, Swedes does not seem to be overrepresented in social or business history journals (according to Tables 1 and 2 and section 3.3) despite the comparative advantage (in terms of interest, at least) relative to other countries.\(^{38}\) This finding actually suggests that the effect of methodology on publication behavior across methodologies is a non-linear one. Taken together, both the actual articles published and average output across departments with different method profiles indicates that Swedish economic historians practicing historical economics are more internationally integrated than those vested in other methods. Adding to this the strong dominance of Anglo-Saxon countries in journal publications and the dominance of economics within these countries, there are strong reasons to believe that the documented methodological wedge can explain much of the low Swedish international research output.

Against this background, it seems hard to motivate a continued one-sided methodological focus in Swedish graduate programs that train economic historians as pure historians often leaving them less knowledgeable in economics and statistics than the average undergraduate economist. This system disables them from critically reviewing any advanced quantitative analyses or detecting crucial statistical measurement errors in the writings of other economic historians, and how does this go together with the highly cherished practice of “source-criticism”?\(^{39}\) Recently some Swedish and Nordic economic historians have started to highlight some of these problems, e.g., Lars Magnusson criticizing the arguments underlying people’s unwillingness to learn and use modern economic theory, and similarly Ola H. Grytten arguing for a more active use of quantitative methods alongside the already predominantly used qualitative techniques.\(^{40}\) Proposals to change the current graduate programs to incorporate more of “theory” and quantitative methods

---

37 This statement is based on comparing the output of Swedish higher faculty (same data as underlying Table 3), where the arguably most economics-oriented department, the one in Lund, is clearly above average for Sweden.

38 For business history, this true only when the special issues of BH (especially the all-Swedish 1993 issue) is not counted. If they were, the representation is clearly above average as also shown in Table 2.


have also been forwarded, but whether these attempts signal the start of a groundbreaking reform process or are merely advanced window-dressing remains to be seen.41

7 Concluding remarks

This paper has presented empirical evidence on the international research activities of Swedish economic historians. Contrary to the claims made by the recent national evaluation commission, the Swedish shares of international journal and book publications and conference presentations are clearly below available cross-country and cross-discipline benchmarks. These findings are robust to using either only non-invited or all articles as well as different time periods. When relating the output shares with available measures of research inputs (numbers of active scholars and size of funding) and comparing with foreign economic historians or scholars in other Swedish disciplines, the results are outright alarming as signals of a systematic underperformance and waste of resources.

The study also presents some explanations to these observed patterns. First, a relatively large supply of funding has made the Swedish field basically self-sufficient and almost independent of what is going on at the international arena. Second, there is a clear propensity to write in the local language, Swedish, which both makes it more difficult to submit papers to and signals a clear disinterest in international journals and conferences. Third, a majority of the researchers writes books instead of papers, as evidenced by the composition of dissertations in recent years, which also increases the costs of submissions to journals and conferences. Fourth, and finally, Swedish economic historians receive insufficient training in quantitative methods and economic theory which has made them both unable and probably less motivated to take active part in the scholarly work of foreign economic historians.

At a time when national research budgets are slashed and the competition for funding is sharpened, producing research on the international frontier becomes crucial. Some Swed-

41 Lindgren, Håkan, Scandinavian business history at the end of the 1990s: its prior development, present situation and future, Business History around the World, Amatori, F. and Jones, G. (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2003. It should be noted that although Lindgren does not specify what he means by “theory” but it is probably not only referring to modern economic theory.
ish economic historians already do this today. The established organizations and abundant research resources in place offer Swedish economic history a good chance to become internationally more productive and competitive. Without reformed graduate programs, urges to make people writing papers in English, and an increased use of historical economics, however, this development will not take place – as the historical evidence clearly shows.
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Table 1. Articles by Swedes in international economic history journals, 1970–2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal name</th>
<th>Longer period</th>
<th>Excl. special issues</th>
<th>Incl. special issues</th>
<th>Recent period</th>
<th>Excl. special issues</th>
<th>Incl. special issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Swedish %</td>
<td>Total Swedish %</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Swedish %</td>
<td>Total Swedish %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Economic History</td>
<td>1970-2004</td>
<td>1869 1 0.1</td>
<td>1873 1 0.1</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>334 1 0.3</td>
<td>338 1 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorations in Economic History</td>
<td>1970-2004</td>
<td>730 2 0.3</td>
<td>730 2 0.3</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>124 1 0.8</td>
<td>124 1 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic History Review</td>
<td>1970-2004</td>
<td>1155 0.3</td>
<td>1155 0.3</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>125 0.3</td>
<td>125 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Review of Economic History</td>
<td>1997-2004</td>
<td>113 5 4.4</td>
<td>102 6 5.9</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>101 5 5.0</td>
<td>90 6 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum “top-4”</td>
<td></td>
<td>3867 8.3</td>
<td>3860 9.3</td>
<td>684 7.3</td>
<td>677 8.3</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Business &amp; Financial History</td>
<td>1990-2004</td>
<td>142 0 0.0</td>
<td>218 0 0.0</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>69 0 0.0</td>
<td>103 0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business History</td>
<td>1970-2004</td>
<td>478 0 0.0</td>
<td>666 13 2.0</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>131 0 0.0</td>
<td>166 0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business History Review</td>
<td>1970-2004</td>
<td>536 0 0.0</td>
<td>604 0 0.0</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>91 0 0.0</td>
<td>102 0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy and History (EH)</td>
<td>1970-1980</td>
<td>70 29 41.4</td>
<td>70 29 41.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise &amp; Society</td>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>73 0 0.0</td>
<td>73 0 0.0</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>73 0 0.0</td>
<td>73 0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of the History of Economic Thought</td>
<td>1994-2004</td>
<td>213 2 0.9</td>
<td>244 2 0.8</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>136 1 0.7</td>
<td>136 1 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial History Review</td>
<td>1993-2004</td>
<td>96 0.33 0.3</td>
<td>96 0.33 0.3</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>56 0 0.0</td>
<td>56 0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Economic Ideas</td>
<td>1993-2004</td>
<td>162 0 0.0</td>
<td>246 0 0.0</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>98 0 0.0</td>
<td>131 0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Political Economy</td>
<td>1970-2004</td>
<td>852 3 0.4</td>
<td>1041 3 0.3</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>103 2 1.9</td>
<td>217 2 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of European Economic History</td>
<td>1972-2004</td>
<td>873 3.5 0.4</td>
<td>881 3.5 0.4</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>112 0.5 0.4</td>
<td>120 0.5 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Transport History</td>
<td>1971-2004</td>
<td>265 0 0.0</td>
<td>306 0 0.0</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>50 0 0.0</td>
<td>57 0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour History Review</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>101 0 0.0</td>
<td>101 0 0.0</td>
<td>1998-2004</td>
<td>101 0 0.0</td>
<td>101 0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum other 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>4638 109.83 2.37</td>
<td>5402 122.83 2.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>1343 22.5 1.68</td>
<td>1616 22.5 1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum other 12 (excluding SEHR and EH)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3830 10.83 0.28</td>
<td>4439 23.83 0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>1132 5.5 0.49</td>
<td>1340 5.5 0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sum (excluding SEHR and EH)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8505 118.16 1.39</td>
<td>9262 132.16 1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>2027 29.83 1.47</td>
<td>2293 30.83 1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>7697 19.16 0.25</td>
<td>8299 33.16 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>1816 12.83 0.71</td>
<td>2017 13.83 0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes and sources: Swe = authors active at Swedish economic history departments. In some cases, the total number of articles was approximated and could marginally deviate from the true number. Also note that some journals have a censored time period due to lacking data availability. For sources see the text. The information in the table was last updated on March 2, 2005.
Table 2. Numbers and shares of articles in the “top-4” economic history journals and two business history journals across countries, 1986–2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>JEH</th>
<th>EEH</th>
<th>EHR</th>
<th>EREH</th>
<th>BHR</th>
<th>BH</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes and sources: Except for the bottom row (“All articles), the numbers in this table are not corrected for co-authorship. Sources are Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) for JEH, EEH, HER, BHR and BH and own calculations for EREH (everything as of 2005-03-02).
Table 3: Internationally published books, book chapters and journal articles by Swedish professors and associate professors of economic history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Max (N)</th>
<th>Min (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Books (not edited)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Ranked international</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Other international</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>0 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Swedish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>0 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Chapters in books</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Ranked international</td>
<td>55.83</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>13.5 (1)</td>
<td>0 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Other international</td>
<td>48.16</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>0 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Swedish</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.33 (1)</td>
<td>0 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articles:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Any international journal (non-econ. history)</td>
<td>36.16</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>5.5 (1)</td>
<td>0 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Scandinavian journals (SEHR and EH)</td>
<td>46.33</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>0 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. International economic history journals</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>0 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum of 1,2,3,4 and 5</strong></td>
<td>223.3</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>0 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of articles (3+4+5) per year as Ph.D.</strong></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0 (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of publications (1+2+3+4+5) per year as Ph.D.</strong></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note and sources:** The total number of professors (23) and associate professors (17) is 40. Max(N) and Min(N) denotes the number of scholars with the highest and lowest amount of publications in each category. The bottom row is calculated by adding together each individual’s own statistic. All figures are co-authorship corrected and forthcoming publications are included when reported. See text for classification details. All information comes from personal homepages, Econlit, SSCI and LIBRIS as of 2005-03-02 and is available from the author upon request.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
<th>Other Nordic</th>
<th>Other European</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIII Economic History Congress, Argentina, 2002</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHA Annual Meeting, San José, CA, USA, 2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHA Annual Meeting, Nashville, TN, USA, 2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHA Annual Meeting, St Louis, MS, USA, 2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHA Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PN, USA, 2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHS Annual Conference, London, UK, 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“– New researchers”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“– Academic”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHS Annual Conference, Durham, UK, 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“– New researchers”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“– Academic”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBHS, Anaheim, CA, USA, 2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBHS, Memphis, TN, USA, 2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBHS, Chicago, IL, USA, 2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBHS, Albany, NY, USA, 2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBHS, San Diego, CA, USA, 2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBHS, San Antonio, TX, USA, 1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th BHC Annual Meeting, Le Creusot, France, 2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th EBHA Annual Congress, Barcelona, Spain, 2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51st BHC &amp; 7th EBHA Annual Congress, Lowell, MA, USA, 2003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th EBHA Annual Congress, Helsinki, Finland, 2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth EHES Conference, Madrid, Spain, 2003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth EHES Conference, Oxford, UK, 2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third EHES Conference, Lisbon, Portugal, 1999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th World Congress of Cliometrics, Venice, Italy, 2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th World Congress of Cliometrics, Montreal, Canada, 2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd World Congress of Cliometrics, Munich, Germany, 1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes and sources: EHA = Economic History Association, EHS = Economic History Society, EBHS = Economic & Business Historical Society, BHC = Business History Conference, EBHA = European Business History Association, EHES = European Historical Economics Society. Counting papers at the 2002 Buenos Aires congress was not easy as several of the 89 sessions did not disclose any papers while others listed dozens. All information was found at web pages of the individual conferences or societies.
Table 5. English-written dissertations in economic history and economics at Swedish universities, 1970–2004 (numbers and shares of total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothenburg</td>
<td>1 of 12 (8%)</td>
<td>3 of 15 (20%)</td>
<td>1 of 18 (6%)</td>
<td>3 of 11 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund</td>
<td>7 of 17 (41%)</td>
<td>10 of 20 (50%)</td>
<td>20 of 31 (65%)</td>
<td>10 of 32 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>1 of 4 (25%)</td>
<td>1 of 12 (8%)</td>
<td>3 of 19 (16%)</td>
<td>8 of 27 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umeå</td>
<td>0 of 2 (0%)</td>
<td>0 of 13 (0%)</td>
<td>3 of 11 (27%)</td>
<td>4 of 14 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppsala</td>
<td>1 of 13 (8%)</td>
<td>1 of 13 (8%)</td>
<td>8 of 35 (23%)</td>
<td>3 of 33 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All economic history</strong></td>
<td>10 of 48 (21%)</td>
<td>15 of 73 (21%)</td>
<td>33 of 114 (31%)</td>
<td>28 of 117 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothenburg</td>
<td>2 of 2 (100%)</td>
<td>40 of 50 (80%)</td>
<td>81 of 82 (99%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund</td>
<td>7 of 13 (54%)</td>
<td>31 of 38 (82%)</td>
<td>64 of 64 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>12 of 19 (63%)</td>
<td>41 of 44 (93%)</td>
<td>64 of 64 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umeå</td>
<td>0 of 4 (0%)</td>
<td>19 of 28 (68%)</td>
<td>23 of 23 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppsala</td>
<td>3 of 6 (50%)</td>
<td>45 of 38 (92%)</td>
<td>61 of 61 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All economics</strong></td>
<td>24 of 44 (55%)</td>
<td>176 of 198 (89%)</td>
<td>286 of 287 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Departmental web pages and LIBRIS (for economic history in Stockholm), as of March 2, 2005. For ongoing projects, see Evaluation commission (2003, pp. 113ff).
Figure 1. Articles in top-4 journals by Swedish economic historians, 1970–2004

Note: Only non-invited articles are included.

Figure 2. Articles in top-4 journals by other Nordic economic historians, 1970–2004

Note: The “other Nordic” countries are Denmark, Finland, Norway and Iceland. Only non-invited articles are included.