

DIVERSITY IN ECONOMICS: AN ANALYSIS OF JOURNAL QUALITY PERCEPTIONS

Kostas Axaroglou*
Athens Laboratory of Business Administration (ALBA)
2A, Athinas Av & Areos Str
16671 Vouliagmeni, Greece
kaxarlog@alba.edu.gr

and

Vasilis Theoharakis*
Athens Laboratory of Business Administration (ALBA)
2A, Athinas Av & Areos Str
16671 Vouliagmeni, Greece
vtheohar@alba.edu.gr

February 11, 2003

JEL Classification: A12, D12

* We thank our survey participants for completing the survey and providing us with constructive comments and feedback. We also thank Mrs. Mary Skordia for superb and invaluable research assistance. All remaining errors are ours.

Diversity in Economics:

An Analysis of Journal Quality Perceptions

Abstract

It is still debatable whether scientific diversity is a virtue or a disadvantage for the development of a discipline. Nonetheless, diversity among scientists with respect to their journal quality perceptions plays an important role in hiring and promotion decisions. In the present paper we examine the degree of diversity within economics based on the journal quality perceptions of 2,103 AEA economists worldwide. Specifically, we empirically test for factors that might explain differences in an economist's journal quality perceptions. These factors include an economist's geographic origin, school of thought, journal affiliation, field of specialization and research orientation. Indeed, we find that a significant degree of diversity in journal quality perceptions exists between economists that belong in different subgroups. These results might explain the frequent debates in tenure and promotion committees where journal standing are used for the evaluation of a researcher's output.

0. Introduction

Thomas Kuhn judged the maturity of sciences by “the extent to which they have a developed paradigm or shared theoretical structures or methodological approaches about which there is a high level of consensus” (Cole 1993). Extending this argument, Pfeffer (1993) claimed that a developed paradigm within a scientific field leads to consensus, which is “a vital component for the advancement of knowledge in the field”. However, these ideas caused a controversy in the organizational science literature with some claiming that an enforced consensus and dominant paradigm would lead to stagnation of knowledge evolution (Cannella and Paetzold 1994) and the industrialization of scholarship (Van Maanen 1995). From an economics perspective, Foss (1996) called for “a balance between the generation of new theoretic alternatives and the selection among them.” More specifically, while he argues that too much pluralism in a discipline or a field of knowledge may halt its progress, too little pluralism might isolate it from empirical reality and make it hierarchical and rigid.

At the same time, Hodgson and Rothman (1999) argued that the advancement of research depends on the creation of a greater effective diversity of both institutions and approaches as “this could facilitate both the promotion of novelty and the testing and evaluation of new ideas”. However, they find that global research and leading journal editorial boards are dominated by few institutions that are likely to defend their own ideas and approaches. “As the institutional structure of the profession...encourages economists to surround themselves with like-minded economists”, geographical clusters of economists with similar opinions may develop (Colander 1994). Therefore, while the

need for a high level of consensus for the development of the economics discipline can be an issue for debate, the level of diversity among economists should be first examined.

Since the publication outlet is frequently used as a proxy for assessing research quality, perceptual differences about the quality of the publication outlet reflect a dimension of diversity within the scientific community that has not been examined. The pressure for high impact research output can be observed by the ongoing practice to rank economics departments and economists based on the volume and quality of journal publications with particular attention to publications in “leading journals” (see for instance Conroy et al. 1995, Scott and Mitias (1996), Dusansky and Vernon (1998), Kalaitzidakis et al. (1999), or Jin and Yau (1999)). In fact, it has been recently shown that there are significant monetary returns for economists with publications in top and second tier journals, but articles in top tier journals offer a significantly higher return than publications in second tier journals (Moore et al 2001). Nonetheless, Beed and Beed (1996) argue against the injustice of quality ratings of journals since existing ranking systems reflect the mainstream’s criteria of quality in research. Thus, existing journal ranking practices tend to downplay any heterogeneity within the economics community and also impose constraints on economists in terms of research questions and methodologies they pursue. In any case though, the underlying perceptual heterogeneity with respect to journal quality is a frequent cause of debate in tenure and promotion committees.

The present study assesses the degree of scientific diversity in economics by examining differences in journal quality perceptions of 2,103 American Economic Association (AEA) members that participated in an online survey. We measure

perceived journal quality by using four metrics: journal familiarity, average rank position, percentage of respondents who classify a journal as “top tier”, and readership. Our analysis unveils significant variations in journal quality perceptions that depend on the respondents’ geographic location, school of thought, field of specialization, research orientation and focus, type of employment, and journal affiliation.

In section 1, we briefly review the literature on journal quality assessment. In section 2, we describe the data collection and our methodology for assessing journal quality perceptions in economics. Sections 3 and 4 explore the degree of diversity in economics based on differences in journal quality perceptions across groups of economists. Conclusions are in section 5.

1. The Assessment of Journal Quality

The economics literature is very rich with studies that rank journals based on their impact and quality. Although, researchers traditionally use citation-based methodologies to rank journals, there are also cases of survey-based rankings. Among others, Moore (1972), Liebowitz and Palmer (1984), Laband and Sophocleus (1985), Laband and Piette (1994), and Liner (2002) use citation-based methodologies in ranking economics journals while Hawkins et al. (1973) and Malouin and Outreville (1987) use survey-based methodologies. Citation-based methods have also been used to study the degree of communication between journals (Stigler et al. 1995), the inter and intra-disciplinary communications of economics journals (Pieters and Baumgartner, 2002), and the geographic and institutional concentration of published research (Hodgson and Rothman, 1999).

However, several researchers take a critical stance against citation-based journal rankings. For instance, Seglen (1997) claims that journal impact factors calculated based on citations are biased, while Beed and Beed (1996) argue that journal rankings based on citations measure primarily “influence” and not “excellence” or “quality” in research. Since, citation-based studies cannot identify the journal quality perceptions of individuals, many of the arguments against journal rankings originate from the need to account for the diversity of the economics community. Therefore, our basic premise is that inherent personal biases and differences in perspectives lead to different opinions with respect to the quality standing of a journal. By surveying a large sample of economists, we seek to present evidence on the degree of diversity of the economics community based on perceptual differences in journal quality rankings. As Hawkins et al. (1973) argue, such a study “might possibly reveal more about the profession than about the journals”.

2 Data and Methodology

2.1 Data Collection

Given the high level of internet accessibility, our analysis is based on data collected through an online survey of AEA members in May of 2002. The American Economic Association is one of the largest associations of economists worldwide and according to Siegfried (1998) almost 60% of all economists affiliated with economics departments in 850 U.S. Colleges and Universities were members of the association in 1996. Also, 73% of academics affiliated with economics departments in 24 large U.S. Universities were members of the AEA in 1995-96.

An e-mail was sent to members of the AEA inviting them to rank up to fifteen journals as “top tier” and up to fifteen journals as “second tier” based on each journal’s contribution to the discipline (in terms of rigor, prestige and importance). To facilitate data entry, a list of one hundred and fifty seven journals was placed on pull down menus (see table 5), including all journals classified by the Journal of Economic Literature (JEL) classification system and also some multidisciplinary journals such as Management Science and the Harvard Business Review. At the same time, respondents could type in the journal of their choice in case it was not available in the pull down menu.

In addition, respondents were prompted to fill in various demographic questions (e.g. type of employment, country of employment), their research focus and school of thought, their field of specialization, the journals they regularly read, the journals with which they are affiliated (as referees, authors, or editors) etc. The survey was initially pilot-tested by a randomly selected group of AEA members who were invited to review and complete the survey and provide us with feedback. Two weeks after the initial mailing, a reminder email was sent to those who had not yet responded. Finally, from the 10,402 emails sent, we received 2,103 valid responses corresponding to a 20.22% response rate. Assuming that respondents spent on average fifteen minutes to complete the survey, nearly 526 labor hours were devoted in this process!

2.2 Respondent Demographics

Table 1 reports some demographics about our survey participants. Since all 2,103 participants are AEA members, similarly with Siegfried’s (1998) findings, nearly 70% of them reside in North America. At the same time, 76% of our survey respondents are

academics while the rest are affiliated with various governmental and international organizations, central banks and private companies. If the AEA's membership profile has not changed since Siegfried (1998) reported a 64% of academics, it appears that we had a higher response rate from academicians. Moreover, almost 55% consider themselves as Neoclassicists followed by 12% as New Keynesian. In terms of research focus, 52% of the respondents were working in research oriented institutions (Major or Primary research). Finally, 13% of the participants were conducting research in Macroeconomics, 10% in Labor Economics, 9% in Industrial Organization, 8% in Microeconomics, etc.

2.3 Measuring the Perceived Quality of Economics Journals

In order, to evaluate perceptions of economics journals we utilize four quality metrics: Familiarity, Average Rank Position, %Top15 and Readership. Familiarity ($Familiarity_i$) corresponds to the number of times respondents selected to rank the particular journal in any tier or order. The *Average Rank Position* (ARP_i) is given by the respondents who chose to rank the particular journal (Hult et al, 1997) is defined as,

$$ARP_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{30} R_{ij} \cdot j}{\sum_{j=1}^{30} R_{ij}} \quad (1 \leq ARP_i \leq 30) \quad (1)$$

where i denotes the journal and R_{ij} the number of times that journal i has been ranked in the j th position. Therefore, a lower ARP_i reflects a higher perceived journal importance. However, the ARP index does not consider the number of respondents that actually ranked a given journal. Obviously, a low awareness/familiarity journal with a small number of devoted readers that ranked it very highly will show a low ARP (high perceived quality). In order to balance between familiarity and rank position, we utilize a

weighted index of rank position ($Index_i$) as developed by Theoharakis and Hirst (2002) and is given by,

$$Index_i = 100 \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{30} R_{ij} * (31-j)}{30 * n} = 100 \frac{31 - ARP_i}{30} * Familiarity_i \quad (0 \leq Index_i \leq 100) \quad (2)$$

where n denotes the number of respondents in the sample. Thus, $Index_i$ assigns to the j th rank position a declining weight equal to $\frac{(31-j)}{30}$, with the 30th and the 1st rank positions receiving a weight of $\frac{1}{30}$ and 1 respectively.

Since economists frequently separate journals in tiers (Moore et al., 2001), we also calculate the percentage of respondents that ranked a journal as top-tier over the total number of respondents that chose to rank it (% *Top15*). In addition, we measure readership ($Readership_i$), as the percentage of the respondents that regularly read the specific journal, which provides us with a measure of “journal consumption”. Before proceeding with the presentation of the journal perceptual rankings, we examined the validity of the *Index*. Indeed, similarly with the findings of Theoharakis and Hirst (2002), while all perception quality measures are highly correlated among themselves, our *Index* appears as the most representative measure of journal quality perceptions; it overall demonstrates the highest level of correlation with each one of the other measures.

3 Identifying Diversity through Journal Quality Perceptions

In table 2, we report journal rankings based on our $Index_i$ along with the other quality measures. Our respondents rank the American Economic Review on the top followed by a group of three journals (the Journal of Political Economy, Econometrica

and the Quarterly Journal of Economics). Overall, these four journals (“*top-4*”) are the most familiar and are considered by the vast majority as top tier irrespective of the respondents’ geographic location. However, readership presents us with a different perspective. In our worldwide sample, while economists read the American Economic Review the most, the Journal of Economic Perspectives and the Journal of Economic Literature follow. Among Europeans, the European Economic Review and the Economic Journal are also widely-read journals. As it might be expected, technical journals (e.g. Econometrica or the Journal of Economic Theory), although considered of high quality, exhibit relatively low readership across all geographic regions.

While there is agreement among respondents about the elite of economics journals (*top-4*), significant heterogeneity in opinion appears especially for journals that seem to have a regional reputation. Thus, the European Economic Review is ranked only 23rd among North Americans but 8th among Europeans and the Economic Journal (published by the Royal Economic Society) is ranked 5th among Europeans but 11th among North Americans. Similarly, the Economic Inquiry (published by the Western Economic Association) is ranked 20th among North Americans but only 41st by Europeans, while the Southern Economic Journal (published by the Southern Economic Association) is ranked 26th among North Americans and only 54th among Europeans.

As our previous discussion indicates, differences in journal quality perceptions appear to exist across geographic regions. Nonetheless, other factors may be linked with an economist’s journal quality perceptions such as the respondents’ school of thought, affiliation with a journal, research focus and area of specialization, as well as characteristics of the institution with which they are affiliated. In order to formally test

whether these factors lead to statistically significant differences in economists' journal quality perceptions, equation (3) is estimated for each of the top thirty journals in our worldwide sample using the Ordered Probit model:

$$RP_j = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^4 (g_i * G_i) + \sum_{i=1}^5 (s_i * ST_i) + a_i * AF_i + f_i * TH_i + c_i * AC_i + r_i * RF_i + \sum_{i=1}^{15} (k_i * FS_i) \quad (3)$$

where RP_j is the rank position assigned to journal j by a respondent, G_i are four dummy variables for the location of a respondent's institution of employment (Asia, Australia/New Zealand, Europe and Latin America), ST_i are five dummy variables for the respondent's school of thought, AF_i is a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent is affiliated with a given journal, TH_i is a dummy variable indicating those respondents that conduct theoretical research (versus those that conduct empirical research), AC_i is a dummy variable indicating those that have an academic position (versus those with a non-academic position), RF_i is a dummy variable indicating those academics that have positions with a research focus (versus those with positions with primarily teaching), and finally FS_i are fifteen dummies indicating the field of specialization following the JEL classification system.

Tables 3 and 4 report only the coefficients of equation (3) for each journal that were found statistically significant (at the 5% level). Essentially, these coefficients indicate the difference in the average number of rank positions that a group of respondents with a certain characteristic, has assigned to a journal in comparison to the rest of the respondents. Since a lower average rank position indicates a more favorable

ranking of a journal, a negative coefficient reflects that the specific group favors the specific journal more than the rest of the respondents.

3.1 Geographical Diversity

The Ordered Probit estimations of equation (3) show that there is a remarkable homogeneity across geographic regions for the *top-4* journals; the only exception being that Europeans rank lower the Journal of Political Economy than the rest of their colleagues. In addition, Europeans have a less favorable opinion than the rest of their colleagues about journals published by regional U.S. associations, such as the Economic Inquiry or the Southern Economic Journal. At the same time they rank higher journals published in Europe like the European Economic Review (almost 0.7 of a rank position), the Economic Journal, and the Oxford Economic Papers. Similarly, Asians favor these three European journals while they show very few other differences with the rest of their colleagues. It is interesting to observe that the Review of Economic Studies, although based in Europe, it is a journal founded by European and U.S. economists that still maintains this regional balance in its editorial board, and is equally appreciated by economists from all regions. Overall, we find that beyond the *top-4* journals, certain journals appear to have a stronger regional appeal.

3.2 Diversity Based on Journal Affiliation

On one hand, a researcher's decision to be affiliated in one-way or another with a given journal may reveal his/her high level of the journal's perceived quality. On the other hand, a more favorable perception for a journal is expected by affiliated researchers,

since due to self-serving bias a higher ranking increases his/her own recognition by the rest of the community. While affiliation with a journal may take various forms, in our study we consider affiliation as expressed through having published in the journal or by serving on its editorial board or as a referee.

Indeed, in our sample, respondents affiliated with a refereed journal rank it more favorably than the rest. Only the Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, which does not follow the traditional journal referee process and publishes papers presented at the Brookings conferences, is not perceived differently by affiliated and non-affiliated respondents. Finally, based on the size of the estimated coefficients, journal preference due to affiliation appears the highest for technical journals (e.g. *Econometrica* or the *Journal of Economic Theory*) or field journals (e.g. the *RAND Journal of Economics*, the *Journal of Development Economics* or the *Journal of Law and Economics*). Apparently, economists affiliated with these journals highly appreciate the specific topics and methodologies used in the research published in these journals.

3.3 Diversity Based on Research related Factors

Economists tend to focus on research projects that study certain research questions (field of specialization), follow a certain research orientation (theoretical vs. empirical), and are guided by the school of thought that they are associated. Therefore, they become more familiar with research similar to their own and of course with academic journals that publish research that interests them. Consequently, it is quite natural to expect that economists favor journals that publish research along the same lines with their own. In this section we examine (based on the parameter estimates of equation

(3)) the differences in journal quality perceptions among respondents' based on their school of thought, research orientation (theoretical vs. empirical), field of specialization, and characteristics of the institution that they are employed (academic vs. non-academic and research vs. teaching focus).

3.3.1 Diversity Based on School of Thought

Traditionally, economists associate themselves with an economic school of thought. Since academic journals in economics may be a frequent publication outlet for research influenced by a given school of thought, we also explore differences in journal quality perceptions based on the respondent's school of thought. Thus, we find that New Keynesians favor journals that publish research with emphasis on market imperfections and rigidities, such as the Quarterly Journal of Economics, the Economic Journal, the Brookings Papers or the Journal of Money Credit and Banking (Table 3). Neoclassicists, on the other hand, favor the top six journals in our ranking and also journals that publish research based on the perfect operation of the market mechanism (such as the Journal of Monetary Economics or the International Economic Review). Post Keynesians have less of an appreciation for journals that publish research with an emphasis on the efficient operation of the markets, such as the Journal of Political Economy or the Journal of Finance. Finally, Institutionalists favor more non-technical journals (i.e. the Journal of Economic Literature, or the Journal of Economic Perspectives), and less mostly technical journals (e.g. Econometrica and the Review of Economic Studies).

3.3.2 Theoretical vs. Empirical Research Orientation

We also requested from our respondents to specify the research orientation that they mostly prefer (i.e. theoretical vs. empirical). Respondents with a focus on theory rank journals that publish theoretical work (such as *Econometrica*, the *Review of Economic Studies* and the *Journal of Economic Theory*) more favorably than the rest. The same group also ranks non-technical journal (such as the *Journal of Economic Perspectives* and the *Brookings Papers*) lower than the rest. Finally, they rank lower than the rest journals that publish empirical work (like the *Review of Economics and Statistics*, the *Journal of Econometrics* and *Economic Inquiry*).

3.3.3 Differences based on Institutional Characteristics

The specific characteristics of the institution where economists are employed can define their contextual working environment and imply certain expectations on the research they pursue. Specifically, academicians favor the top six journals in our list along with a few other mostly technical journals (such as the *Journal of Economic Theory* or the *Journal of Monetary Economics*) more than those in non-academic positions. Among our academic economists, those associated with institutions that place a strong emphasis on research (*“Major or Primary Research”*) favor more than the rest (*“Balanced or Teaching”*) the *top-4* journals, with the only exception being the *American Economic Review*. At the same time, they have a less favorable view of non-technical journals (such as the *Journal of Economic Perspective* and the *Brookings Papers*) or journals with empirical focus (i.e. *Economic Inquiry* or the *Southern Economic Journal*).

3.3.4 Diversity Based on Field of Specialization

Research specialization familiarizes economists with certain research questions, methodologies, techniques and journals that publish research in their field. Consequently, specialization might influence our respondents' quality perceptions of journals (Table 4). Overall, economists consistently favor their field journals and demonstrate significant differences in journal quality perceptions from the rest of their colleagues. For example, those that specialize in Mathematical and Quantitative Methods (JEL C) favor journals that publish mostly theoretical and technical research, such as *Econometrica* (by a full rank position), the *Journal of Econometrics* (by a 0.8 of a rank position), or the *Journal of Finance*. Microeconomists (JEL D) favor the *RAND Journal of Economics* and Macroeconomists (JEL E) the *Journal of Monetary Economics* (by almost a full rank position), the *Journal of Money Banking and Credit* or the *Journal of Financial Economics*. At the same time these two groups show some similarities by having a less favorable view for the *Journal of Economic Literature*, but a more favorable view for journals that publish mostly theoretical research (such as the *Econometrica*, the *Review of Economic Studies* or the *Journal of Economic Theory*). Also, Industrial Organization economists (JEL L) favor the *RAND Journal of Economics*, by a full rank position, and have similar journal perceptions with Microeconomists.

Economists specializing in International Economics (JEL F) show strong preference for journals that publish research in international economics, such as the *Journal of International Economics* (by a 0.87 of a rank position) the *International Economic Review*, and the *European Economic Review*. Respondents in Public Economics (JEL H) favor few highly ranked journals (i.e. three out of the *top-4*) and a

few applied journals such as the Journal of Public Economics (by 0.8 of a rank position), the Journal of Labor Economics or the Journal of Law and Economics. Labor economists (JEL J) and those that specialize in Law and Economics (JEL K) favor their field journals by a full rank position (i.e. the Journal of Labor Economics and the Journal of Law and Economics respectively). Respondents that specialize in General Economics and Teaching (JEL A) mostly favor non-technical journals (e.g. the Journal of Economic Literature, or the American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings), while Financial Economists (JEL G) strongly favor journals that publish research with an emphasis in finance, like the Journal of Finance, or the Journal of Financial Economics.

4. How Diverse are Journal Quality Perceptions in Economics?

The absence of diversity across groups of economists should have led to statistically insignificant differences in journal quality perceptions among them. Hence, the discovery of statistically significant differences in perceived quality of journals across groups of economists signifies some diversity among them. Considering that our study is based on data collected from AEA members, where 70% of them work in North America and 76% hold academic positions, we dealt with a sample that is relatively more homogeneous than the worldwide economics community. Thus, any diversity found within this sample would be amplified if a broader sampling frame were used. In the proceeding discussion we use the number of journals with a significant parameter estimation of equation (3), as a proxy for the degree of diversity between groups of economists. Indeed, our statistical analysis unveils significant differences in journal quality perceptions among economists belonging in various groups with respect to their

geographic location, journal affiliation, school of thought, institutional affiliation, research orientation and field of specialization.

Journal affiliation is the dimension that most certainly contributes to differences in opinion among economists. As expected, our survey participants favor the journal with which they are affiliated much more than the rest of their colleagues in twenty-nine out of thirty journals in our sample. In terms of geographic location, economists in Latin America and Asia show the least diversity from the rest of their colleagues (dominated by North Americans) since their journal quality perceptions differ from the rest of their colleagues in only three and five journals respectively. On the other hand, European economists differ noticeably from the rest of their colleagues since they perceive eleven journals in a different manner.

The characteristics of our respondents' institution of employment were also linked with diversity in opinion among economists. Economists with an academic affiliation have different journal quality perceptions from their colleagues with non-academic jobs in fifteen out of the thirty journals examined. Among academicians, those affiliated with research-focused institutions show different journal quality perceptions from the rest of their colleagues (affiliated with teaching oriented institutions) in sixteen out of the thirty journals examined. Thus, the type of institution and its research culture appear to be linked with significant diversity among economists.

Some diversity in journal quality perceptions was found between economists that perform theoretical research and those that pursue mostly empirical research (in nine journals). The school of thought also appears as a factor leading to different opinions among economists especially for those that classify themselves as either Institutionalists

(in twelve journals) or Neoclassicists (in eleven journals). Finally, the field of specialization within economics plays a role in journal perceptions among economists, with economic historians being the least diverse from the rest of their colleagues (two journals) and Macroeconomists the most (twelve journals).

From a journal quality perceptions perspective, these results unveil significant diversity among groups of economists despite the fact that our sample focused on AEA members.

5. Conclusions

In the present paper we examined the journal quality perceptions of more than 2,000 AEA economists and demonstrated that opinions about journal quality can vary significantly across economists that belong in different subgroups. Although a handful of journals are highly perceived across all quality measures, a respondent's affiliation with a journal as author, referee, or member of the editorial board, was systematically linked with a more favorable journal ranking. Readership data presented us with an additional dimension for assessing journals, but indicated that only a limited number of journals enjoy a significant number of regular readers.

Consequently, the great diversity in opinion among economists on journal quality may explain some of the debates surrounding the evaluation of a researcher's work in tenure and promotion committees. Further, these findings should serve as a warning against monolithic research evaluation practices that do not account for the underlying differences of the community. We therefore hope that this study will help refuel research

creativity, as our results demonstrate the importance of a broader range of journals for the dissemination of economics research.

A possible shortcoming of our survey is that both the instrument of the survey and most of the journals surveyed are in English. Further, as noted earlier, although significant perceptual differences were found, all of our survey respondents were members of the American Economic Association and thus are more homogeneous than the worldwide economics community. However, future research should further study the issue of diversity within economics by taking alternative perspectives.

Geographical location		Research field of interest	
North America	1471	General Economics & Teaching	39
Europe	389	Methodology & History of Economic Thought	27
Australia / New Zealand	57	Mathematical & Quantitative Methods	96
Asia	98	Microeconomics	170
Latin America	42	Macroeconomics & Monetary Economics	275
Other	46	International Economics	154
TOTAL	2103	Financial Economics	125
		Public Economics	162
School of thought		Health, Education & Welfare	117
Behavioralist	121	Labor & Demographic Economics	215
Institutionalist	161	Law & Economics	50
Keynesian/ New Keynesian	224	Industrial Organization	188
Keynesian/ Post Keynesian	99	Bus. Administration & Bus. Economics; Marketing; Accounting	27
Marxist	11	Economic History	39
Neoclassical	1037	Economic Development, Technological Change & Growth	128
Austrian	31	Economic Systems	15
Other	189	Agricultural & Natural Resource Economics	118
Null	230	Urban, & Regional Economics	56
TOTAL	2103	Other Special Topics	37
		Not actively engaged in research	20
Type of employment		No answer	45
Academic (Colleges/Universities)	1485	TOTAL	2103
Government	147		
Central Banks	55	Research focus	
International Organizations	56	Major Research	371
Private Companies	143	Primarily Research	491
Other	58	Balanced	590
Retired	16	Primarily Teaching	198
No answer	143	No answer	453
TOTAL	2103	TOTAL	2103

Table 1- Demographics

	Worldwide (n=2103)						North America (n=1471)						Europe (n=389)					
Rank	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP
1	AER	91.64	1996	97.95	86.67	2.03	AER	91.36	1392	98.13	85.30	2.04	AER	93.87	377	98.67	90.53	1.94
2	JPE	72.70	1710	97.08	35.06	4.18	JPE	73.98	1202	97.50	35.70	3.84	EM	73.47	324	94.75	25.35	4.54
3	EM	71.55	1690	95.86	20.40	4.29	EM	71.81	1183	96.03	18.65	4.21	JPE	71.32	318	96.86	33.43	4.83
4	QJE	63.95	1629	92.82	23.07	6.23	QJE	64.22	1145	92.05	22.53	6.25	QJE	66.94	311	96.46	26.18	5.88
5	RESTAT	38.73	1211	78.53	9.58	10.82	RESTAT	42.55	905	80.11	10.46	10.25	EJ	52.40	284	81.69	29.25	9.47
6	RES	38.47	1113	84.46	8.56	9.19	RES	36.53	743	83.58	7.39	9.30	RES	46.24	239	89.54	12.26	8.42
7	JEL	35.23	1067	77.51	42.23	10.17	JEL	32.36	686	77.26	38.04	10.18	JEL	44.70	254	75.98	55.43	10.46
8	EJ	32.96	1006	76.44	10.71	10.33	JEP	30.89	698	67.62	50.69	11.47	EER	44.59	273	67.40	26.74	11.94
9	JEP	31.92	1022	69.57	52.59	11.30	JET	29.97	646	76.32	4.61	10.53	JEP	34.94	204	73.04	59.89	11.01
10	JET	30.41	934	77.62	4.61	10.46	RJE	29.78	733	65.89	10.53	13.07	JET	32.70	186	80.11	4.74	10.48
11	RJE	28.09	995	66.33	10.51	13.19	EJ	27.83	611	72.50	5.27	10.90	RESTAT	29.75	192	72.40	8.36	12.92
12	JF	24.26	802	71.32	8.76	11.92	JF	23.94	556	70.50	7.90	12.00	JME	26.72	172	70.35	11.42	12.87
13	JME	23.03	810	66.79	8.76	13.06	JME	21.21	533	63.23	8.05	13.44	JF	26.55	159	75.47	10.03	11.52
14	AERPP	21.62	729	56.93	21.78	12.29	AERPP	20.21	486	54.94	20.85	12.65	RJE	25.94	172	69.77	9.75	13.40
15	EER	21.00	792	53.16	7.43	14.27	IER	19.77	499	62.12	3.29	13.52	AERPP	23.51	148	56.08	22.84	12.46
16	IER	20.52	754	59.81	3.43	13.83	BPEA	19.55	513	47.17	7.53	14.18	BPEA	23.18	160	52.50	7.52	14.09
17	BPEA	20.43	766	48.56	7.69	14.17	JPUE	19.27	556	51.08	6.58	15.70	JPUE	23.08	168	58.93	10.86	14.96
18	JPUE	19.97	812	53.08	7.64	15.48	JE	18.63	498	54.02	4.32	14.49	IER	21.23	155	53.55	3.62	15.02
19	JE	18.76	715	55.66	4.77	14.45	JLE	17.99	532	44.74	8.92	16.08	EL	20.08	177	27.12	8.91	17.76
20	JLE	16.51	714	43.98	8.61	16.41	EI	17.79	528	35.80	10.39	16.13	JE	20.07	141	59.57	6.69	14.39
21	JMCB	15.23	690	42.90	6.05	17.07	JLAE	15.79	436	55.96	6.00	15.02	ECO	18.18	153	32.68	3.90	17.13
22	EI	14.93	656	33.38	8.25	16.64	JMCB	15.35	482	42.53	5.63	16.94	JIE	15.67	113	59.29	6.13	14.81
23	JLAE	14.40	578	54.33	5.54	15.28	EER	14.20	410	44.15	2.56	15.72	OEP	15.62	137	41.61	2.23	17.69
24	ECO	12.92	552	40.22	1.90	16.24	ECO	11.75	343	43.44	1.10	15.88	JLE	14.73	119	45.38	9.47	16.55
25	JIE	12.69	515	52.62	6.15	15.46	JIE	11.63	334	49.40	6.14	15.63	JMCB	14.10	132	37.12	6.69	18.53

Table 2 - Journal rankings by geographical area

	Worldwide (n=2103)						North America (n=1471)						Europe (n=389)					
Rank	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP
26	EL	11.68	566	27.03	5.02	17.98	SEJ	11.56	415	30.60	7.46	18.71	SJE	12.68	138	27.54	3.06	20.28
27	JFE	10.73	430	51.86	3.74	15.26	JFE	10.36	287	51.92	3.80	15.07	GEB	12.37	95	41.05	6.13	15.80
28	JDE	10.48	494	36.44	5.69	17.62	JHUR	10.22	309	40.45	8.71	16.40	JFE	11.44	85	51.76	3.34	15.29
29	SEJ	9.42	497	29.38	5.43	19.04	JDE	9.76	324	35.49	5.12	17.71	JEDC	11.37	104	28.85	3.90	18.24
30	OEP	8.73	436	42.43	1.08	18.36	EL	8.89	308	25.65	3.51	18.26	JLAE	11.36	90	51.11	4.46	16.27
31	CAJE	8.72	445	18.43	4.25	18.64	JEH	8.68	265	43.40	4.46	16.54	ECOTH	10.74	86	37.21	3.34	16.43
32	JHUR	8.56	373	40.21	6.66	16.52	CAJE	8.66	305	19.02	4.83	18.47	JEBO	10.72	87	37.93	5.57	16.62
33	ECOTH	7.93	322	40.68	1.85	15.46	AUJAE	7.86	211	45.02	6.07	14.56	KY	10.39	86	45.35	4.46	16.91
34	JEDC	7.84	412	26.94	1.95	18.99	JBES	7.34	236	35.59	2.12	17.27	JDE	10.13	92	33.70	5.01	18.15
35	JEH	7.54	330	43.03	3.79	16.58	ECOTH	7.06	195	43.59	1.39	15.02	IJIO	9.70	93	30.11	8.64	18.83
36	JEBO	7.35	364	29.12	3.43	18.26	JEDC	6.81	255	25.88	1.54	19.21	CJE	8.94	69	36.23	3.34	15.88
37	GEB	7.27	326	35.28	3.28	16.93	JEBO	6.50	240	25.00	2.56	19.04	JINDE	8.59	85	30.59	5.57	19.20
38	AUJAE	7.13	273	44.69	5.07	14.52	OEP	6.34	231	40.69	0.22	18.88	CAJE	8.41	90	12.22	1.67	20.10
39	JBES	6.87	318	35.22	1.85	17.38	ILRR	6.19	195	34.87	5.71	16.98	APE	8.19	74	16.22	1.39	18.08
40	APE	6.54	291	21.99	2.26	16.81	JB	6.00	179	45.25	1.17	16.20	NBERM	8.05	70	45.71	1.95	17.57
41	CJE	6.36	245	43.27	1.90	14.63	GEB	5.92	194	32.99	2.63	17.53	EI	7.26	75	20.00	2.23	19.71
42	NBERM	6.05	267	50.19	2.15	16.70	APE	5.64	171	24.56	2.56	16.44	JAEC	6.74	63	30.16	2.79	18.52
43	ET	5.82	270	25.56	1.28	17.40	EDCC	5.51	175	31.43	2.71	17.11	PC	6.49	62	37.10	5.57	18.79
44	EDCC	5.81	257	33.85	2.97	16.75	ET	5.49	173	27.17	0.73	17.01	JBES	6.48	54	38.89	1.67	17.00
45	JAEC	5.59	276	31.52	2.46	18.22	NBERM	5.22	159	50.31	2.05	16.52	ET	5.85	53	18.87	2.79	18.11
46	JB	5.44	236	42.37	1.13	16.45	CJE	5.20	137	45.26	1.32	14.25	JBF	5.35	47	29.79	3.62	17.72
47	IJIO	5.33	277	24.19	3.69	18.86	JHE	5.18	164	36.59	5.41	17.05	JHUR	5.25	42	45.24	2.23	16.40
48	PC	5.18	269	34.57	3.28	18.86	JAEC	5.08	179	29.61	2.05	18.47	JEGR	5.09	49	32.65	3.62	18.88
49	JINDE	4.96	252	31.75	3.38	18.58	PC	5.00	182	34.07	2.85	18.87	WA	5.04	52	36.54	3.62	19.69
50	ILRR	4.88	225	33.33	4.56	17.33	JUE	4.83	188	29.26	3.00	19.66	JMAE	4.47	53	24.53	1.11	21.15

Table 2 (continue) - Journal rankings by geographical area

Rank	Worldwide (n=2103)						North America (n=1471)						Europe (n=389)					
	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP
51	SJE	4.85	313	22.36	0.62	21.22	JEE	4.58	148	33.78	5.85	17.34	EDCC	4.46	37	32.43	2.23	16.95
52	JEE	4.41	205	34.63	5.02	17.43	IJIO	4.58	163	21.47	2.34	18.61	JEH	4.13	35	40.00	1.39	17.23
53	JHE	4.36	202	35.64	4.36	17.40	JINDE	4.24	145	33.10	2.63	18.10	WD	4.05	34	44.12	3.90	17.09
54	KY	3.98	195	36.41	1.38	18.11	LE	4.19	142	35.21	4.17	17.98	SEJ	3.93	45	22.22	0.00	20.80
55	JUE	3.96	220	29.09	2.61	19.63	NTJ	3.84	150	26.00	3.51	19.70	JB	3.76	35	28.57	0.84	18.46
56	JMAE	3.74	232	25.00	0.46	20.84	DE	3.59	105	32.38	2.63	15.92	JIMF	3.74	37	27.03	3.62	19.22
57	HBR	3.45	141	46.10	2.26	15.55	HBR	3.28	92	46.74	1.76	15.28	JM	3.56	41	29.27	2.23	20.85
58	JBF	3.32	161	31.06	2.15	17.98	JMAE	3.07	136	25.00	0.37	21.04	JEE	3.50	33	33.33	2.79	18.64
59	LE	3.27	158	34.18	3.23	17.96	REDY	2.90	95	34.74	2.34	17.54	AUJAE	3.14	27	25.93	1.95	17.41
60	JEGR	3.15	167	26.35	1.64	19.11	SJE	2.86	134	20.15	0.07	21.60	REDY	3.08	31	32.26	1.95	19.42
61	WD	3.06	144	35.42	3.18	17.58	CPI	2.78	96	25.00	3.73	18.20	HBR	2.79	22	45.45	2.79	16.18
62	NTJ	3.05	174	24.71	2.92	19.93	JIMF	2.67	100	30.00	1.46	19.21	MS	2.78	27	40.74	1.11	19.00
63	JM	2.93	180	27.22	1.38	20.72	CJ	2.62	73	32.88	2.19	15.15	EEJ	2.61	19	42.11	0.84	14.95
64	JIMF	2.75	153	27.45	1.79	19.65	EEH	2.59	90	23.33	2.49	18.30	JHE	2.55	26	30.77	1.95	19.54
65	REDY	2.74	135	33.33	2.05	18.20	JM	2.53	107	27.10	1.10	20.56	HPE	2.55	19	47.37	1.11	15.32
66	DE	2.69	116	32.76	1.95	16.36	JRS	2.52	87	37.93	1.90	18.24	JPKE	2.52	20	45.00	1.67	16.30
67	CJ	2.42	98	32.65	2.10	15.45	JEGR	2.50	94	21.28	1.24	19.27	SJPE	2.45	36	11.11	0.56	23.06
68	CPI	2.37	116	24.14	3.08	18.09	KY	2.47	91	30.77	0.59	19.02	HER	2.42	21	33.33	0.56	17.57
69	MS	2.33	112	41.96	1.13	17.86	JBF	2.45	89	26.97	1.46	18.83	ILRR	2.32	23	26.09	1.67	19.22
70	JRS	2.26	119	33.61	1.59	19.00	HEC	2.45	81	28.40	3.15	17.65	WE	2.29	20	45.00	1.67	17.65
71	HEC	2.25	108	27.78	2.67	17.85	CH	2.40	64	39.06	2.05	14.45	PF	2.14	22	36.36	0.84	19.64
72	JEI	2.25	84	54.76	2.05	14.13	WD	2.36	82	29.27	2.63	18.29	EME	2.09	23	8.70	0.00	20.39
73	HER	2.19	100	39.00	1.33	17.16	RJUE	2.34	82	36.59	2.27	18.40	JEI	2.08	15	53.33	1.67	14.80
74	HPE	2.16	93	41.94	1.23	16.32	JEI	2.33	61	54.10	1.98	14.15	SCW	2.05	26	15.38	0.84	21.81

Table 2 (continued) - Journal rankings by geographical area

Rank	Worldwide (n=2103)						North America (n=1471)						Europe (n=389)					
	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP	Journal	INDEX	Familiarity	% Top15	Readership (%)	ARP
75	EEH	2.12	105	23.81	2.05	18.27	MS	2.32	72	44.44	1.17	16.79	JCE	2.04	17	47.06	1.11	17.00
76	RJUE	2.10	119	28.57	2.15	19.87	HER	2.22	69	42.03	1.61	16.80	JDS	2.04	20	30.00	1.39	19.10
77	EEJ	2.04	103	20.39	1.64	18.53	HPE	2.18	66	42.42	1.39	16.41	HEC	1.94	18	27.78	1.95	18.44
78	CH	1.98	78	34.62	1.74	14.97	EEJ	2.08	79	15.19	1.90	19.37	AE	1.78	13	38.46	1.11	15.00
79	PF	1.94	114	29.82	0.26	20.24	AJES	2.06	60	33.33	0.80	15.85	AJES	1.71	13	38.46	0.56	15.69
80	AJES	1.91	80	32.50	0.72	15.91	PF	1.86	78	26.92	0.15	20.45	JRS	1.64	17	23.53	1.11	19.76
81	JPKE	1.89	85	42.35	1.18	16.95	RIO	1.84	67	26.87	1.54	18.87	JES	1.53	15	40.00	0.00	19.07
82	WA	1.87	117	29.06	0.87	20.91	AEJ	1.82	63	14.29	0.66	18.22	RJUE	1.52	25	8.00	1.39	23.92
83	AE	1.84	72	40.28	0.82	14.89	JEED	1.82	59	38.98	2.63	17.42	ENE	1.47	13	46.15	2.23	17.77
84	JCE	1.76	89	32.58	1.13	18.51	JCE	1.68	59	30.51	1.10	18.46	JUE	1.46	16	12.50	0.84	20.38
85	AEJ	1.68	83	15.66	0.67	18.25	AE	1.64	46	36.96	0.66	15.30	RFS	1.45	10	70.00	0.84	14.10
86	RIO	1.57	86	24.42	1.33	19.50	JPKE	1.62	52	40.38	1.17	17.21	JCMS	1.45	15	20.00	1.67	19.73
87	AB	1.42	62	25.81	0.97	16.50	BE	1.57	44	29.55	0.88	15.20	EXE	1.41	13	23.08	1.67	18.31
88	EXE	1.42	77	24.68	1.03	19.34	AB	1.53	49	22.45	0.80	17.20	EEH	1.41	12	33.33	0.28	17.25
89	AUER	1.40	73	16.44	0.72	18.86	MLRE	1.50	51	37.25	1.98	18.02	CJ	1.30	11	27.27	0.84	17.18
90	BE	1.39	58	27.59	0.82	15.83	EXE	1.43	56	21.43	0.80	19.75	AEJ	1.29	11	36.36	0.84	17.36
91	RFS	1.39	49	71.43	1.49	13.08	EEDR	1.42	51	23.53	1.68	18.71	AR	1.28	9	33.33	0.28	14.44
92	JEED	1.38	65	36.92	2.05	17.58	RFS	1.38	32	75.00	1.61	11.97	AUER	1.23	13	7.69	0.28	19.92
93	EME	1.37	76	14.47	0.36	19.59	RRPE	1.37	36	66.67	0.66	14.17	ADR	1.22	8	37.50	0.56	13.25
94	JES	1.33	57	50.88	0.05	16.33	JRI	1.34	48	33.33	0.66	18.67	AB	1.15	7	42.86	1.39	11.86
95	AR	1.28	54	35.19	0.87	16.06	FM	1.33	42	33.33	1.32	17.02	RS	1.11	14	21.43	1.11	21.71
96	JDS	1.23	63	25.40	1.03	18.63	AR	1.30	40	35.00	1.02	16.68	JHET	1.11	8	62.50	0.84	14.75
97	EEDR	1.22	63	22.22	1.38	18.76	ARS	1.23	31	45.16	0.88	13.52	MADY	1.10	13	23.08	0.28	21.15
98	ENE	1.20	59	32.20	1.13	18.15	JES	1.21	34	55.88	0.07	15.32	JFO	1.07	14	7.14	0.28	22.07
99	JRI	1.20	65	30.77	0.72	19.37	QREB	1.20	45	28.89	0.37	19.27	JLEO	1.07	8	50.00	1.39	15.38
100	WE	1.20	64	34.38	1.23	19.22	JAE	1.19	40	37.50	0.59	17.90	RIO	1.06	14	14.29	1.11	22.14

Table 2 (continued) - Journal rankings by geographical area

Journal	Geographical location				Affiliation	School of Thought					Theoretical Orientation	Academics	Research focus
	Europe	Asia	Australia/New Zealand	Latin America		Behavioralist	Institutionalist	Keynesian/ New Keynesian	Keynesian /Post Keynesian	Neoclassical			
AER					-.192			-.379		-.191	.184	-.216	
JPE	.244				-.609				-.540	-.315		-.201	-.154
EM					-.747		.569			-.193	-.204	-.243	-.235
QJE					-.492			-.302	.247	-.251		-.205	-.209
RESTAT	.160			.522	-.615		.203			-.127	.397	-.158	
RES					-.811		.264			-.264	-.381	-.265	-.316
JEL	-.366		-.352		-.556		-.532						.254
EJ	-.539	-.241	-.501		-.525			-.249	-.248				.146
JEP					-.650		-.476				.139		.233
JET		-.263			-.803					-.144	-.396	-.204	
RJE					-.740		.252					-.117	-.157
JF					-.544				.343				
JME			-.326		-.575		.224			-.158		-.176	
AERPP	-.154	-.267	-.359		-.375				-.261				
EER	-.739	-.320			-.403			-.231					-.107
IER			-.379		-.681					-.150		-.199	
BPEA								-.291			.237		.157
JPUE	-.160				-.582				.265				
JE					-.740	.284	.324				.140		.128
JLE					-.559		.293			-.129			
JMCB					-.481			-.264					.136
EI	.347			.692	-.609		-.335				.143	-.235	.323
JLAE					-.821		-.259						
ECO					-.670	-.345							.321
JIE			-.354		-.731		.300	-.236					
EL	-.291		-.331		-.497	-.282						-.174	
JFE					-.481							-.294	
JDE					-.877					-.166		-.183	
SEJ	.227			.702	-.594							-.187	.188
OEP	-.441	-.409			-.418			-.217	-.489				.120

Table 3- Ordinal Probit results

Journal	General Economics & Teaching	Mathematical & Quantitative Methods	Microeconomics	Macroeconomics & Monetary Economics	International Economics	Financial Economics	Public Economics	Health, Education & Welfare	Labor & Demographic Economics	Law & Economics	Industrial Organization	Economic History	Economic Development, Technological Change & Growth	Agricultural & Natural Resource Economics	Urban, Rural & Regional Economics
AER					-.355		-.422	-.290			-.395			-.331	-.497
JPE				-.453	-.354		-.386		-.277	-.670					
EM	.426	-1.001	-.464	-.243				-.302			-.299				
QJE	.373		-.217		-.305		-.352		-.575	-.325	-.272	-.821	-.240		
RESTAT						-.244		-.394	-.322						
RES			-.344	-.258											
JEL	-.455	.427	.260	.275		.486				.342	.330				
EJ					-.306	.298			-.213				-.390		
JEP				.202		.292									.334
JET		-.343	-.272	-.208							-.229			-.357	
RJE			-.305					-.391		-.429	-1.028				
JF		-.493	-.378	-.361		-1.535				.629					
JME				-.930	-.269						.297	-.449		.316	
AERPP	-.448								-.236						
EER					-.410								-.358		
IER		-.429		-.441	-.557								-.398	-.373	
BPEA		.296		-.222										.439	
JPUE						.354	-.802	-.456		-.357				-.449	-.370
JE		-.795						-.324							
JLE							-.381	-.637	-1.026						-.394
JMCB				-.514				.443							
EI							-.290								
JLAE			-.321				-.345			-.1.12	-.743				
ECO			-.300		-.299		-.333						-.284		
JIE					-.867			.494	.273					.435	
EL															
JFE				-.329		-.1.41		.420		-.579				.409	
JDE						.326		.367		.510			-.844		
SEJ	-.538								-.442						-.782
OEP					-.322										

Table 4- Ordinal Probit Results (per research field of interest)

Journal	Abbreviation	Journal	Abbreviation
Accounting Review	AR	Experimental Economics	EXE
African Development Review	ADR	Exploration in Econ. History	EEH
Agribusiness	AGB	Financial Management	FM
Agric. & Resource Econ. Review	ARER	Games & Economic Behavior	GEB
Agricultural Economics	AE	Harvard Business Review	HBR
AER Papers & Proceedings	AERPP	Health Economics	HEC
American Economic Review	AER	History of Polit. Economy	HPE
American J of Econ. & Sociology	AJES	Ind. & Labor Relations Review	ILRR
American J of Agricultural Econ.	AUJAE	Indian Economic J	IEJ
Annals of Public & Cooper. Econ.	APCE	Indian J of Economics	IJE
Annals of Regional Science	ARS	Intl Economic Review	IER
Antitrust Bulletin	AB	Intl J of Ind. Organization	IJO
Applied Economics	APE	Intl J of Soc. Econ.	IJSE
Applied Geography & Dev.	AGD	Intl Labor Review	ILR
Atlantic Economic J	AEJ	J of Acc. & Economics	JAE
Australian Economic Review	AUER	J of Acc. Research	JAR
Australian J of Agric. Econ.	AJAE	J of Agricultural Economics	JAGE
British J of Ind. Relations	BJIR	J of Applied Econometrics	JAEC
Brookings Papers on Econ. Act.	BPEA	J of Banking & Finance	JBFB
Business Economics	BE	J of Bus. Economics & Stats.	JBES
Business History Review	BHR	J of Business	JB
California Management Review	CMR	J of Common Market Studies	JCMS
Cambridge J of Economics	CJE	J of Comparative Economics	JCE
Canadian J of Economics	CAJE	J of Consumer Rsrch	JCR
Cato J	CJ	J of Developing Areas	JDA
Challenge	CH	J of Development Economics	JDE
Colorado Business Review	CBR	J of Development Studies	JDS
Contemporary Econ. Policy	CPI	J of Econ. Behavior & Organiz.	JEBO
Demography	DE	J of Econometrics	JE
Eastern Economic J	EEJ	J of Econ. Dynamics & Control	JEDC
Econ. Develop. & Cultural Change	EDCC	J of Economic Education	JEED
Econometric Theory	ET	J of Economic Growth	JEGR
Econometrica	EM	J of Economic History	JEH
Economic & Social Review	ESR	J of Economic Issues	JEI
Economic Geography	EG	J of Economic Literature	JEL
Economic History Review	HER	J of Economic Perspectives	JEP
Economic Inquiry	EI	J of Economic Studies	JES
Economic J	EJ	J of Economic Theory	JET
Economic Theory	ECOTH	J of Economics & Business	JEB
Economica	ECO	J of Econ. & Mgmt Strategy	JEMS
Economics Letters	EL	J of Environ. Econ. & Mgmt	JEE
Economics of Education Review	EEDR	J of European Econ. History	JEEH
Empirical Economics	EME	J of Fin. Services Research	JFSR
Energy Economics	ENE	J of Finance	JF
Energy J	ENJ	J of Financial Economics	JFE
European Economic Review	EER	J of Financial Research	JFR

Table 5 - Journals and Abbreviated Journal Names

Journal	Abbreviation	Journal	Abbreviation
J of Forecasting	JFO	NBER Macro. Annual	NBERM
J of Health Economics	JHE	Oxford Economic Papers	OEP
J of History of Economic Thought	JHET	Population Development Rev.	PDR
J of Human Resources	JHUR	Population Studies	PS
J of Industrial Economics	JINDE	Public Choice	PC
J of Intl Business Studies	JIBS	Public Finance Quarterly	PFQ
J of Intl Economics	JIE	Public Finance	PF
J of Int'l. Money & Finance	JIMF	Quarterly J Economics	QJE
J of Labor Economics	JLE	Quarterly J of Bus. & Econ.	QJBE
J of Labor Rsrch	JLR	Quarterly Rev. of Econ. & Bus.	QREB
J of Law & Economics	JLAE	Rand (Bell) J Economics	RJE
J of Law, Economics & Organization	JLEO	Reg. Science & Urban Econ.	RJUE
J of Macroeconomics	JM	Regional Studies	RS
J of Mathematical Economics	JMAE	Rev. of Black Polit. Economy	RBPE
J of Monetary Economics	JME	Review of Business	RB
J of Money Credit & Banking	JMCB	Review of Bus. & Econ. Rsrch	RBER
J of Political. Economy	JPE	Review of Econ. Dynamics	REDY
J of Post Keynesian Economics	JPKE	Review of Economic Studies	RES
J of Public Economics	JPUE	Review of Econ. & Statistics	RESTAT
J of Regional Science	JRS	Review of Financial Studies	RFS
J of Risk & Insurance	JRI	Review of Ind.Organization	RIO
J of Urban Economics	JUE	Review of Radical Polit. Econ.	RRPE
J of World Trade	JWT	Scandinavian J of Economics	SJE
Kyklos	KY	Scottish J of Polit. Economy	SJPE
Labor History	LH	Sloan Management Review	SLMR
Land Economics	LE	Social Choice & Welfare	SCW
Macroeconomic Dynamics	MADY	Southern Economic J	SEJ
Management Science	MS	Urban Studies	US
Managerial & Decision Economics	MDE	Weltwirt.Arch./Rev. of Wrld Econ.	WA
Michigan Law Review	MLR	World Development	WD
Monthly Labor Review	MLRE	World Economy	WE
National Tax J	NTJ	Yale Law J	YLJ
Natural Resources J	NRJ		

Table 5 - Journals and Abbreviated Journal Names

References

- Beed, K. and C. Beed. 1996. "Measuring the Quality of Academic Journals: The Case of Economics," *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 18, 3, 369-396.
- Burton, M.P. and E. Phimister. 1995. "Core Journals: A Reappraisal of the Diamond List," *Economic Journal*, 105, 361-373.
- Cannella, A.A. and R.L. Paetzold. 1994. "Pfeffer's Barriers to the Advance of Organizational Science: A Rejoinder," *Academy of Management Review*, 19, 2, 331-341.
- Colander, D. 1994. "Vision, Judgment and Disagreement among Economists," *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 1, 1, 43-56.
- Cole, S. 1993. "The Hierarchy of Sciences?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 89, 111-139.
- Conroy, M.E., Dusaksky, R., Drukker, D., and A. Kildegaard. 1995. "The productivity of Economics Departments in the U.S.: Publications in the Core Journals," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 33, 1966-1971.
- Dusansky, R. and C.J. Vernon. 1998. "Rankings of U.S. Economics Departments," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12, 1, 157-170.
- Foss, N.J. 1996. "Research in Strategy, Economics, and Michael Porter," *Journal of Management Studies*, 33, 1, 1-24.
- Hawkins, R.G., Ritter, L.S., and I. Walter. 1973. "What Economists Think of Their Journals," *Journal of Political Economy*, 81, 1017-1032.
- Hodgson, G. M. and H. Rothman. 1999. "The Editors and Authors of Economics Journals: A Case of Institutional Oligopoly?" *Economic Journal*, 109, 165-187.
- Hult, G. T. M., W. T. Neese, and R. E. Bashaw. 1997. "Faculty Perceptions of Marketing Journals," *Journal of Marketing Education*, 19(Spring), 37-52.
- Jin, J.C. and Yau, L. 1999. "Research productivity of the Economics Profession in East Asia," *Economic Inquiry*, 37, 4, 706-711.
- Kalaitzidakis P., Mamuneas, T.P. and T. Stengos. 1999. "European Economics: An Analysis based on Publications in the Core Journals," *European Economic Review*, 43,
- Kuhn, T.S. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*, 2nd edition, University of Chicago Press.
- Laband, D. and M.J. Piette. 1994. "The Relative Impacts of Economics Journals: 1970-1990," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 32, 640-666.
- Laband, D. and J.P. Sophocleus. 1985. "Reveals Preference for Economic Journals. Citations as Dollar Votes," *Public Choice*, 46, 317-24.
- Liner, G.H. 2002. "Core Journals in Economics," *Economic Inquiry*, 40, 1, 138-145.
- Liebowitz, S.J. and J.P. Palmer. 1984. "Assessing the Relative Impact of Economics Journals," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 22, 1, 77-88.
- Malouin, J.L. and J. F. Outreville. 1987. "The Relative Impact of Economics Journals: A Cross-Country Survey and Comparison," *Journal of Economics and Business*, 39, 267-77.

- Moore, W.J. 1972. "The Relative Quality of Economics Journals: A Suggested Rating System," *Western Economic Journal*, 156-69.
- Moore, W.J., Newman, R.J. and G.K. Turnbull. 2001. "Reputational Capital and Academy Pay," *Economic Inquiry*, 39, 4, 663-671.
- Pfeffer, J. 1993. "Barriers to the Advance of Organizational Science: Paradigm Development as a Dependent Variable," *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 4, 599-620.
- Pieters, R. and H. Baumgartner. 2002. "Who Talks to Whom? Intra-and Interdisciplinary Communication of Economics Journals," *Journal of Economic Literature*, XL, 2, 483-509.
- Scott, L.C. and P.M. Mitias. 1996. "Trends in Rankings of Economics Departments in the U.S.: An Update," *Economic Inquiry*, 34, 378-400.
- Seglen, P.O. 1997. "Why the Impact Factor of Journals Should not be Used for Evaluating Research," *British Medical Journal*, 314,
- Siegfried, J.J. 1998. "Who is a Member of the AEA?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12, 2, 211-223.
- Stigler, G.J., Stigler S.M. and C. Friedland. 1995. "The Journals of Economics," *Journal of Political Economy*, 103, 2, 331-359.
- Theoharakis, V. and A. Hirst. 2002. "Perceptual Differences of Marketing Journals: A Worldwide Perspective," *Marketing Letters*, 13, 4, 389-402.
- Van Maanen, J. 1995. "Style as Theory," *Organization Science*, 6, 1, 133-143.