



THE CITATION IMPACT OF FEMINIST ECONOMICS

Frances Woolley

To cite this article: Frances Woolley (2005) THE CITATION IMPACT OF FEMINIST ECONOMICS , Feminist Economics, 11:3, 85-106, DOI: [10.1080/13545700500301312](https://doi.org/10.1080/13545700500301312)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13545700500301312>



Published online: 13 Nov 2008.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 160



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 10 View citing articles [↗](#)

THE CITATION IMPACT OF *FEMINIST ECONOMICS*

Frances Woolley

ABSTRACT

Feminist economics is a transformative project. However, transformation generates resistance. Feminist economics can be deliberately excluded, co-opted through an uncritical application of rational choice theory, or ignored. And feminist economics can be listened to: when the United Nations consults feminist economists; when feminist economists publish in widely read journals; when a student finds inspiration in a *Feminist Economics* article. All of these are ways feminist economics can, and has, influenced the profession. After ten years of discourse, it is possible to take stock and assess the impact of feminist economics. This article provides a partial assessment through a consideration of citations of the journal *Feminist Economics*, describing its impact on mainstream economics, heterodox economics, and other disciplines. While the overall project of feminist economics encompasses much more than just one journal, studying the citations for *Feminist Economics* is a first step toward assessing the influence of the entire corpus.

KEYWORDS

Feminist economics, methodology, gender, interdisciplinary, citations

JEL Codes: B4, B5

INTRODUCTION

Feminist economics – whether one refers to the field of study or the journal – is a transformative project. According to the *Feminist Economics* website: “By opening new areas of economic inquiry, welcoming diverse voices, and encouraging critical exchanges, the journal enlarges and enriches economic discourse” (IAFFE 2005). Yet disciplinary transformation generates resistance. Feminist economics can be deliberately excluded, as in “that’s not economics,” “that publication won’t count towards tenure,” or “this is really just sociology.” Feminist economics can be co-opted with an uncritical application of rational choice theory, as in post- or sub-Becker studies. Feminist economics can be ignored. And feminist economics can be heard: when experts in the United Nations consult feminist economists in the preparation of the United Nations Human Development Report; when feminist economists publish in widely read

journals; when a student reads a *Feminist Economics* article, says “aha!” and then cites the piece in her first publication a few years later. All of these are ways feminist economics can, and has, influenced the profession. After ten years of discourse, it is possible to take stock and ask: who is listening? The difficulty is that listening is unobservable. To re-phrase an old puzzle: if a feminist economist speaks in a room full of traditional colleagues, does she make a sound?

In this article, I conduct a preliminary and partial assessment of the disciplinary location, character, and status of feminist economics by examining the citation patterns for one journal: *Feminist Economics*. In other research (Frances Woolley and David Long 2004), I have considered citation patterns for gender and the economy categorized more broadly; here, I have chosen to focus simply on the journal that self-identifies as the voice for feminist economists. I take this approach first to create a manageable and well-defined area of study; second, to avoid asking the question “What is feminist economics?”; and, finally, to take stock and find out where feminist economics is having an impact, on whom, and why – a project that is timely now, thirteen years after the formation of the International Association for Feminist Economics (IAFFE) in 1992.

THE IMPACT OF *FEMINIST ECONOMICS*: CITATION PATTERNS

Citation patterns have been used by a number of authors to trace the influence of scholarship and research by female economists (Marianne A. Ferber 1988; Marianne A. Ferber and Julie A. Nelson 2003), to test for discrimination in the academy (Scott Smart and Joel Waldfogel 1996), and to discern the nature of interdisciplinarity (Stephen Bulick 1982). Because scholars cite work that they have read – the work of people who have had an impact on the development of their ideas, people they respect, or even just people they know – looking at what is cited and by whom allows us to trace the impact of feminist economist scholars and scholarship. In short, a study of citation patterns suggests some answers to the questions: “Who reads *Feminist Economics*?” “Who thinks it is sensible?” and “Who cares?”

Following others in the literature, I use the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), Humanities Citation Index, and Science Citation Index, now available electronically through “Web of Science.”¹ The SSCI is created from the references listed in selected academic journals, such as *Feminist Economics*. For example, if an article in *Feminist Economics* contains a bibliography listing twenty references, every one of those references will be entered into the SSCI as a cited reference. Each time a reference is listed in a bibliography of a selected journal article (e.g., when a paper from *Feminist Economics* is listed in the bibliography of a *Journal of Economic Perspectives*

article) that reference counts as one citation for *Feminist Economics*. The SSCI covers hundreds of journals, but excludes citations in books, working papers, or technical reports. The coverage is most complete for well-established, English-language academic journals from large publishers and for American journals (provision of English-language bibliographic information is one criterion a journal must meet before being in the SSCI).² Yet even here there are some notable omissions – for example, neither the *Eastern Economic Journal* nor the *Journal of Economic Methodology* is included in the SSCI. New journals, small publishers, journals based outside the United States, and non-English-language journals are less likely to be included.

It is difficult to know how much the SSCI misses, simply because very few alternative measures of citation impact exist. The few that do are either confidential (e.g., proprietary publisher information about website downloads of articles), difficult and time-consuming to search accurately (e.g., most Internet search engines), or of recent and unknown reliability (e.g., www.scholar.google.com). These alternatives do not produce results suitable for the type of analysis carried out in this article because, for example, these sources do not code the citing article by subject area.

By tracing the citation patterns of a non-random collection of articles from *Feminist Economics*, Table 1 provides some sense of how the SSCI compares to four other Internet-based measures of impact. I chose to focus on Internet-based measures because these would be expected to pick up precisely what the SSCI misses (e.g., citations in working papers, course reading lists, or technical government reports). Google Scholar was chosen because it is the only search engine that focuses specifically on academic sites and provides fairly accurate estimates of the total number of citations (for other search engines one needs to count manually the number of true

Table 1 Comparison of the SSCI with other sources of citation information^a

Author	SSCI	Google Scholar	Google German	Google Spanish	Google French
Woolley (1996)	5 ^b	3	0	0	0
Woolley (2000)	2	4	0	0	0
Agarwal (1997)	62	85	2	4	2
Benería (1999)	5	13	1	0	0
Rubery, Smith, and Fagan (1998)	23	25	3	1	1
Bergmann (1971)	176	39	0	2	2

Notes: ^aSearches completed May 2005. The SSCI citations are cumulative over entire period. Language searches were completed by restricting webpage language and typing author name and either “feminist economics” or a title fragment such as “davos man” or “white wages.” Repeated searches were done to try to obtain accurate results. ^bWoolley figures include citations of “Woolley, F.” and other misspellings.

hits). The remaining impact measures are language-specific versions of www.google.com with the search restricted to results in specific languages. Google.com was chosen over, say, altavista.com, for this part of the search, because not only does it provide facilities for language restrictions, the results are more comparable to those of scholar.google.com.

Two of the articles in Table 1 are my own (Frances Woolley 1996, 2000), selected to represent low-impact articles. The article by Bina Agarwal (1997) is included because it is a very highly cited article, while a 1999 contribution by Lourdes Benería is chosen to represent work that I would expect to have a high impact in non-English speaking countries. The article by Jill Rubery, Mark Smith, and Colette Fagan (1998) is typical of the highest impact European scholarship, and the piece by Barbara R. Bergmann (1971) is chosen to represent high-impact early feminist economics scholarship.

The most important point about Table 1 is that the results from the SSCI are comparable to those of other search methods. While the SSCI's scope is limited to the bibliographies of journal articles and is narrow compared to the scope of Google Scholar, low-impact SSCI articles also have little impact on Google Scholar and articles cited frequently in the SSCI also pick up many citations in Google Scholar. The major difference between the two is that Google Scholar gives higher citation figures for recent articles, while the SSCI cites higher figures for older articles. For example, the SSCI picks up citations of Bergmann in the 1970s and 1980s, but Google Scholar does not. The SSCI numbers included in Table 1, like the figures presented throughout this article, are cumulative citations since the article's publication.

The second point to take from Table 1 is that the accurate criticism frequently levied at the SSCI – that its coverage of non-English language and developing world publications is incomplete – is not something we can easily address by using another search methodology. Electronic searches in German, Spanish, and French find very few webpages referring to any *Feminist Economics* publications. As noted above, however, it is difficult to conduct accurate citation searches using conventional search engines, so the language figures in Table 1 should be regarded as estimates, not definitive counts. In short, although the SSCI has limitations, there is no obvious or better alternative.

One aspect regarding SSCI's coverage of *Feminist Economics* needs further explanation. *Feminist Economics* was first included in the index in 1998 – three years after the journal began publication. While this is a relatively short time to wait for inclusion, it does mean that citations in *Feminist Economics* for 1995 through 1997 are not included in the SSCI database. For example, a 1996 *Feminist Economics* article by A. Haroon Akram-Lodhi (1996) makes reference to a piece published in the journal a year earlier by Carmen Diana Deere (1995). This citation, along with any others made in *Feminist Economics* between 1995 and 1997, is excluded from the SSCI.

However, when that same Carmen Diana Deere article is referenced by Kelly Hoffman and Miguel Angel Centeno (2003) in the *Annual Review of Sociology* and by Jongsoog Kim and Lydia Zepeda (2004) in *Feminist Economics*, the citations do appear in the database because the *Annual Review of Sociology* and *Feminist Economics* from 1998 onwards are SSCI journals. Citations of *Feminist Economics* articles published during 1995 through 1997 are also difficult to identify in the SSCI database, as they are often not entered using standard abbreviations. For example, current *Feminist Economics* articles are listed under the journal abbreviation FEM ECON, while pre-1997 articles are usually entered under FEMINIST EC or sometimes FEMINIST ECONOMICS. For these reasons, in the analysis below, I have separated the citation counts for articles published between 1995 and 1997 and those published in 1998 and afterwards.

The first thing that one learns when studying citation patterns is that most journal articles are rarely cited. The median number of citations for an article published in *Feminist Economics* between 1998 and 2004 is one – and this figure represents cumulative citations over the entire period. This is not unique to *Feminist Economics*. Other new specialist journals have, if anything, lower citation levels. The *Journal of Public Economic Theory*, for example, has 43 cited articles in the database over the same time period, and just one of these articles had over ten citations, with 18 references. The median number of citations appears to be about one. However, as journals with low citation numbers are not included in the SSCI (as noted above, a journal must meet a citation threshold in order to be included), even these few citations are large compared with most. Even articles from a top-ranked field journal such as *Journal of Public Economics* are rarely cited more than ten times.

The SSCI uses a summary measure called the “impact factor.” The impact factor is designed to measure “the frequency with which the ‘average article’ in a journal has been cited in a particular year or period.”³ It is calculated as:

$$\text{Impact factor} = \frac{\text{number of current year citations}}{\text{number of items published in journal over previous two years}}$$

If we look at the “impact factor” calculated by the SSCI for every journal in 2003, we find that (as of July 2004) *Feminist Economics* has an impact factor of 0.250, which puts it above *International Tax and Public Finance*, *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, *Applied Economics*, *Applied Economics Letters*, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, *Journal of Macroeconomics*, and a number of regional or highly specialized journals. It ranks slightly below *Public Choice* at 0.297 or *Economic Inquiry* at 0.301 (calculated from the SSCI, July 2004).

The second point is that citations are generated through a community of scholarship. Citation patterns reflect authors' knowledge of the work of others. That knowledge is sometimes gained through literature searches. Just as often it is gained when scholars go to conferences, referee articles, become supervisors or supervisees, or chat with friends and colleagues.

To find out more about the community of scholarship surrounding *Feminist Economics*, I analyzed the places where the journal has been cited since it first started publication. I began by looking carefully at the people who cite the journal. Those who reference *Feminist Economics* most frequently are Deborah M. Figart (citing articles from the journal fourteen times), Ellen Mutari (ten), Bina Agarwal (eight), Nancy Folbre (eight), and Julie A. Nelson (eight). Others citing the journal four or more times include Lourdes Benería, Michael Bittman, Peter S. Burton, Samuel Cameron, Robert Drago, Martha MacDonald, Karine S. Moe, Martha Nussbaum, Diane Perrons, Shelley A. Phipps, and Marilyn Power (my apologies to those I have missed). A complete list of all citing authors is included in Appendix 1, although secondary authors on some papers in health and science disciplines have been omitted.

A few points can be made about these authors and about the list in general. This article asks: "Who is listening?" According to the author list, the partial answer is, first, mostly women. It is perhaps worth restating the obvious implication: if few high-profile "mainstream" economists – say tenured professors at major research universities – are women, and the readers of *Feminist Economics* are mostly women, then we would expect few mainstream economists to take heed of the journal. A second point, and again a fairly obvious one, is that the people who cite *Feminist Economics* are often people who publish in the journal, are involved with the journal as associate editors (Agarwal, Benería, Nelson, and MacDonald, for example) or editorial board members or are members of IAFFE. Those who are involved in the journal see interesting work published there. Having said that, a majority of the spring 2005 editorial board members have *not* published something citing a *Feminist Economics* article, and the "big-name" economists and people outside North America are over-represented among these non-citers (possibly the latter fact reflects the North American focus of the SSCI or the different academic culture in Europe). Additionally, people self-cite. The majority of those who cite *Feminist Economics* most frequently reference at least one of their own articles. There is nothing wrong with promoting your own work; if everyone who published in *Feminist Economics* cited their own articles frequently, the impact and visibility of the journal would increase markedly. Also, one has to publish to self-cite; the overwhelming majority of the frequent citers listed above are also frequent publishers.

These findings have strategic implications. If people self-cite or cite articles they have refereed and found interesting, the journal will have

more impact in the mainstream when more people from the mainstream are involved in the journal (with the caveat that token involvement, like a name on an editorial board, does not necessarily lead to citation). Better yet, when people who are involved in the journal achieve prominence in the profession, *Feminist Economics* can bask in reflected glory.

I have said something about who cites the journal. The next question is: “Where are these citations occurring?” The “where” question can, with less effort than the “who” question, be broken down further. Are the citations in economics publications or in journals representing other disciplines? In the heterodox stream or the mainstream? In so-called “top” journals or not? When analyzing citation patterns, I divided the articles published in *Feminist Economics* into three groups. As noted above, *Feminist Economics* was not included in the SSCI until 1998. Since the 1995 to 1997 figures are not strictly comparable to the figures for 1998 and subsequent years, I have reported them separately. One of the articles published in 1995 through 1997, Agarwal (1997), is something of an outlier. It has approximately three times more citations than the next most cited article and alone accounts for almost one-quarter of the citations of articles published in *Feminist Economics* during this time period. Breaking out the results for this one article makes it easier to interpret the overall citation patterns.

Table 2 gives a partial assessment by disciplinary affiliation of the sources where *Feminist Economics* is cited. (A full list of all journals in which *Feminist Economics* articles were cited up to 2005 appears in Appendix 2.) These disciplinary affiliations are based on the SSCI’s own coding of journals by subject area, although I have collapsed a number of categories into, for example, “other, social science.” Often, journals are listed under more than one category (e.g., under both sociology and management). The category “economics, women’s studies” in Table 2 represents journals that are listed both as economics journals *and* women’s studies journals. Similarly, the category “other, economics” includes interdisciplinary economics journals (e.g., journals coded as “economics, sociology” or “economics, industrial relations” not identified with specific categories). The category “women’s studies, other” includes journals listed as “women’s studies” and another discipline. The rest of the categories in Table 2 are fairly straightforward.

Some of the findings in Table 2 replicate those of earlier research in which I was involved (Woolley and Long 2004) that looked at the most cited feminist economics texts, so I suspect they are fairly robust. First, economics citations represent less than half of the overall citation impact of *Feminist Economics*. “Economics”; “economics, women’s studies”; and “other, economics” (interdisciplinary journals with economics as one of the fields, such as “demography, economics”) together account for 47 percent of *Feminist Economics*’ total citations.

Table 2 Citations of papers published in *Feminist Economics* by discipline, all years to April 2005 (calculated by the author using the SSCI)

	SSCI (1998 onwards)		SSCI (1995–1997) (excluding Agarwal)		Agarwal (1997)		All Articles %
	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	
<i>Economics</i>							
Economics, women's studies	20	44	29	59	37	23	26
Economics	11	24	16	33	7	4	13
Economics, planning and development	2	5	3	7	10	6	4
Other, economics	3	6	8	17	3	2	5
<i>Related</i>							
Planning and development, including other	2	5	2	4	10	6	3
Industrial relations	5	10	3	7	2	1	4
<i>Other, Social Science</i>							
Environment, geology, geography	9	19	1	1	5	3	5
Sociology	6	13	5	11	8	5	6
Social science, interdisciplinary	6	12	3	7			4
Other, social science	13	29	11	23	10	6	12
<i>Women's Studies, Humanities</i>							
Women's studies	4	8	4	9	3	2	4
Other, women's studies	3	7	3	6			3
Law	3	6	2	4	2	1	2
Humanities, multidisciplinary	1	1	2	4			1
<i>Science and Health</i>							
Other, science	5	11	1	1	3	2	3
Other, health	8	18	6	12	2	1	6
Total	100	218	100	205	100	62	100
All economics as percentage of total		36%		57%		56%	47%

“Economics, women’s studies” represents one-quarter of the citations of articles published in *Feminist Economics*. This category has just one member: *Feminist Economics* itself. Moving across the columns of Table 2, it is striking how the percentage of citations accounted for by “economics, women’s studies” (i.e., *Feminist Economics*) increases. This is particularly surprising given that *Feminist Economics* was not included in the SSCI until 1998, so a number of early citations of *Feminist Economics* articles in the journal would not be included in the database. One would expect the 1995 through 1997 figures to be lower. I am not sure what explains this increase, but possibly it is a reflection of an emerging feminist economics canon. “Seminal” papers such as Agarwal’s have inspired or energized other feminist economists, so they cite her. Perhaps it is just a residual effect: it is not that early papers are cited relatively more in “economics, women’s studies”; it is that later papers have a bigger impact elsewhere, so the relative impact on “economics, women’s studies” is smaller.

The positive spin one can put on this finding is that feminist economists are a close-knit community of scholars who read, cite, and build upon each other’s work. A more worrying aspect is that to some extent we are talking to ourselves, preaching to the converted, and not really changing the world. Yet, as the Editor of this journal has suggested,

one could actually claim that talking among themselves has been essential for feminist economists to develop a new, more cogent, and mature discourse and alternative perspectives, with refinements to the crudest initial critiques. The prior need to be in constant engagement with the mainstream made it impossible for *Feminist Economics* to move on with more developed ideas that could ultimately really be a compelling alternative to standard neoclassical models. (Diana Strassman, pers. comm.)⁴

And as an anonymous reviewer pointed out, to expect many mainstream economics scholars to be willing to listen against their interests is probably utopian. As she put it:

Would involving mainstream economics in the journal (whatever is meant exactly [by mainstream]) prevent it [from] being feminist economics? Certainly changing the world is our main aim, but that is a huge project which we chip away at in diverse ways and, for me, not by over-compromising what we believe and how we work.

Are we, at least, changing economics? One of the most encouraging findings represented in Table 2 is that economics journals count for 16 percent of citations of articles published in *Feminist Economics* between 1995

and 1997 (excluding Agarwal). This figure demonstrates that there is a flow of ideas from *Feminist Economics* to other economics journals. I suspect that the relatively low impact of Agarwal (1997) on “economics” can be explained by three factors. First, her citation numbers are not greatly inflated by self-citations. Second, it is an artifact of the data: the SSCI lists many of the key development economics journals as “economics, planning and development” or just “planning and development.” Even though development economists might not consider their work interdisciplinary or outside “economics,” the SSCI tends to identify “economics” with developed country economics. A final explanation for Agarwal’s fairly low number of “economics” citations is that she has relatively few citations in the journals strongly identified with heterodox economics. There are no citations of Agarwal (1997) in *Cambridge Journal of Economics* or *Journal of Economics Issues*, two journals that accounted for over half of the “economics” citations for the 1998 and onwards articles. I would explain this in terms of the greater openness of development journals to heterodox thought in general, hence the lesser need for heterodox development economists to publish in the more exclusively heterodox journals.

The greatest impact of *Feminist Economics*, however, is in interdisciplinary economics (e.g., “economics, planning and development”) and outside economics. In terms of interdisciplinary economics, the contrast between Agarwal (1997) and the other articles published between 1995 and 1997 is interesting. Many of the other 1995 – 7 articles focused on women and work issues in developed countries and hence, tend to have more of an impact on areas such as industrial relations. Agarwal (1997), however, focuses on what happens within the household in a developing country context, hence the impact on planning and development. This unsurprising finding has important implications: the impact of feminist economics is shaped by what feminist economists choose to research and to publish. Some people will read and cite articles on Western labor markets; others will read and cite articles on women in the South. And the work we choose to do fills a gap in knowledge about women’s economic lives – knowledge that concerns other disciplines. Fields such as sociology and industrial relations consistently make up a reasonable percentage of citations of feminist economics work. In part, this is simply a size phenomenon: there are a lot of sociologists out there writing and citing. Yet it also suggests synergies and complementarities in terms of subject matter and methodology. If one looks at other economics journals, such as *Journal of Public Economic Theory* or *Canadian Journal of Economics*, one finds less relative impact outside the discipline and more relative impact within.

By way of contrast, the impact of feminist economics research on women’s studies is very low. This is partially accounted for by the small number of journals devoted to women’s studies – a discipline that is a very small part of the academic universe. Even if a *Feminist Economics* article were

cited in every volume of every women's studies journal, it would not have a large impact in the SSCI. The relatively low number of citations in women's studies journals also reflects, as argued elsewhere (Woolley and Long 2004), something of an unwillingness of those publishing in women's studies journals to engage with social science research methods, even if serious and qualitative. And perhaps, the lack of measurable impact of Agarwal (1997) on women's studies reflects a somewhat developed-world orientation within parts of the women's studies community.

I was surprised how much impact recent articles in *Feminist Economics* have had in health and medicine (broadly defined) and in environmental studies and geography. (I did a number of double-checks of these citations to make sure that I had not made an error when downloading or saving data from the SSCI.) Once one starts to look at individual references, however, the pattern is clear – the citation patterns reflect the research *Feminist Economics* has been publishing recently on environment and growth, on the one hand, and on care-giving and health, on the other. For example, Susan Wismer's (1999) article "From the Ground Up: Quality of Life Indicators and Sustainable Community Development" is cited in an article by Ilana Preuss and Amanda W. Vemuri (2004) on "'Smart Growth' and Dynamic Modeling: Implications for Quality of Life in Montgomery County, Maryland" in *Ecological Modeling*. As noted earlier, there are many areas in which mainstream economists are not writing, and *Feminist Economics* addresses these topics in an economic context and therefore publishes research of interest to the broader academic community.

When interpreting the overall results in Table 2, however, it is useful to bear in mind that the distribution of citations looks a bit like the distribution of wealth – a small percentage of all articles published account for the bulk of the citations. For example, citations of just three articles – Francine Blau, Patricia Simpson, and Deborah Anderson (1998); Tony Lawson (1999); and Rubery, Smith, and Fagan (1998) – account for over 20 percent of all citations of post-1998 articles. The fact that two of these three articles explore employment/labor economics issues tends to bias the citation patterns toward these areas. And not all citations share equal importance: a departmental tenure committee may be more impressed by a citation in *American Economic Review* than in *Ecological Modeling*. Table 3 breaks down journals within the broad category "economics" (excluding now "other, economics" and "economics, women's studies"). The impact, overwhelmingly, is within heterodox journals such as *Journal of Economics Issues* and *Cambridge Journal of Economics*. There are some "top-ranked" journal citations, such as *Economic Journal*, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, and *American Economic Review*. However, the majority of these citations are by people who have published in *Feminist Economics* and are, in a number of cases, self-cites.

ARTICLES

Table 3 Citations of *Feminist Economics* in economics and women's studies journals, all years to April 2005 (calculated by the author using the SSCI)

	Articles published 1998 onwards	Articles published 1995–1997 (excluding Agarwal [1997])	Agarwal (1997)	Total
<i>Feminist Economics</i>	44	59	23	126
<i>World Development</i>	3	7	6	16
<i>Journal of Economic Issues</i>	7	7		14
<i>Cambridge Journal of Economics</i>	7	2	1	10
<i>Journal of Economic Perspectives</i>	2	3	1	6
<i>Review of Social Economy</i>	1	5		6
<i>Signs</i>	2	1	1	4
<i>Journal of Population Economics</i>	2	1		3
<i>Review of Income and Wealth</i>	1	1	1	3
<i>American Economic Review</i>	1	1		2
<i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>		1	1	2
<i>Southern Economic Journal</i>	1	1		2
<i>World Bank Economic Review</i>	2			2
<i>Economic Journal</i>	1			1
<i>Economic Letters</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Economic Growth</i>	1			1

The third column in Table 3 shows the “economics” and “economics, other” journals in which Agarwal (1997) is cited. The important thing to get out of this table is that there is not a quantity-quality trade-off. As well as being cited more often than other articles, Agarwal is also cited in highly regarded journals such as *World Development*, one of the top development field journals. What this reflects, I think, is a much less rigid adherence to the mainstream conventions of formalism and rational choice outside the North American context and a greater acceptance of the idea that structures, constraints, institutions, households, and non-market mechanisms matter. Yet there is more to life than traditional economics, and the relatively low impact within the mainstream has to be seen within a broader context, where the interdisciplinary nature, accessibility, and relevance of *Feminist Economics* allows it to reach a wide audience.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Feminist Economics is a collaborative product of an academic community, and its impact reflects who feminist economists are and what they do. The journal has an impact on the mainstream economics profession when feminist economists swim with the current by publishing in mainstream journals, teaching and working in mainstream departments and institutions, and talking to mainstream people. It has an impact when people

from the mainstream decide to explore another tributary, to Google “feminist economics” and see what comes up.

It seems, unfortunately, that people from outside the discipline of economics are as likely, or more likely, to dip their toes into feminist thinking than are many traditional economists. Yet this is only a problem if feminist economists accept others’ parameters of debate. For example, there is far more grant money for medical research than for economic theory. Feminist economists know about care-giving and can apply for such grant money. Policy-makers are not interested in reading theorems, proofs, and lemmas. Feminist economics is comprehensible and that works in our favor. In an ecosystem, most life is found on the banks of the river, at the edge of the stream, where there is water, soil, sunlight – everything needed for growth. We know where we are now, so let us embrace that and keep on producing.

*Frances Woolley, Department of Economics, Carleton University,
1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, Canada K1S 5B6
e-mail: frances_woolley@carleton.ca*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper was presented at the International Association of Feminist Economics conference, Oxford, August 2004. The research is funded by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada standard research grant. I would like to thank Bina Agarwal, David Long, Raj Mankad, Diana Strassmann, and many others for helpful comments and suggestions; Zhao Bill Snow for research assistance; and three anonymous reviewers, as well as the *Feminist Economics* journal staff, for their valuable input and advice.

NOTES

¹ Information about the SSCI can be found online at <http://www.isinet.com/products/citation/SSCI> (accessed March 30, 2005).

² The ISI website describes the criteria for selection into the SSCI as follows: “The evaluation process consists of evaluation of many criteria such as, Basic Journal Publishing Standards (including Timeliness of publication, adherence to International Editorial Conventions, English Language Bibliographic Information [including English article titles, keywords, author abstracts, and cited references]). ISI also examines the journal’s Editorial Content, the International Diversity of its authors and editors. Citation Analysis using ISI data is applied to determine the journal’s citation history and/or the citation history of its authors and editors” (Thomson ISI 2005a).

³ This definition and the following formula are taken from Thomson ISI (2005b).

⁴ For similar arguments from the Editor, please refer to the Editorial in the 10(3) issue of *Feminist Economics* (Strassmann 2004).

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, Bina. 1997. "'Bargaining' and Gender Relations: Within and Beyond the Household." *Feminist Economics* 3(1): 1–51.
- Akram-Lodhi A. Haroon. 1996. "'You Are Not Excused from Cooking': Peasants and the Gender Division of Labor in Pakistan." *Feminist Economics* 2(2): 87–105.
- Benería, Lourdes. 1999. "Globalization, Gender, and the Davos Man." *Feminist Economics* 5(3): 61–83.
- Bergmann, Barbara R. 1971. "The Effect on White Incomes of Discrimination in Employment." *Journal of Political Economy* 79(2): 294–313.
- Blau, Francine, Patricia Simpson, and Deborah Anderson. 1998. "Continuing Progress? Trends in Occupational Segregation in the United States over the 1970s and 1980s." *Feminist Economics* 4(3): 29–71.
- Bulick, Stephen. 1982. *Structure and Subject Interaction: Toward a Sociology of Knowledge in the Social Sciences*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Deere, Carmen Diana. 1995. "What Difference Does Gender Make? Rethinking Peasant Studies." *Feminist Economics* 1(1): 53–72.
- Ferber, Marianne A. 1988. "Citations and Networking." *Gender and Society* 2(1): 82–9.
- and Julie A. Nelson. 2003. *Feminist Economics Today: Beyond Economic Man*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hoffman, Kelly and Miguel Angel Centeno. 2003. "The Lopsided Continent: Inequality in Latin America." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 363–90.
- IAFFE. 2005. "IAFFE." <http://iaffe.org/iaffe/Home.asp> (accessed July 27, 2004).
- Kim, Jongsoo and Lydia Zepeda. 2004. "When the Work is Never Done: Time Allocation in US Family Farm Households." *Feminist Economics* 10(1): 115–39.
- Lawson, Tony. 1999. "Feminism, Realism, and Universalism." *Feminist Economics* 5(2): 25–59.
- Preuss, Ilana and Amanda W. Vemuri. 2004. "'Smart Growth' and Dynamic Modeling: Implications for Quality of Life in Montgomery County, Maryland." *Economic Modeling* 171(4): 415–32.
- Rubery, Jill, Mark Smith, and Colette Fagan. 1998. "National Working-Time Regimes and Equal Opportunities." *Feminist Economics* 4(1): 71–101.
- Smart, Scott and Joel Waldfogel. 1996. A Citation-Based Test for Discrimination at Economics and Finance Journals. Working Paper 5460. Washington, DC: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Strassmann, Diana. 2004. "Feminist Economics – It Flourishes." *Feminist Economics* 10(3): 1–2.
- Thomson ISI. 2005a. "Journal Selection Process." <http://www.isinet.com/selection/#jsc> (accessed July 23, 2005).
- Thomson ISI. 2005b. "The Impact Factor: ISI." http://www.isinet.com/cgi-bin/html_hl?DB=ISISite&STEMMER=en&WORDS=impact+factor+&COLOUR=Purple&STYLE=s&URL=http://sunweb.isinet.com/ts/knowtrend/essays/journalcitationreports/impactfactor/#Muscat_highlighter_first_match (accessed March 30, 2005).
- Wisman, Susan. 1999. "From the Ground Up: Quality of Life Indicators and Sustainable Community Development." *Feminist Economics* 5(2): 109–14.
- Woolley, Frances. 1996. "Getting the Better of Becker." *Feminist Economics* 2(1): 114–20.
- . 2000. "Degrees of Connection: A Critique of Rawls's Theory of Mutual Disinterest." *Feminist Economics* 6(2): 1–21.
- and David Long. 2004. "Does Gender + the Economy = Feminist Economics?" Unpublished manuscript, Carleton University.

APPENDIX 1. LIST OF AUTHORS CITING ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN
FEMINIST ECONOMICS (1995 – 1997), EXCLUDING CITATIONS OF AGARWAL
 (1997), CREATED USING THE SSCI APRIL 2005 DATA

Adaman, F.; Agarwal, B. (2); Agustin, L. M.; Akusjarvi, G.; Akram-Lodhi, A. H.; Allen-Mersh, T. G.; Alm, J.; Al-Samarrai, S.; Altschuler, J.; Amariglio, J.; Andersson, G.; Anthony, D.; Araia, R.; Aslanbeigui, N.; Austen, S.; Badgett, M. V. L. (3); Bailey, C.; Baines, S.; Barker, D. K.; Bassett, K.; Behrman, J. R.; Benería, L. (3); Bergmann, B. R.; Berik, G.; Bianchi, S. M.; Birbaumer, N.; Bittman, M. (4); Blau, F. D. (2); Blumenberg, E.; Boris, E.; Braun, C.; Bravewomon, L.; Brewer, R. M.; Brown, K. M.; Browne, M. N.; Brunner, N.; Burton, P. (3); Butler, S. S.; Butler-Smith, P.; Cadsby, C. B.; Cagatay, N. (2); Callister, P.; Cameron, S. (4); Carlson, A.; Carrasco, C.; Centeno, M. A.; Chamallas, M.; Chan, A. M. K.; Cherry, R.; Ciscel, D. H.; Dale, K.; Dallalfar, A.; Dallas, L. L.; Dekel, R.; Dijkstra, A. G.; Dimand, R. W.; Dolfma, W. (2); Donath, S.; Drago, R.; Dudleston, A. C.; Dupre, J.; Dymski, G.; Echevarria, C.; Eckel, C. C.; Elson, D. (3); Elson, D.; Elson, D.; England, P.; Escamilla, J. B.; Esim, S.; Ferber, M. A. (2); Figart, D. M. (10); Floro, M. (2); Floro, M. S.; Folbre, N. (4); Forget, E. L. (2); Fraser, N.; Frey, B. S.; Friesen, J.; Frisch, M.; Gagnier, R.; Galtry, J. (2); Gasca, R.; Giddings, L. (2); Gideon, J.; Giullari, S.; Goodin, R. E. (2); Grapard, U.; Gray, A.; Greaves, L.; Green, A. E.; Green, C. A.; Grossbard-Shechtman, S. (2); Grossman, P. J.; Grown, C. (2); Haddock, S. A.; Hankivsky, O.; Hanmer, L. C. (2); Hansen, B. F.; Hanson, J. D.; Hardill, I. (2); Hartmann, H.; Hazarika, G.; Headlee, S.; Heath, J. A.; Hedenborg, S.; Heila, H.; Henriksson, M.; Hiedemann, B. G.; Hill, M. T.; Himmelweit, S.; Hirschfeld, M. L.; Hobgood, M. E.; Hoffman, K.; Hoffman, S. D.; Hoppe, H.; Hopton, J.; Horne, C.; Houser, D.; Huang, A.; Humphries, J.; Hyde, J. S.; Hyman, P. (2); Hyoun, C.; Isometsa, E.; Iversen, V.; Jackson, C. (2); Jefferson, T. (2); Joesch, J. M.; Jones, K.; Kahn, L. M.; Kangas, O.; Kashian, R.; Kessler-Harris, A.; Khan, B. Z.; Kidder, D. L.; Kim, J.; King, J. E.; King, M. C. (2); Knaul, F. M.; Knowles, S.; Korinek, K.; Krebs, A.; Kreimer, M.; Kurzban, R. (2); Ladino, C.; Landefeld, J. S.; Lapidus, J. (2); Larbig, W.; Lawson, T. (3); Leary, M. R.; Levison, D. (3); Lewis, J.; Lewis, M.; Logue, K. D.; Lonnqvist, J.; Lorgelly, P. K.; Lupton, D.; MacDonald, M. (2); MacDonald, S.; MacPhail, F. (2); Madra, Y. M.; Matheson, G. (2); Maynes, E.; McCulla, S. H.; McCullough, T.; McGoldrick, K. M.; McKay, A. (2); McKinley, N. M.; Meagher, G. (3); Meier, S.; Miles, M.; Mink, G.; Moe, K. S. (4); Moehling, C. M.; Molin, M.; Monk-Turner, E.; Montoya, P.; Movahedi, S.; Mutari, E. (6); Naples, N. A. (2); Nelson, J. A. (4); Neuman, S.; Nielsen, H. J.; Nolan, B.; Normark, M.; Nyland, C.; Offutt, S.; OHara, S. U. (2); Osberg, L.; Oughton, E.; Owen, D. W.; Owen, P. D.; Pain, R.; PalmerJones, R.; Palmer-Jones, R.; Parpo, A.; Patel, H.; Patterson, P. L.; Pavitt, C.; Perrons, D. (2); Phipps, S. A. (5); Polachek, S. W.; Posel, D. R. (2); Power, M. (4); Preissl, H.; Presser, H. B.;

Purkayastha, D. (2); Recio, A.; Reiter, S. A.; Robinson, J. P.; Robst, J.; Rose, N. E.; Rose, P.; Rosenzweig, M. R.; Ruccio, D. F.; Ruwanpura, K. N.; Sacks, M. P.; Sayer, L. C. (2); Schmied, V.; Schneider, G.; Schultz, V.; Seguino, S. (3); Shackelford, J.; Shaffer, P.; Sharp, D. C.; Sharp, R.; Smith, J.; Spencer, C.; Spriggs, W. E.; Springer, K. W.; Steinberg, R. J.; Strober, M. H.; Suarez-Morales, E.; Summerfield, G. (2); Suominen, K.; Taylor, L. O.; Thein, V.; Tsavellas, G.; Tu, S. H.; Turner, C. G.; Ulbricht, S.; Ungerson, C. (2); van der Lippe, T.; van Dijk, L.; Vanevery, J.; Varcoe, C.; Waldfogel, J.; Waller, W.; Werther, K.; Wheelock, J. (2); Whittington, L. A.; Williams, P. F.; Williams, R. M.; Wiseman, V.; Woolley, F.; Zelizer, V. A.; Zepeda, L.; Ziemba, S.; Zimmerman, T. S.

List of authors citing Agarwal (1997), created using April 2005 SSCI data

Agargun, M. Y.; Agarwal, B. (6); Allen, M.; Baines, S.; Basu, K.; Bittman, M.; Bojer, H.; Braunstein, E.; Buchanan, G. O.; Burton, P.; Carter, M. W.; Cartwright, R.; Chan, A. M. K.; Crow, B.; Deshmukh-Ranadive, J.; England, P.; Evers, B.; Ferber, M. A.; Folbre, N. (2); Gideon, J.; Giullari, S.; Gray, L. C.; Grossbard-Shechtman, S.; Hill, M. T.; Himmelweit, S.; Horrell, S.; Humphries, J.; Iversen, V.; Jackson, C.; Jefferson, T.; Jeffery, P. (2); Jeffery, R.; Jutting, J. P.; Kalabamu, F.; Kanji, S.; Kantor, P. (2); Karlekar, M.; Kevane, M.; Kim, J.; King, J. E.; Koltun, V.; Lansky, M.; Lewis, J.; Matheson, G.; Monk-Turner, E.; Nelson, J. A.; Nussbaum, M. C. (5); Osberg, L.; Oughton, E.; Oxley, D.; Peter, F. (2); Phipps, S.; Posel, D.; Povey, E. R.; Purkayastha, D.; Reese, P. B.; Robeyns, I.; Ruwanpura, K. N.; Sanghera, B.; Sayer, L.; Shaffer, P.; Sharif, N. R. (2); Steele, S. R.; Strober, M. H.; Sultana, F.; Thorsen, D.; Turner, C. G.; Walters, B.; Weinberger, K.; Wheelock, J.; Woolley, F.; Zepeda, L.

List of authors citing articles published in *Feminist Economics* 1998 or later

Adnett, N.; Alvarez, B.; Amariglio, J.; Ananth, C. V.; Arun, S. V.; Arun, T. G.; Austen, S.; Badgett, M. V. L.; Baines, S. (2); Barker, D. K.; Baunach, D. M.; Baxter, J.; Becker, W. E.; Benería, L.; Bergeron, S.; Berkhout, P.; Bernardo, L. M.; Bianchi, S. M.; Blair-Loy, M.; Blau, F. D.; Blazevic, V.; Borooah, V. K.; Brewer, R. M.; Broomhill, R.; Bruning, G.; Brzuzy, S.; Budig, M.; Buhler, E.; Burgess, J.; Cantillon, S.; Cao, X. M.; Carter, M. W.; Cespedes, G. C.; Chan, A. M. K.; Chevallier, B.; Christendat, D.; Christensen, K.; Cohen, B.; Cohen, P. N.; Coleman, M. G.; Coltrane, S.; Condon, M.; Conrad, C. A.; Cooper, C.; Corcoran, S. P.; Cornish, F.; Creighton, C.; Davis, A.; de la Rosa, R.; Dex, S.; Dijkstra, A. G.; Dimand, R. W.; Dolan, C. S.; Drago, R. (3); Dyer, J.; Ellingsaeter, A. L.; Ellis, M.; Engeser, P.; England, P.; Ettlinger, N.; Evans, W. N.; Fagan, C.; Figart, D. M. (4); Floro, M.; Folbre, N. (2); Forget, E. L.; Frijters, P.; Fussell, E.; Ganguly-Scrase, R.; Gardiner, J.; Gardner, M. J.; Gasper, D.; Gilton, C. S.; Grossbard-Shechtman, S.; Grown, C.; Hambrey, M.

J. (2); Hammer, E.; Hansen, J.; Harding, S.; Hardy, S.; Haylett, C. (2); Heintz, J.; Hill, M. T.; Himmelweit, S.; Hinkley, L. L.; Hoad, N.; Hobson, K.; Holmwood, J.; Hyatt, D.; Jacobs, J. A.; Jefferson, T.; Jefferson, T.; Jennings, A.; Jolls, C. (2); Joshi, H.; Kahn, L. M.; Kani, J.; Kashian, R.; Kasperbauer, J. L.; Kato, K.; Kaul, N.; Kawakami, K.; Kawakami, M.; Kemp, S. R.; Kennedy, P.; King, J. E.; King, M. C. (2); Klasen, S.; Kleman, J.; Knuppel, R. A.; Koggel, C. M.; Lagerlof, N. P.; Lawson, T. (2); Leal, M.; Lewin-Epstein, N.; Lewis, J.; Lewis, M.; Lewis, S.; Liu, C.; Lu, U.; MacDonald, M. (3); MacPhail, F.; Mamadouh, V.; Mayer, M. (2); McCluskey, M. T.; McDowell, L.; McGoldrick, K. M.; McKelvey, B. (2); Meagher, G.; Medved, A. J. M.; Melberg, K.; Michalos, A. C.; Miles, D.; Mollien, P.; Murphy-Lawless, J.; Mutari, E. (4); Nelson, J. A. (3); Newman, C.; Nitta, T.; Nolan, B.; Nussbaum, M. C.; Nyland, C.; Oaks, L. (2); Odih, P.; O'Hara, S. U.; Olivieri, A.; Olmsted, J. C.; Osterle, A.; Oughton, E. (2); Palley, T. I.; Peinado, J. M.; Perrons, D. (4); Peter, F. (2); Phipps, S.; Pichini, S.; Pitetti, R.; Plantenga, J. (3); Plug, E.; Pollert, A.; Popliker, M.; Power, M.; Prasch, R. E. (2); Preston, A.; Preuss, I.; Prskawetz, A.; Pujol, M. A.; Puri, R. K.; Pyle, J. L.; Ramamurthy, P.; Rankin, K. N.; Raunio, T.; Reichert, K.; Riach, P. A.; Rich, J.; Robeyns, I.; Robinson, J. K.; Rodriguez, E.; Rosenfield, R.L.; Ruccio, D. F.; Saget, C.; Schach, S.; Scheidt, R.; Schippers, J.; Schneider, G.; Scholtes, S.; Schultz, V.; Schwab, R. M.; Scorza, W. E.; Segal, E.; Seguino, S.; Seiz, J. A.; Sen, A.; Shackelford, J.; Sharp, P.; Sharp, R.; Shlomai, A.; Siegers, J.; Sikic-Micanovic, L.; Simpson, P. A.; Skevik, A.; Smithson, J.; Smulian, J. C.; Steele, S. R.; Stier, H.; Strachan, G.; Strassmann, D.; Strober, M. H.; Stroeve, A. P.; Strome, S. E.; Stromwall, L.; Sutton, S. E.; Sznadger, M.; Thein, V.; Thomson, E.; Thorsen, D.; Tijdens, K. (2); Toroyan, T.; Tsafiriri, A.; Tsukuda, M.; Upadhyay, U. D.; Vaknin, K. M.; Valodia, I.; Van Klaveren, M.; van Staveren, I. (2); Vemuri, A. W.; Vikat, A.; Villanueva, M. A.; Vintzileos, A. M.; Ward, J.; Ward, K. B.; Warren, T. (2); Wheelock, J. (2); Wiesemann, A.; Wilson, R.; Winkler, J. A.; Winstanley, D.; Wright, R.; Yao, J. E.; Yu, C. S.; Zelizer, V.

ARTICLES
APPENDIX 2. COMPLETE LISTING OF ALL JOURNALS IN WHICH CITATIONS APPEAR

	1998 onwards articles	1995 – 97 excl. Agarwal	Agarwal (1997)	Total
<i>Feminist Economics</i>	44	59	23	126
<i>World Development</i>	3	7	6	16
<i>Journal of Economic Issues</i>	7	7		14
<i>Cambridge Journal of Economics</i>	7	2	1	10
<i>World Bank Economic Review</i>	2			2
<i>Journal of Economic Perspectives</i>	2	3	1	6
<i>Journal of Social Policy</i>	3	3		6
<i>Review of Social Economy</i>	1	5		6
<i>Social Politics</i>	2	4		6
<i>Work, Employment & Society</i>	3	3		6
<i>Asian Journal of Women's Studies</i>	2	2	1	5
<i>Development and Change</i>	2	1	2	5
<i>Signs</i>	2	1	2	5
<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>		3	1	4
<i>Canadian Public Policy—Analyse De Politiques</i>	2	2		4
<i>Economic And Industrial Democracy</i>	2	2		4
<i>Gender & Society</i>	3	1		4
<i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i>	3	1		4
<i>Political Geography</i>	3		1	4
<i>Social Indicators Research</i>	2	2		4
<i>Economy and Society</i>	1	1	1	3
<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	3			3
<i>International Labour Review</i>	2		1	3
<i>Journal of European Social Policy</i>	3			3
<i>Journal of Family Issues</i>	1	2		3
<i>Journal of Population Economics</i>	2	1		3
<i>Population and Development Review</i>	1	2		3
<i>Review of Income and Wealth</i>	1	1	1	3
<i>Social Science & Medicine</i>	3			3
<i>Sociologia Ruralis</i>	3			3
<i>Time & Society</i>	2	1		3
<i>American Behavioral Scientist</i>	1	1		2
<i>American Economic Review</i>	1	1		2
<i>Antipode</i>	2			2
<i>Australian Feminist Studies</i>	1	1		2
<i>British Journal of Industrial Relations</i>	2			2
<i>British Medical Journal</i>	2			2
<i>Columbia Law Review</i>	1	1		2
<i>Contributions to Indian Sociology</i>			2	2
<i>Deutsche Zeitschrift Fur Philosophie</i>		1	1	2
<i>Economic and Political Weekly</i>			2	2
<i>Economic Inquiry</i>		2		2

(continued)

CITATION IMPACT OF *FEMINIST ECONOMICS*

APPENDIX 2. (Continued)

	1998 onwards articles	1995–97 excl. Agarwal	Agarwal (1997)	Total
<i>European Journal of Population–Revue Européenne De Demographie</i>	1	1		2
<i>European Journal of Women’s Studies</i>	1	1		2
<i>Feminist Review</i>	1	1		2
<i>Feminist Studies</i>		2		2
<i>Industrial Relations</i>	2			2
<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	2			2
<i>Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization</i>		2		2
<i>Journal of Peasant Studies</i>		1	1	2
<i>Journal of Political Philosophy</i>	1	1		2
<i>Pacific Review</i>	1	1		2
<i>Rural Sociology</i>	1	1		2
<i>Social Dynamics: A Journal of the Centre for African Studies</i>		1	1	2
<i>Social Forces</i>	1	1		2
<i>Society</i>	1	1		2
<i>Southern Economic Journal</i>	1	1		2
<i>Women’s Studies International Forum</i>	1	1		2
<i>Work and Occupations</i>	1	1		2
<i>Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work</i>	1			1
<i>American Journal of Agricultural Economics</i>		1		1
<i>American Journal of Economics And Sociology</i>		1		1
<i>American Journal of Family Therapy</i>		1		1
<i>Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</i>		1		1
<i>Annual Review of Sociology</i>		1		1
<i>Applied Economics</i>		1		1
<i>Applied Economics Letters</i>		1		1
<i>Archives de Pédiatrie</i>	1			1
<i>Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation</i>	1			1
<i>Arthritis and Rheumatism</i>		1		1
<i>Australian Journal of Political Science</i>	1			1
<i>Brain Research</i>	1			1
<i>British Journal of Sociology</i>	1			1
<i>Business Ethics Quarterly</i>		1		1
<i>Canadian Journal of Chemistry–Revue Canadienne de Chimie</i>	1			1
<i>Canadian Journal of Development Studies–Revue Canadienne D’Etudes du Développement</i>		1		1
<i>Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology–Revue Canadienne de Anthropologie</i>	1			1
<i>Childhood: A Global Journal of Child Research</i>	1			1
<i>Classical and Quantum Gravity</i>	1			1

(continued)

ARTICLES

APPENDIX 2. (Continued)

	1998 onwards articles	1995 – 97 excl. Agarwal	Agarwal (1997)	Total
<i>Clinical & Experimental Metastasis</i>		1		1
<i>Clinical Cancer Research</i>	1			1
<i>Communication Theory</i>		1		1
<i>Communist and Post-Communist Studies</i>		1		1
<i>Comparative Education Review</i>		1		1
<i>Contemporary Family Therapy</i>		1		1
<i>Continuity and Change</i>		1		1
<i>Cultural Anthropology</i>	1			1
<i>Culture Health & Sexuality</i>	1			1
<i>Demography</i>	1			1
<i>Desarrollo Económico: Revista de Ciencias Sociales</i>	1			1
<i>Digestive Diseases and Sciences</i>	1			1
<i>Discrete & Computational Geometry</i>			1	1
<i>Drustvena Istrazivanja</i>	1			1
<i>Ecological Economics</i>		1		1
<i>Ecological Modelling</i>	1			1
<i>Economic Development and Cultural Change</i>		1		1
<i>Economic History Review</i>			1	1
<i>Economic Journal</i>	1			1
<i>Economic Record</i>		1		1
<i>Economica</i>		1		1
<i>Economics and Philosophy</i>			1	1
<i>Economics Letters</i>	1			1
<i>Environment and Planning D: Society & Space</i>		1		1
<i>Environmental Politics</i>	1			1
<i>Ethics</i>			1	1
<i>European Journal of Industrial Relations</i>	1			1
<i>European Journal of Personality</i>		1		1
<i>European Societies</i>		1		1
<i>Food Policy</i>		1		1
<i>Fordham Law Review</i>	1			1
<i>Gender Work and Organization</i>	1			1
<i>General Hospital Psychiatry</i>		1		1
<i>Geographische Zeitschrift</i>	1			1
<i>Geology</i>	1			1
<i>Gesundheitswesen</i>	1			1
<i>Global and Planetary Change</i>	1			1
<i>GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies</i>	1			1
<i>Gruppenpsychotherapie und Gruppendynamik</i>	1			1
<i>Habitat International</i>			1	1
<i>Harvard Law Review</i>	1			1
<i>Health & Social Care in the Community</i>		1		1
<i>Health Policy</i>		1		1
<i>History of Political Economy</i>		1		1
<i>Human Relations</i>	1			1

(continued)

CITATION IMPACT OF *FEMINIST ECONOMICS*APPENDIX 2. (*Continued*)

	1998 onwards articles	1995–97 excl. Agarwal	Agarwal (1997)	Total
<i>Indiana Law Journal</i>	1			1
<i>Industrial & Labor Relations Review</i>		1		1
<i>Insurance Mathematics & Economics</i>	1			1
<i>International Development Planning Review</i>			1	1
<i>International Journal of Manpower</i>	1			1
<i>International Sociology</i>	1			1
<i>Internet Research: Electronic Networking Applications and Policy</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Applied Econometrics</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Canadian Studies—Revue D'Etudes Canadiennes</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Common Market Studies</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Developing Areas</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Development Studies</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Economic Geography</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Economic Growth</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Economic History</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>			1	1
<i>Journal of Environmental Psychology</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Exposure Analysis and Environmental Epidemiology</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Gender Studies</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Health Psychology</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Immunological Methods</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Interdisciplinary History</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Labor Research</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Legal Studies</i>			1	1
<i>Journal of Leukocyte Biology</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Lightwave Technology</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Management</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Pathology</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Planning Education and Research</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Post Keynesian Economics</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Religious Ethics</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Safety Research</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Sociology</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of Structural Engineering: ASCE</i>	1			1
<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Virology</i>		1		1
<i>Journal of Women & Aging</i>		1		1
<i>Kyklos</i>		1		1
<i>Middle Eastern Studies</i>		1		1
<i>Molecular and Cellular Endocrinology</i>	1			1
<i>National Tax Journal</i>		1		1

(continued)

ARTICLES

APPENDIX 2. (*Continued*)

	1998 onwards articles	1995 – 97 excl. Agarwal	Agarwal (1997)	Total
<i>New York University Law Review</i>	1			1
<i>Obstetrics and Gynecology</i>	1			1
<i>Organization</i>		1		1
<i>Oxford Economic Papers: New Series</i>		1		1
<i>Pediatric Emergency Care</i>	1			1
<i>Phytochemistry</i>			1	1
<i>Policy and Politics</i>	1			1
<i>Population and Environment</i>	1			1
<i>Professional Geographer</i>	1			1
<i>Psychiatry Research</i>			1	1
<i>Psychological Bulletin</i>		1		1
<i>Psychology of Women Quarterly</i>		1		1
<i>Review of Black Political Economy</i>		1		1
<i>Review of Economics and Statistics</i>		1		1
<i>Review of International Studies</i>			1	1
<i>Revista De Biologia Tropical</i>		1		1
<i>Rutgers Law Review</i>		1		1
<i>Scientometrics</i>	1			1
<i>Sedimentology</i>	1			1
<i>Siam Journal on Optimization</i>	1			1
<i>Social & Legal Studies</i>	1			1
<i>Social Policy & Administration</i>	1			1
<i>Social Problems</i>	1			1
<i>Social Psychology Quarterly</i>		1		1
<i>Social Science Research</i>	1			1
<i>Social Work Research</i>	1			1
<i>Sociological Forum</i>			1	1
<i>Sociological Research Online</i>		1		1
<i>Sociological Review</i>			1	1
<i>Sociological Theory</i>	1			1
<i>Sociology of Health & Illness</i>		1		1
<i>Sociology-Journal of the British Sociological Association</i>			1	1
<i>South African Journal of Economics</i>		1		1
<i>Southern California Law Review</i>		1		1
<i>Stanford Law Review</i>	1			1
<i>Tidsskrift for Samfunnsforskning</i>	1			1
<i>Tourism Management</i>	1			1
<i>Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers</i>	1			1
<i>Urban Affairs Review</i>	1			1
<i>Urban Studies</i>	1			1
<i>Yale Law Journal</i>		1		1
<i>International Labour Review</i>				0