REVEALED PERFORMANCES: WORLDWIDE RANKINGS OF ECONOMISTS AND ECONOMICS DEPARTMENTS, 1990–2000

Tom Coupé
Economics Education and Research
Consortium, Kyiv

Abstract
In this paper, I study the production of academic research by economics departments and economists. Worldwide rankings are provided based on both citations and publications. These rankings reveal a dominant position of the United States in the production of economics literature. Over time, however, the extent of this dominance is decreasing. (JEL: A10, A14)

1. Introduction

In a time that so much is said and written, especially by economists, about the globalization of the economy, it is surprising to see the localism that prevails when economists study the production of economics research. U.S. economists rank U.S. institutions (for example, Scott and Mitias 1996; SM henceforward)[1], Canadian economists restrict themselves to Canadian departments (Lucas 1995), Asian economists focus on Asian departments (Jin and Yau 1999) and Australian economists look at Australian Departments (Harris 1990). Only recently, the European single market-idea has reached the rankings with the publication of a ranking of European departments based on ten top journals (Kalaitzidakis, Mamuneas, and Stengos 1999; KMS henceforward) but earlier on, Dutch economists had ranked Dutch economists (for example, De Ruyter van Steveninck 1998), Belgian economists had restricted themselves to Belgian departments (Bauwens 1998) and German economists had focused on German-

Acknowledgments: I am 131,000+ in my ranking. I thank Mathias Dewatripont, Peter Neary, Gerard Roland, and Frederic Warzynski and several visitors to my home page for helpful comments, Barry Hirsch, David Laband, and Loren Scott for sending me their page-size corrections and the Belgian federal government (PAI 4/28) and the European Economic Association for financial support. Of course, errors are mine.

E-mail address: tcoupe@eerc.kiev.ua

1. The only exception is Hirsch, Austin, Brooks, and Moore (1984). Recently, some other papers on the output of economics departments worldwide have been presented (based on fifteen journals, Kocher and Sutter (2001), and based on thirty journals, Kalaitzidakis et al. (2003)). Lubrano, Bauwens, Kirman, and Protopopescu (2003) present a new European ranking and compare European departments to departments in California.

speaking economists (Bommer and Ursprung 1998). Here, we will take the final step and provide a worldwide ranking of departments and of economists, using ten years of data (1990–2000).[2]

Another, often heard, critique of rankings is that rankings only use a limited number of journals. The European ranking mentioned above is based on ten journals and the most recent U.S. ranking (Dusansky and Vernon 1998; DV henceforward) is based on eight journals. Departments or individuals dissatisfied with their ranking find a powerful excuse in this narrowness. Here, we will compute rankings that are based on different samples of journals, one sample even using up to 700 different journals. Of course, using many journals raises the issue of quality differences among these journals. Therefore, we will also construct weighted rankings where the weights are based on the citations that were received by the journals in the recent past. Several weighting schemes will be used so the excuse that we were disadvantaged by the specific weighting scheme will be more difficult to defend. In addition, rankings based on the number of citations will be presented.

Finally, we will show how the performance of economics departments has evolved over time. Our database covers the period 1969–2000 for economists and 1990–2000 for departments. This allows us to look at how the institutional rankings evolved during the 1990s. By mimicking the method used by Hirsch, Austin, Brooks, and Moore (1984; HABM henceforward) for the period 1978–1982, we will also be able to show how the performance of the departments changed over a longer period of time. It will also allow us to show what happened to the gap between U.S. and non-U.S. departments.

2. Data and Ranking Methodologies[3]

As our main source of data, we use the EconLit database. In the period 1969–2000, some 800 journals have been indexed by EconLit, so one can claim with a slight exaggeration, first, that if one is not in EconLit, one did not do academic research in economics, and second, that these journals together form the "economics literature."[4]

Since the late 1980s, EconLit includes the affiliation of the authors in its

2. In this article we focus on the period 1990–2000. For rankings on shorter and longer periods, see ⟨http://homepages.ulb.ac.be/~tcoupe/ranking.html⟩. There, one can also find a working paper version of this paper that contains information on the composition of EconLit, insider bias and much more.

3. All the different rankings can be found on my web page. This paper, because of size constraints, will include only four out of eleven article-based rankings, together with an overall ranking based on an average of these eleven methodologies and finally, three citation-based rankings.

4. About 800 journals have been included at least once. About 10 percent of these have been included every year since 1969. For less than 200 journals, information is available for 1969. Some

database.[5] This enables us to rank both economists and their departments. Unfortunately, however, EconLit neither standardizes the names of the authors, nor standardizes the names of the departments. Careful inspection, combined with numerous searches on the Internet, reduced this problem to a large extent (though some problems can not be resolved, for example, if two people or departments have identical names—see the Appendix for a more detailed description of the standardization process).

Other controversial decisions have to be made besides those due to the standardization. First, there is the weighting of coauthors. Should a paper written by two authors be considered as equal to a paper written by one author or not? And what if the author of a paper indicates an affiliation to more than one department? We follow the literature by simply ascribing $1/n$th of a paper to each of the n authors of that paper, a choice that can be justified by referring to Sauer (1988) who found that the monetary value of papers (in the wage equation) follows such a rule. A similar rule is applied with respect to affiliations.[6,7]

Second, there is the question of what to count, the number of articles or the number of pages. Both alternatives are considered here (see Table 1 for a general overview of the methodologies).

A third source of disagreement is about which journals to include. We decided to start with all journals that are part of EconLit, hence including journals that are somewhat peripheral to economics such as the *Yale Law Review* and the *American Political Science Review*. This implies that not only pure economists are counted and hence that the departments are economics departments in a wide sense.

Fourth, one should be aware of possible selection bias as EconLit is likely to be somewhat English language biased: unimportant English language journals are more likely to be included than unimportant journals written in other languages.

A fifth problem is due to the quality differences between journals (and

of these journals have been dropped; other journals have been added since 1969. See my web page for information on which journals were included when.

5. This implies that we use the affiliation at the time of writing or publishing and not current affiliation. For the differences between stocks and flows see for example, Hogan (1984). Scott and Mitias (1996) show that these two approaches can give quite different results for the United States.

6. If an article is coauthored by more than three persons, EconLit only gives the name of the first author. The bias thus created is small, as such articles are very rare (the distribution of the number of coauthors during the 1990s is as following: 57.2 percent are written by one author, 31.1 percent are written by two authors, 9.3 percent by three and 2.4 percent by four authors or more). Note that we attribute one fourth of the articles' value to the first author of an article that is coauthored by more than three authors.

7. It would be interesting to see the effect of coauthorship on citations. Studies have shown a positive effect on citations (for example, Johnson 1997).

TABLE 1. AN OVERVIEW OF THE FOURTEEN METHODOLOGIES

Publications
1) Article count
   · Count of the number of articles
   · All journals included in EconLit
2) Page count
   · Count of the number of pages
   · All journals included in EconLit
3) Bauwens
   · Article count weighted for quality
   · Quality weights between 1 and 5 (based on the product of the impact factor and the number of citations received by a journal in a given year)
   · All journals included in EconLit
4) Impact
   · Article count weighted for quality by impact factor
   · Average of impact-factor between 1994 and 2000
   · Citations in year t to articles published in journal y in t-1 and t-2 divided by the number of articles published in t-1 and t-2
   · 273 journals included
5) Laband–Piette articles
   · Article count weighted for quality by Laband-Piette articles index
   · Laband–Piette index is long-term impact factor (5 years)
   · 121 journals
6) Laband–Piette adjusted articles
   · Article count weighted for quality by adjusted Laband–Piette articles index
   · Laband–Piette index is long-term impact factor (5 years) that gives higher weight to citations from better journals
   · 121 journals
7) Laband–Piette pages
   · Pages count weighted for quality by Laband–Piette pages index
   · Laband–Piette index is long-term impact factor (5 years)
   · 71 journals
8) Laband–Piette adjusted pages
   · Pages count weighted for quality by adjusted Laband–Piette index
   · Laband–Piette index is long-term impact factor (5 years) that gives higher weight to citations from better journals
   · 71 journals
9) Kalaitzidakis, Mamuneas, and Stengos
   · Pages count weighted for quality by adjusted Laband–Piette index
   · 10 journals
10) Hirsch, Austin, Brooks, and Moore
   · Pages count weighted for differences in page size
   · 24 journals
11) Scott and Mitias
   · Pages count weighted for differences in page size
   · 24 journals

Citations
12) Citation count weighted for coauthorship
13) Time Adjusted Citation count, weighted for coauthorship
   · Citations divided by the number of years since publication.
14) Citation count

articles).[8] Citations seem to be the most appropriate criterion to rank journals (and are also most frequently used). We will use different weightings that are based on such citation analysis.[9] First, we will use the average of the impact factor between 1994 and 2000, the impact factor, as defined by the *Journal Citation Reports* (JCR henceforward) of the Institute of Scientific Information, being equal to the number of citations in year t to all articles published in journal y in t-1 and t-2 divided by the number of articles published in y in t-1 and t-2. This reflects the number of citations that can be expected for an average article published in y, in the first two years after publication. This impact factor is available for 273 journals. Some might find two years of citations too short, so we also use the four versions of the Laband and Piette (1994; LP henceforward) index. This index is based on five years of data but is less recent (1990 citations to articles published between 1985–1989). We will also use their 'adapted' index, which adapts for different page size, gives higher weights if citations are from higher quality journals, and gives a zero weight to citations from noneconomics journals. The disadvantage is that this LP index is only available for a limited number of journals: 121 for the articles ranking and 71 for the pages ranking.[10] On the other hand, the journals thus included are economics journals in a stricter sense.

Clearly, using citation based-weightings forces us to drop a large number of journals.[11] The method of Bauwens (1998) solves this problem in an ad hoc way: it gives each journal a weight between 1 and 5 on the basis of the product of the impact factor and the total number of citations received during a given year and then gives weight 1 to journals not included in the *JCR* but included in EconLit, on the grounds that the non-*JCR* included journals are likely to be rarely cited ones.[12] Of course, this procedure disadvantages the top journals as it shrinks the weighting difference between top journals and other journals (because an article in the *AER* would be equal to only five articles in a minor economic journal, while the product as described here would give a difference of, say, 200). It is important to note that, like EconLit, the *JCR* may be biased towards English-language journals.

We also replicated the ranking, based on the number of pages published in top ten journals, of KMS (1999). By restricting to these ten, one gets a ranking

8. An analysis of some other problems like insider-bias and the composition of EconLit and the SSCI can be found on my home page.

9. Mason et al. (1997) show that journal rankings based on citations correlate positively with the rankings based on a reputation survey.

10. The difference is due to the fact that we only had the page-size normalizing weights for seventy-one journals (normalizations provided to us by David Laband).

11. For a list with journals and weightings, see my web page.

12. We slightly deviate from the Bauwens method: we take the average of the impact-factors and citations between 1994 and 2000 and we use these for all journals included in the Journal Citation Reports. Hence, not only those journals that are considered as economics journals by the JCR. We also included the Belgian journals but excluded the two 'reviews' included in EconLit.

based on top publications. As tenth methodology, we take the twenty-four journals and the page-size corrections used by HABM (1984) to rank economics departments on their number-of-pages-production in the period 1978–1982. Finally, we compute a ranking based on the thirty-six journals and the page-size corrections used by SM (1996) to rank both economists and economics departments over the period 1983–1994. These last two rankings allow us to make some comparisons over a longer period of time.

The preceding rankings all weigh articles and pages by the quality of the journals in which they were published. This approach is often criticized on the ground that even in high-quality journals one can find low quality articles. Therefore, we will also present three rankings that are based on the citations the articles received.

To be able to compute these citation-based rankings, we linked the articles included in EconLit to the articles included in the Web of Science. The Web of Science indexes articles published between 1975 and 2000 and gives for each of these articles the total number of citations (including self-citations) since the date of publication. Note that linking the Web of Science to EconLit has the advantage that, with the exception of those papers that have more than three authors, citations are not attributed to the first author only as has been the case for previous citation based rankings (Garfield 1990; Medoff 1996).

So, to be counted, an article should be:

- published between 1990 and 2000
- included in EconLit[13]
- included in the Web of Science

Of course, these rankings also have shortcomings:

- Citations to books are not included (for example, William Greene's *Econometric Analysis* has several hundred citations)
- Citations to unpublished manuscripts are not included
- Citations to articles not included in EconLit are not included (for example, Thaler's "Toward a Positive Theory of Consumer Choice," published in the *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* in 1980 and cited 394 times, is not included)
- Citations to articles published before 1990 are not included (for example, Barro's "Are Government Bonds Net Wealth?"—cited 937 times since 1974—is not counted).
- Self-citations are included.

13. There are a small number of journals, mostly journals recently included in EconLit, which are not taken into account. See the Appendix for a list.

One should be aware of these limitations when interpreting the citation rankings. Our first citation-based measure is a simple count of the number of citations, weighted for coauthorship and multiple affiliations. The second citation-based measure, in addition, tries to correct for the fact that papers that have been published more recently have had less time to receive citations. To correct for this, we simply divide the total number of citations an article received by the number of years since publication. Our last citation-based ranking simply counts the number of citations to which a person or a department has contributed. Hence, no corrections are made for differences in date of publication, multiple authorship, or multiple affiliations. Table 1 gives a short summary of the fourteen methodologies and their main characteristics.

3. Department Rankings[14]

3.1 Rankings of Departments Based on Articles and Pages Published

Space constraints prevent us from giving here the ranking for each methodology. Instead, we focus on four different methodologies:[15]

- The KMS ranking, using page counts and includes ten top journals.
- The adjusted Laband ranking, using page counts and includes seventy-one journals.
- The impact factor ranking, using article counts and includes 258 journals.
- The HABM ranking, using page counts and includes twenty-four journals and comparable to a ranking for 1978–1982.

Each methodology has some advantages and some disadvantages. Some take a limited number of journals, some include many journals but attach a lot (too much?) of weight to some top journals, others use no weights and take article counts rather than page counts etc. Each of the four methodologies we give here, stresses a different factor: one methodology focuses on publications in a limited number of top journals, one takes a weighted page count for a bigger set of journals, one takes weighted article counts for an even larger journal set. The fourth one is included because it is comparable to a previous ranking.

For the clarity of Table 2 below, we use, just as DV (1998), the (unweighted) mean over, in our case, eleven different rankings (methodologies) to order the departments. Besides clarity, the advantage of using such an average is that, in order to rank high, a department should score high on all criteria. Of course, taking the mean implies an implicit weighting for the journals and also

14. For some more general background statistics see my web page.

15. On my web site one can also find the rankings according to the other methodologies.

TABLE 2. RANKINGS OF DEPARTMENTS BASED ON PUBLICATIONS

	Department	KMS	LPpaga	Impact	HABM	Min	Max
1	Harvard U	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	U Chicago	2	2	2	2	2	5
3	U PA	7	6	5	4	3	7
4	Stanford U	5	4	3	6	3	6
5	MIT	3	3	6	3	3	8
6	U CA Berkeley	9	8	4	9	2	9
7	Northwestern U	4	5	9	5	4	14
8	Yale U	8	9	7	11	7	11
9	U MI Ann Arbor	13	11	8	10	5	13
10	Columbia U	10	10	10	14	7	14
11	Princeton U	6	7	11	8	6	21
12	UCLA	11	13	12	7	7	14
13	NYU	12	12	13	12	12	14
14	Cornell U	23	16	14	13	13	23
15	London School of Economics	19	23	16	16	9	23
16	U WI Madison	21	21	15	17	15	21
17	Duke U	25	15	17	15	14	28
18	OH State U	30	18	22	19	17	30
19	U MD College Park	26	24	18	26	17	29
20	U Rochester	14	14	26	18	13	45
21	U TX Austin	22	19	21	23	18	32
22	U MN	24	27	20	25	20	31
23	U IL Urbana Champaign	46	31	24	24	19	46
24	U CA Davis	27	30	25	22	19	30
25	U Toronto	17	22	30	27	17	30
26	U Oxford	31	39	19	28	10	39
27	U British Columbia	34	29	29	29	21	34
28	U CA San Diego	15	17	32	21	15	56
29	U Southern CA	45	26	27	34	25	45
30	Boston U	16	20	35	30	16	46
31	PA State U	40	34	28	39	25	40
32	Carnegie Mellon U	20	25	39	20	20	53
33	U Cambridge	50	55	23	44	15	55
34	U FL	42	33	40	35	28	46
35	MI State U	54	42	38	31	30	54
36	Rutgers U NJ	53	48	31	40	23	53
37	U WA	48	37	36	33	32	48
38	U NC Chapel Hill	52	40	33	32	30	52
39	TX A&M U	43	44	44	37	29	44
40	IN U, Bloomington	51	41	34	47	33	51
41	U IA	32	32	42	41	32	73
42	U Tel Aviv	18	28	49	36	18	81
43	U VA	35	38	37	42	35	85
44	U College London	36	52	48	38	36	64
45	Hebrew U	38	49	45	49	38	58
46	Brown U	29	35	52	43	29	97
47	U Tilburg	63	56	55	64	41	64
48	U Pittsburgh	28	36	58	48	28	82
49	U Warwick	74	83	46	45	34	83
50	U AZ	70	62	50	56	45	70
51	U Western Ontario	33	43	66	46	33	88

TABLE 2. CONTINUED

	Department	KMS	LPpaga	Impact	HABM	Min	Max
52	Johns Hopkins U	44	54	53	50	44	68
53	Australian National U	73	84	41	75	15	94
54	Vanderbilt U	60	46	56	61	46	86
55	Queens U, Canada	47	53	72	55	47	76
56	Washington U, MO	57	50	57	54	48	95
57	U Montreal	37	47	80	58	37	90
58	Georgetown U, DC	75	68	43	62	43	75
59	U CO Boulder	78	71	54	67	52	78
60	U GA	193	73	47	51	38	193
61	VA Polytechnic Institute & State U	87	64	73	57	57	92
62	Purdue U in	146	58	71	66	48	146
63	U CA Irvine	68	63	61	69	61	105
64	Boston College	69	45	75	63	43	128
65	IA State U	135	89	63	79	46	135
66	U Amsterdam	90	82	65	104	51	104
67	NC State U	85	72	74	65	47	116
68	Erasmus U Rotterdam	123	90	60	109	39	123
69	Dartmouth College	65	59	64	53	50	144
70	Catholic U Louvain	59	70	97	93	55	100
71	U York, UK	107	118	51	77	50	118
72	AZ State U	108	60	67	72	49	124
73	U Toulouse I	41	51	100	70	41	117
74	U Essex	71	80	81	52	52	123
75	U Stockholm	49	61	85	95	49	115
76	U CA Santa Barbara	56	69	94	74	56	117
77	London Business School	110	76	82	73	69	110
78	FL State U	152	103	86	60	60	152
79	U New S Wales	131	106	93	101	40	131
80	U Alberta	128	93	91	94	74	128
81	McMaster U	72	81	84	88	72	119
82	U Houston	66	75	95	76	66	148
83	Syracuse U, NY	148	101	88	68	66	148
84	U Autonoma Barcelona	61	66	126	91	61	126
85	U Nottingham	155	165	70	86	48	165
86	Hong Kong U of Science & Tech	89	67	106	78	67	171
87	U Bonn	62	74	136	120	62	136
88	York U Canada	100	97	101	139	88	139
89	CA Institute of Technology	39	57	105	59	39	236
90	LA State U	276	109	87	83	72	276
91	U Southampton	67	88	90	99	67	149
92	U CT	255	162	69	100	57	255
93	GA State U	97	91	121	71	71	135
94	U KY	147	119	96	92	83	147
95	George Washington U, DC	160	127	78	105	78	160
96	INSEE	55	65	155	96	55	159
97	Southern Methodist U	126	77	120	84	68	173
98	U Notre Dame IN	144	87	108	118	78	144
99	Stockholm School of Econ	82	96	83	153	82	153
100	Simon Fraser U CN	92	94	114	124	92	133
101	U OR	94	78	124	85	75	204
102	George Mason U, VA	265	161	92	110	64	265
103	Birkbeck College, U London	79	112	110	87	79	153

TABLE 2. CONTINUED

Department	KMS	LPpaga	Impact	HABM	Min	Max
104 Free U Amsterdam	134	133	89	133	83	148
105 U MA Amherst	140	142	77	157	77	165
106 U SC	129	115	122	80	80	146
107 U Paris I	96	102	170	165	26	176
108 U Bristol	109	137	76	114	76	141
109 U Melbourne	162	164	102	163	30	170
110 U IL Chicago	154	120	98	106	92	154
111 U Copenhagen	103	100	123	173	93	173
112 McGill U	122	111	115	126	98	131
113 U Groningen	137	151	118	115	77	156
114 Chinese U Hong Kong	105	98	153	116	98	153
115 Free U Brussels ULB	64	86	139	107	64	164
116 U Newcastle upon Tyne	164	214	59	89	55	217
117 Tulane U	149	95	113	108	89	194
118 American U, Washington, DC	136	154	104	142	104	154
119 U Mannheim	130	126	142	177	72	177
120 Auburn U	219	171	144	97	71	219
121 U Pompeu Fabra	58	79	161	90	58	206
122 SUNY Buffalo	111	116	112	121	107	194
123 U Manchester	207	218	68	170	54	218
124 U CA Santa Cruz	81	99	143	98	81	217
125 Monash U, Australia	153	160	128	186	61	186
126 Rice U, Houston, TX	86	85	140	82	82	260
127 U TN Knoxville	178	181	129	81	81	181
128 Emory U	167	121	107	113	91	202
129 U National Singapore	150	136	116	207	63	207
130 U Laval	133	135	169	132	116	172
131 U Carlos III Madrid	102	104	180	134	97	180
132 U Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario	88	114	152	136	88	160
133 Wayne State U, MI	174	147	134	103	102	174
134 U WI Milwaukee	274	187	119	112	92	274
135 U MO Columbia	211	123	148	169	104	211
136 U CA Riverside	124	124	149	138	95	181
137 U AL	113	134	150	141	113	169
138 U Quebec Montreal	99	132	178	144	99	178
139 SUNY Albany	121	128	137	152	117	200
140 U Oslo	151	152	109	185	109	192
141 U Miami, FL	117	138	135	131	108	190
142 U Maastricht	218	149	130	281	75	281
143 U DE	171	172	145	102	102	207
144 U Sydney	222	173	125	221	60	222
145 EHESS	76	110	187	150	76	205
146 U Vienna	80	105	186	200	80	200
147 U Munchen	176	169	159	171	122	176
148 U E Anglia	125	179	111	162	111	216
149 U Geneva	119	146	191	161	119	191
150 INSEAD	120	108	133	199	108	222
151 Clemson U	158	129	171	128	109	255
152 U Birmingham	197	232	117	148	107	232
153 U Guelph	166	159	162	178	133	182
154 Hitotsubashi U	106	150	216	222	79	236
155 Tufts U	170	153	158	122	103	229

TABLE 2. CONTINUED

Department	KMS	LPpaga	Impact	HABM	Min	Max
156 Brigham Young U	101	107	181	117	101	304
157 U Tokyo	116	143	185	211	116	211
158 City U London	199	198	151	175	146	199
159 U Zurich	93	139	176	204	93	204
160 SUNY Stony Brook	84	92	164	156	84	345
161 Carleton U, Ottawa	186	178	173	181	154	205
162 U Reading	238	264	99	189	87	264
163 Academia Sinica	172	184	220	167	128	220
164 Catholic U Leuven	268	207	138	266	62	268
165 Bar Ilan U	320	219	160	146	127	320
166 European U Institute, Firenze	118	130	188	188	118	247
167 U Bocconi	115	157	215	176	101	240
168 U UT	173	113	182	166	113	294
169 Brandeis U	83	117	177	130	83	345
170 IN U Purdue U, Indianapolis	95	122	228	125	95	266
171 U Exeter	192	182	167	158	147	225
172 U Bologna	163	175	267	197	89	267
173 U WY	142	144	192	119	119	286
174 U NE Lincoln	236	195	165	223	132	236
175 WV U	249	228	183	123	123	249
176 U KS	220	167	179	180	124	230
177 Norwegian School Econ & Business Admin.	185	174	163	288	143	288
178 Temple U	387	210	146	149	127	387
179 U Glasgow	278	311	103	140	103	311
180 Southern IL U Carbondale	273	197	203	160	153	273
181 KS State U	269	212	175	192	115	269
182 CUNY Baruch College	299	145	166	147	122	299
183 U OK	283	158	210	145	142	283
184 College of William & Mary	182	148	209	129	129	313
185 U Strathclyde	264	315	127	184	112	315
186 U Edinburgh	272	234	141	196	141	272
187 U Hong Kong	190	200	207	155	155	214
188 Washington State U	403	202	147	201	110	403
189 Uppsala U, Sweden	233	226	172	206	163	233
190 Osaka U	168	205	275	187	126	275
191 U Tsukuba, Japan	104	140	255	159	104	275
192 U NM	184	235	174	143	143	247
193 U College Dublin	114	163	217	137	114	271
194 U CO Denver	188	190	221	195	178	263
195 U Rome “La Sapienza”	200	236	308	385	43	385
196 Concordia U	169	180	231	243	169	253
197 Santa Clara U, CA	258	141	195	182	138	349
198 Queen Mary & Westfield College	241	262	168	183	168	262
199 MT State U	143	176	233	111	111	371
200 U RI	223	193	218	256	162	271

Notes: KMS: ten top journals of Kalaitzidakis et al. LPpaga: Laband-Piette adjusted page count. Impact: article count weighted by impact factor. HABM: twenty-four journals of Hirsch et al. Min: minimum over eleven methodologies. Max: maximum over eleven methodologies.

penalizes departments which score high on some rankings but very low on others. By focusing on the mean ranking, we also neglect the variance: for example, the Free University of Brussels-ULB ranks 115th worldwide on the basis of the mean ranking, but its rank varies between 64 (its "lowest" rank) and 164 (its 'highest' rank). To have an indication of this variance, I give in columns 5 and 6 of Table 2, for each department, its lowest and its highest rank over the eleven methods. From these columns one can easily notice that even at the top of the rankings, there is some variation: for example, depending on the methodology, Stanford ranks 4th or 7th. But as one goes further down the ranking, the difference between lowest and highest rank tends to increase. In Appendix A2, one can find the rank-correlation between different rankings.

Harvard is first on all eleven publication criteria we used, so it is not surprising to find it back at Place 1 in the overall ranking. Second is Chicago, before Penn, Stanford, and MIT. The first non-U.S. department is LSE at 15, the first non-English language department in the 1990s was Tel Aviv (but at the end of the 1990s, this title goes to Tilburg).

To get an idea of changes in the production of economics departments, we also computed seven rankings based on five-year periods (from 1990–1994 to 1996–2000).[16] While even in the top ten there are some changes over time, the departments that made it into the top ten in 1990–1994 are also those departments that make it into the top ten of 1996–2000. In the top thirty, most notably are the rise of the University of Texas at Austin and Oxford, and the decline of Rochester and Boston University. Further down, big leaps forward can be observed for, among others, University College London, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Toulouse I, New South Wales, Hong Kong Institute of Science and Technology, and Stockholm School of Economics. And not surprisingly, there are some major losers, too. Overall, Europe's share in the top 100 increases from 14 percent to 26 percent.

When interpreting changes one should be aware that the composition of EconLit has changed over time; several journals have been added since 1990. These changes in the journals that are included are likely to lead to changes in some rankings and hence also in the overall ranking.[17] In Table 3, we therefore look at each ranking separately.

Table 3 shows that Europe performs better when looking at the unweighted number of articles or pages or at the KMS ranking (they included the *European Economic Review* and *The Economic Journal* among the ten journals they used). There is also a clear difference between the adjusted and the unadjusted LP ranking, with the former being more favorable to European departments. The HABM and the SM rankings finally seem to advantage the U.S. departments. Anyhow, all methodologies show a big gap between the United States and Europe, with the

16. See my web page for the tables.

17. Moreover, often a difference of five places is only a matter of a few articles more or less.

TABLE 3. NUMBER OF U.S. AND EUROPEAN DEPARTMENTS IN THE PUBLICATIONS TOP 100 BY METHODOLOGY AND PERIOD

	Europe			United States		
	1990–2000	1990–1994	1996–2000	1990–2000	1990–1994	1996–2000
Articles	25	19	31	57	62	51
Bauwens	23	19	32	62	64	53
Impact	24	18	29	65	71	58
LParticles	16	11	22	71	77	65
Lparticlesadj	20	13	25	67	74	63
Pages	28	23	33	55	59	49
LPpag	18	11	21	69	78	67
LPpagadj	21	14	27	65	72	60
KMS	25	22	28	60	62	56
HABM	19	12	22	70	78	66
SM	17	13	22	71	77	65

Notes: Articles: article count. Bauwens: article count weighted by Bauwens' weights. Impact: article count weighted by impact factor. LParticles: Laband–Piette article count. LParticlesadj: Laband–Piette adjusted article count. Pages: page count. LPpag: Laband–Piette page count. LPpagadj: Laband–Piette adjusted page count. KMS: ten journals of Kalaitzidakis et al. HABM: twenty-four journals of Hirsch et al. SM: thirty-six journals of Scott and Mitias.

number of U.S. top 100 departments being two to three times the number of European departments. But they also show that Europe is catching up.

Changes over a Longer Period of Time: A Comparison with Hirsch, Austin, Brooks, and Moore (1984). Taking the same twenty-four journals, the same page-size-normalization[18] and a comparable length of time (1996–2000)[19] as HABM did at the beginning of the 1980s, allows us to show how the performance of the departments changed over time (Table 4). There are, however, some drawbacks which one should keep in mind: as other journals (than the twenty-four included) may have increased their relative importance, it might be that some departments have done more substitution towards these new top journals than others, which obviously reduces the comparability over time. Moreover, as this methodology uses only twenty-four journals, one should be aware that one publication more or less could imply a drop or a rise of several places.

At the top of the 1978–1982 HABM-ranking, Harvard succeeded in beating Chicago: Harvard turned around a 20 percent lag at the end of the seventies in a 15 percent lead at the end of the 1990s. At a considerable distance follow MIT, Stanford, and Penn. Concerning the changes at the top, one should note the positive evolution of MIT, Princeton, and NYU and the negative evolution of Yale and Wisconsin at Madison. Remarkable progress has been made, among

18. Provided to us by Barry Hirsch.

19. We take five years (1996–2000). They write: "The time period includes 1978–1982, plus all 1983 issues prior to June." Note that differences in the treatment of branch campuses might have an influence.

TABLE 4. COMPARISON OVER TIME USING THE HABM METHODOLOGY

Department	HABM 1996–2000	HABM 1978–1982
Harvard U	1	2
U Chicago	2	1
MIT	3	8
Stanford U	4	3
U PA	5	5
Northwestern U	6	7
U CA Berkeley	7	10
Princeton U	8	14
UCLA	9	11
NYU	10	20
Yale U	11	6
Cornell U	12	12
U MI Ann Arbor	13	16
Columbia U	14	13
London School of Economics	15	4
Duke U	16	50
U WI Madison	17	9
U TX Austin	18	65
Carnegie Mellon U	19	21
U MD College Park	20	45
U College London	21	112
U Oxford	22	26
U CA Davis	23	43
U CA San Diego	24	30
U MN	25	15
U NC Chapel Hill	26	29
OH State U	27	23
MI State U	28	40
U Toronto	29	28
U Rochester	30	17
U WA	31	22
U FL	32	41
Boston U	33	57
U IL Urbana Champaign	34	19
U Warwick	35	61
U Essex	36	78
U Southern CA	37	42
U Tel Aviv	38	27
PA State U	39	39
Dartmouth College	40	70
Brown U	41	67
U British Columbia	42	18
U Pittsburgh	43	101
Rutgers U NJ	44	35
U VA	45	33
U IA	46	47
Washington U, MO	47	115
U Toulouse I	48	143+
U Cambridge	49	37
Johns Hopkins U	50	49
Georgetown U, DC	51	122
U AZ	52	54

TABLE 4. CONTINUED

Department	HABM 1996–2000	HABM 1978–1982
Hong Kong U of Science & Tech	53	143+
Hebrew U	54	25
U Western Ontario	55	24
Boston College	56	72
U Tilburg	57	143+
U Montreal	58	138
CA Institute of Technology	59	48
TX A&M U	60	34
U GA	61	62
IN U, Bloomington	62	46
FL State U	63	90
U Pompeu Fabra	64	143+
GA State U	65	92
Queens U, Canada	66	44
Vanderbilt U	67	56
INSEE	68	143+
U Nottingham	69	143+
Purdue U in	70	32
Syracuse U, NY	71	89
U CA Irvine	72	143+
U CA Santa Barbara	73	38
U CO Boulder	74	116
Erasmus U Rotterdam	75	143+
U New S Wales	76	93
VA Polytechnic Institute & State U	77	36
AZ State U	78	74
U OR	79	97
U TN Knoxville	80	85
U Southampton	81	82
Rice U, Houston, TX	82	130
U Houston	83	58
WV U	84	143+
Free U Brussels ULB	85	143+
Australian National U	86	31
George Washington U, DC	87	104
Chinese U Hong Kong	88	143+
Stockholm School of Econ	89	143+
MT State U	90	143+
Southern Methodist U	91	69
U College Dublin	92	143+
London Business School	93	143+
U Newcastle upon Tyne	94	110
U Bonn	95	86
U Stockholm	96	132
U Laval	97	143+
IN U Purdue U, Indianapolis	98	143+
U Carlos III Madrid	99	143+
U Autonoma Barcelona	100	143+

Note: 143+ means that these universities were not in the top 143 published in HABM (1984).

others, by Duke, Texas at Austin, Brown, and Pittsburgh. In contrast, Minnesota and Rochester lost several places. Another important message of these comparisons, however, is that, while important changes do occur, rankings do not change radically even if we look over a long period of time.

As HABM's 1984 article included a list of the top forty non-U.S. departments, we can also consider whether the United States is still the dominant producer of economics literature.[20] In HABM's ranking, the London School of Economics was the only non-U.S. department that could compete with the top U.S. departments, taking fourth place worldwide. The second non-U.S. department ranked 19th and only 24 non-U.S. departments got into the top 100. Further, in the worldwide top 100, eleven departments were located in Europe, two in Israel, eight in Canada, the remaining three in Australia and New Zealand. About eighteen years later, the hegemony of the United States is still unthreatened. The first non-U.S. department is still LSE but it drops to 15th place. European departments doubled their presence in the top 100. Oxford (+4),[21] Cambridge (−12), Warwick (+26), Essex (+42), Southampton (+1), and Bonn (−9) remain in the top 100, Birkbeck just misses the top 100 while Birmingham, York, and Bristol declined considerably. But fourteen new European departments deserved their place in the top league, bringing the total of Europe on twenty-two.

The freshmen are University College London (from 112 to 21), Toulouse I, Tilburg, Pompeu Fabra, INSEE, Nottingham, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Brussels-ULB, Stockholm School of Economics, London Business School, University College Dublin, Stockholm, Carlos III, and Autonoma de Barcelona. Canada loses two: Carleton, Alberta, Simon Fraser and McMaster failed to repeat their performance of the end of the seventies but Montreal and Laval now entered the top 100. The representatives of Israel remain Tel Aviv and Hebrew University but both lost several places in the ranking. Australian National University drops 55 places to number 86. The Chinese University of Hong Kong and the University of New South Wales complete the list of non-U.S. departments in the top 100 and bring the result to thirty-four non-U.S. versus sixty-six U.S. institutions.

3.2 Rankings of Departments Based on Citations

Table 5 shows what happens if we count citations rather than publications. The table is sorted by weighted citation counts (for multiple affiliations and coauthorship) but we further include the rank based on an unweighted citation count

20. See Portes (1987), Frey (1993) and Frey and Eichenberger (1993) for some explanations ranging from "politics as outside option for European economists' to 'lack of incentives to publish due to government management."

21. +5 means that it gains 5 places.

and a weighted citation count that tries to control for differences in time since publication. Such differences are important: an article published in 1990 has ten years to be cited, an article published in 2000 just one, so articles published earlier in the period under consideration will have larger weights in the uncorrected citation counts. Moreover, different departments might specialize in different subdisciplines that not only have different citation propensities but also have different citation time lags (i.e., an article from one discipline might be cited, on average, faster than an article from another sub-discipline).

Harvard is not only the biggest producer of articles; it is also the biggest generator of citations. Chicago is again second and Berkeley, Stanford, and Penn complete the top five. LSE is the first non-U.S. institution at rank 16.

Looking at five-year periods makes clear that departments that see their citation-impact decline are Rochester and Illinois at Urbana Champaign.[22] Columbia and Oxford in contrast are getting better. Impressive are also the rise of Toulouse I (from 172 at the beginning of the 1990s to 54 now) and the drop of Copenhagen (from 19 in 1990–1994, to 141 in 1996–2000). The latter case is a nice example of the importance a few articles can have. Some of the most cited articles at the beginning of the nineties (all having several hundreds of citations) have been written by scholars from this department, Soren Johansen and Katarina Juselius on cointegration. From 1996 onwards these publications fall away, which leads to serious drop in its ranking.

Table 6 shows that also in terms of citations, the dominance of the United States is very clear: in the nineties, sixty-nine out of the top 100 academic departments were located in the United States. But again, Europe is catching up: by the end of the 1990s, it has twenty-eight departments in the top 100 against eighteen at the beginning of the 1990s. Note finally that the most cited economist, Soren Johansen who generated 1,538 coauthor-weighted citations during the 1990s, would be at place forty-nine in this ranking of departments!

3.3 Some Overall Impressions

- Harvard has been the top economic producer during the nineties, both in terms of articles, pages, and citations. In second place comes Chicago. The top five often included Berkeley, MIT, Penn, and Stanford, and a few times Northwestern and Michigan at Ann Arbor. Outside the United States, it is LSE that contributes most to the Economics Literature.
- Rankings are quite stable at the top end: a department that is not in the top twenty today is unlikely to be a top ten department in five years. A bit further down the ranking, big changes are possible, there are several examples of departments that jump more than 100 places to enter into the top 100.

22. These rankings can be found on my web site.

TABLE 5. RANKINGS OF DEPARTMENTS BASED ON CITATIONS

		Rank		#		
	Department	Citescoauyw	Cites	Citescoau	Citescoauyw	Cites
1	Harvard U	1	1	16,293	2,626	25,004
2	U Chicago	2	2	13,509	2,035	18,757
3	U CA Berkeley	6	5	8,992	1,328	12,877
4	Stanford U	3	4	8,929	1,385	13,369
5	U PA	5	3	8,800	1,346	13,565
6	MIT	4	6	8,703	1,361	12,794
7	Yale U	7	8	8,331	1,193	10,982
8	U MI Ann Arbor	8	9	6,956	1,038	9,987
9	Northwestern U	9	7	6,943	999	11,249
10	Princeton U	10	10	6,627	966	9,939
11	UCLA	12	12	5,303	816	7,721
12	Columbia U	11	11	5,229	849	7,723
13	NYU	13	13	4,482	715	7,138
14	U WI Madison	14	15	4,470	688	6,443
15	U Rochester	17	14	4,454	599	6,827
16	London School of Economics	16	17	4,065	640	6,120
17	Cornell U	15	16	4,044	644	6,313
18	Duke U	18	20	3,844	593	5,551
19	U MD College Park	20	18	3,554	566	5,624
20	U CA San Diego	21	21	3,550	537	5,370
21	U Oxford	19	23	3,201	568	4,648
22	OH State U	23	22	3,116	478	4,840
23	U IL Urbana Champaign	25	24	3,043	454	4,548
24	U MN	26	18	3,017	448	5,624
25	U Copenhagen	38	42	2,727	315	2,852
26	Carnegie Mellon U	28	25	2,711	415	4,126
27	U CA Davis	27	29	2,677	429	3,692
28	U TX Austin	24	27	2,665	460	3,975
29	U Cambridge	22	31	2,567	484	3,589
30	Boston U	31	28	2,487	369	3,766
31	U British Columbia	29	30	2,398	379	3,671
32	U Southern CA	30	32	2,389	378	3,581
33	U Toronto	36	40	2,251	330	3,006
34	U WA	35	34	2,239	336	3,366
35	MI State U	33	33	2,230	351	3,456
36	U NC Chapel Hill	34	35	2,108	348	3,321
37	PA State U	32	36	2,096	360	3,280
38	IN U, Bloomington	37	38	2,023	323	3,089
39	U FL	40	39	1,941	299	3,056
40	TX A&M U	43	37	1,929	280	3,114
41	Brown U	41	41	1,890	295	2,878
42	U Tel Aviv	44	26	1,876	272	4,007
43	Rutgers U NJ	42	47	1,808	295	2,510
44	U IA	46	44	1,791	268	2,767
45	U VA	39	46	1,791	304	2,534
46	U CO Boulder	50	48	1,696	254	2,497
47	U AZ	48	43	1,665	258	2,829
48	Washington U, MO	47	49	1,635	262	2,311
49	Australian National U	51	50	1,518	253	2,298
50	U Warwick	52	56	1,473	243	1,966
51	U College London	45	45	1,460	270	2,700

TABLE 5. CONTINUED

	Department	Rank Citescoauyw	Rank Cites	# Citescoau	# Citescoauyw	# Cites
52	Vanderbilt U	53	51	1,414	234	2,264
53	NC State U	64	53	1,399	185	2,218
54	U GA	59	52	1,374	203	2,249
55	U Sussex	49	65	1,366	257	1,752
56	IA State U	54	55	1,318	218	2,094
57	Johns Hopkins U	56	59	1,306	205	1,925
58	U Pittsburgh	60	54	1,236	200	2,207
59	Queens U, Canada	69	62	1,235	181	1,844
60	U CA Irvine	61	58	1,225	194	1,945
61	U Stockholm	55	67	1,219	209	1,662
62	Hebrew U	57	57	1,217	203	1,958
63	U MA Amherst	68	72	1,179	182	1,593
64	U Newcastle upon Tyne	62	75	1,177	191	1,546
65	Boston College	63	59	1,133	187	1,925
66	Georgetown U, DC	71	71	1,115	180	1,607
67	U Western Ontario	75	63	1,091	159	1,808
68	U Montreal	74	66	1,084	171	1,750
69	U Tilburg	58	64	1,082	203	1,788
70	Syracuse U, NY	67	77	1,066	183	1,522
71	U CT	80	70	1,055	148	1,610
72	Erasmus U Rotterdam	72	61	1,047	174	1,850
73	AZ State U	78	69	1,004	152	1,641
74	Dartmouth College	65	76	990	184	1,532
75	Purdue U in	77	68	987	154	1,649
76	U Manchester	70	90	979	181	1,268
77	U Amsterdam	66	74	977	184	1,550
78	FL State U	79	78	947	149	1,474
79	U York, UK	76	88	940	158	1,342
80	U IL Chicago	85	80	928	141	1,462
81	LA State U	91	73	910	128	1,570
82	U CA Santa Barbara	82	93	903	145	1,212
83	U SC	98	81	883	119	1,452
84	U Bristol	89	96	879	135	1,177
85	VA Polytechnic Institute & State U	90	82	877	133	1,446
86	London Business School	84	85	837	143	1,397
87	Simon Fraser U CN	102	83	835	113	1,439
88	U Houston	92	84	822	127	1,406
89	U CA Santa Cruz	87	91	819	137	1,220
90	McMaster U	103	95	809	112	1,182
91	CA Institute of Technology	83	87	793	145	1,357
92	U Nottingham	81	104	747	146	1,031
93	George Mason U, VA	109	108	742	106	954
94	U Wales Cardiff	73	110	736	172	924
95	U Alberta	101	94	732	113	1,187
96	Rice U, Houston, TX	114	92	707	102	1,220
97	U E Anglia	88	116	704	136	895
98	GA State U	100	98	698	115	1,101
99	SUNY Stony Brook	120	103	693	96	1,058
100	U Southampton	96	107	692	120	1,009
101	SUNY Buffalo	124	105	692	92	1,022

TABLE 5. CONTINUED

	Department	Rank Citescoauyw	Rank Cites	# Citescoau	# Citescoauyw	# Cites
102	Southern Methodist U	118	97	689	100	1,166
103	Birkbeck College	111	100	678	103	1,075
104	Catholic U Louvain	97	79	673	119	1,465
105	U Strathclyde	107	124	669	106	852
106	U New S Wales	95	106	663	121	1,012
107	U WI Milwaukee	123	118	663	92	881
108	U OR	106	101	660	110	1,063
109	U Lancaster	104	136	655	112	787
110	U Essex	94	102	647	121	1,059
111	U Toulouse I	86	86	641	137	1,364
112	Free U Amsterdam	93	119	637	126	875
113	U Miami, FL	137	122	635	82	863
114	U Reading	105	133	633	111	823
115	U KY	117	125	630	102	847
116	Tulane U	119	111	627	99	921
117	U Notre Dame IN	113	141	599	103	747
118	Monash U, Australia	135	143	583	84	728
119	U Groningen	116	147	574	102	698
120	York U Canada	126	130	573	91	831
121	Stockholm School of Econ	99	109	569	116	940
122	U Autonoma Barcelona	130	120	557	89	873
123	Emory U	122	113	555	94	913
124	Free U Brussels ULB	110	99	543	104	1,091
125	INSEAD	121	112	535	95	918
126	Catholic U Leuven	115	121	530	102	865
127	U DE	142	127	530	78	843
128	U National Singapore	108	137	527	106	768
129	U TN Knoxville	148	138	523	74	755
130	American U, Washington, DC	141	135	517	79	802
131	SUNY Albany	158	159	509	68	638
132	Southern IL U Carbondale	154	131	506	71	825
133	U Maastricht	131	134	506	89	817
134	George Washington U, DC	112	149	506	103	693
135	Auburn U	152	126	499	72	844
136	U AL	143	114	499	78	911
137	INSEE	125	115	495	92	897
138	U UT	155	129	485	70	832
139	U TX Dallas	159	139	484	67	754
140	European U Institute	149	132	480	73	824
141	U Bonn	132	158	480	89	646
142	McGill U	140	140	478	79	750
143	U MO Columbia	136	150	478	82	692
144	Temple U	166	145	469	65	721
145	U Munchen	128	172	463	90	581
146	U Waterloo	139	142	461	80	736
147	Brigham Young U	161	153	460	67	679
148	U Glasgow	133	179	459	88	552
149	Wayne State U, MI	151	165	455	72	593
150	U Guelph	156	155	453	70	658
151	Clemson U	180	151	446	59	689
152	U Zurich	127	178	442	91	558

TABLE 5. CONTINUED

	Department	Rank Citescoauyw	Rank Cites	# Citescoau	# Citescoauyw	# Cites
153	U Kiel	178	180	435	60	551
154	U Mannheim	138	171	427	81	583
155	U Oslo	144	163	426	78	598
156	KS State U	150	167	424	72	589
157	CUNY Baruch College	170	156	422	63	647
158	Brandeis U	153	144	420	71	726
159	Uppsala U, Sweden	134	183	420	87	534
160	Clark U	187	170	413	56	584
161	WV U	157	162	410	68	607
162	Hong Kong U of Science & Tech	129	123	404	90	856
163	City U London	177	154	400	60	671
164	EHESS	164	89	397	66	1,336
165	Carleton U, Ottawa	181	187	393	58	519
166	U Melbourne	146	185	385	75	523
167	U Hawaii	189	177	382	55	565
168	Hitotsubashi U	196	163	376	53	598
169	U Aarhus	171	157	376	62	647
170	U Wales Swansea	184	168	376	57	589
171	U NE, Lincoln	182	173	374	57	572
172	U Quebec Montreal	167	190	374	64	515
173	Washington State U	169	161	372	63	626
174	U Liverpool	163	184	371	66	530
175	U Vienna	172	166	367	62	591
176	Santa Clara U, CA	173	195	361	61	494
177	SUNY Binghamton	176	193	361	60	496
178	Tufts U	183	176	359	57	566
179	Marquette U	225	198	357	44	483
180	U CA Riverside	188	169	351	55	585
181	U Pompeu Fabra	145	146	350	75	718
182	OR State U	175	174	348	60	571
183	U Leeds	162	201	347	67	474
184	U Birmingham	147	188	343	74	518
185	GA Institute Technology	192	148	334	54	695
186	Norwegian School Econ & Business Adm.	186	219	332	56	426
187	Bar Ilan U	215	193	331	47	496
188	U Bocconi	190	152	331	55	685
189	U Exeter	165	199	330	65	476
190	U Edinburgh	168	182	324	63	536
191	Kyoto U	211	181	324	48	545
192	Williams College	209	204	313	49	463
193	U WY	200	195	312	50	494
194	U Western Australia	179	214	309	59	437
195	U OK	193	186	305	53	520
196	U NM	214	207	305	48	452
197	Fordham U, NY	174	205	303	60	459
198	U Heriot Watt	195	202	303	53	470
199	U North TX	213	206	299	48	453
200	Miami U, Oxford, OH	245	210	295	40	444

Notes: Citescoau: citation count weighted for coauthorship and multiple affiliations. Citescoauyw: citation count weighted for coauthorship, multiple affiliations, and differences in years since publication. Cites: citation count.

TABLE 6. NUMBER OF U.S. AND EUROPEAN DEPARTMENTS IN THE CITATIONS' TOP 100 BY METHODOLOGY AND PERIOD

	Europe			United States		
	1990–2000	1990–1994	1996–2000	1990–2000	1990–1994	1996–2000
Citescoau	20	18	28	69	71	61
Citescoauyw	25	18	29	66	71	60
Cites	21	18	29	68	71	61

Notes: Citescoau: citation count weighted for coauthorship and multiple affiliations. Citescoauyw: citation count weighted for coauthorship, multiple affiliations, and differences in years since publication. Cites: citation count.

- The United States dominates clearly: more than half of the top 100 departments are located in the United States. Nevertheless, Europe is clearly catching up, whatever weighting method one uses, from about fifteen departments in the top 100, it now has about thirty departments within the class of top departments. And Europe wins these places from the United States rather than from the rest of the world. However, there is no department outside the United States that really belongs to the "primi inter pares." If we would compare these numbers to the parts in either the total number of departments or the total number of economists in these regions, one would see that both the United States and Canada harbor more top departments than can be expected, while Europe, Asia, and Australia are seriously underrepresented.

3.4 Size Differences

Until now, we did not correct for size differences between departments: departments that employ a lot of professors will publish a lot simply because of their size, even if the individual professors publish relatively few papers, and hence will get a high ranking. DV (1998) solve partially this problem by asking the different departments for the names of their faculty.[23] However, this is only feasible because they limit themselves to eighty U.S. top departments. In addition, if one is interested in a department's reputation then this critique is less valid as the visibility of a department will also be influenced by its size, though DV (1998) find not that high a correlation between subjective studies and their output-based studies (between 60 percent and 80 percent).

Table 7 shows the rank correlation, computed using only those departments that scored on all rankings, of the different rankings and a count of the number of employees of a department (based on the affiliations mentioned on the most recent publication). As one can see, the correlation declines with the number of

23. Partially because this does not correct for differences in teaching loads. For U.S. institutions one could use faculty lists in the "Guide to Graduate Study in Economics" of the Economics Institute of the University of Colorado, Boulder.

Table 7. Correlation between Ranking and Size

	Latest affiliation		Latest affiliation
Articles	0.96	Lppagadj	0.74
Bauwens	0.94	KMS	0.61
Impact	0.89	HABM	0.76
Lparticles	0.86	SM	0.79
Lparticlesadj	0.77	Cites	0.82
pages	0.95	Citescoau	0.83
Lppag	0.83	Citescoauyw	0.85

Notes: Articles: article count. Bauwens: article count weighted by Bauwens' weights. Impact: article count weighted by impact factor. LParticles: Laband–Piette article count. LParticlesadj: Laband–Piette adjusted article count. Pages: page count. LPpag: Laband–Piette page count. LPpagadj: Laband–Piette adjusted page count. KMS: ten journals of Kalaitzidakis et al. HABM: twenty-four journals of Hirsch et al. SM: thirty-six journals of Scott and Mitias. Citescoau: citation count weighted for coauthorship and multiple affiliations. Citescoauyw: citation count weighted for coauthorship, multiple affiliations, and differences in years since publication. Cites: citation count.

journals included, but even for the latter, the correlation is fairly high. Hence, size is important. It also explains the big gap between the numbers 1 and 2, Harvard and Chicago: 652 economists have Harvard as their most recent department while only 295 have Chicago.

One relatively easy method that (partially) corrects for the size bias is restricting the number of people that we take into account for the computation of the department total. So instead of summing over all people that mention department X, we could compute the mean rankings that would result when only taking the five, twenty, and fifty best performing scholars. The results of such an exercise are given in Table 8.

As one can see some fairly radical changes are the consequence: if only taking five or twenty scholars, MIT wins the first place ahead of Yale, Harvard, Chicago, and Princeton, though taking fifty scholars again brings Harvard at the top. Most striking however is the U Toulouse I that jumps from 73 (overall) to 11 (top 5) worldwide. Not surprisingly, increasing the number of scholars makes the ranking more similar to the overall ranking, more so for the lower ranked departments (that tend to be smaller). The impact of these size-corrections again stresses the importance of being aware of the variability.

4. Individual Rankings[24,25]

4.1 Rankings of Economists Based on Articles and Pages Published

Next we look at the rankings of individuals. Table 9 ranks individual economists on the same basis as Table 2 ranked departments: Peter Phillips (Yale) has been

24. Our choice to order on the basis of the average rank implies that those who did not rank on a specific methodology are pulled down several ranks. This again stresses the importance of taking into account the variance!

25. For an analysis based on the CVs of top economists, see my web page.

TABLE 8. OVERALL RANKING OF DEPARTMENTS BY PUBLICATION OUTPUT OF TOP SCHOLARS

	Top 5	Top 20	Top 50
1	MIT	MIT	U Harvard
2	Yale U	Harvard U	U Chicago
3	Harvard U	U Chicago	MIT
4	U Chicago	Yale U	U PA
5	Princeton U	Princeton U	Stanford U
6	U PA	U PA	Princeton U
7	U CA Berkeley	Stanford U	U CA Berkeley
8	U Stanford	U CA Berkeley	Yale U
9	Northwestern U	Northwestern U	Northwestern U
10	Columbia U	Columbia U	Columbia U
11	U Toulouse I	UCLA	UCLA
12	UCLA	NYU	NYU
13	U TX Austin	U MI Ann Arbor	U MI Ann Arbor
14	Duke U	U CA San Diego	Cornell U
15	U CA San Diego	Duke U	U Rochester
16	NYU	U TX Austin	Duke U
17	U WI Madison	London School of Economics	London School of Economics
18	London School of Economics	U WI Madison	U WI Madison
19	U MI Ann Arbor	Cornell U	U MN
20	Brown U	U Rochester	U MD College Park
21	MI State U	U MD College Park	U CA San Diego
22	U MD College Park	U CA Davis	U TX Austin
23	U Rochester	U MN	U CA Davis
24	U CA Davis	Boston U	OH State U
25	U Cambridge	U Toronto	Boston U
26	U Oxford	OH State U	U British Columbia
27	U College London	U IL Urbana Champaign	U IL Urbana Champaign
28	U IA	Brown U	U Toronto
29	U Montreal	U British Columbia	U Oxford
30	OH State U	U Oxford	U Tel Aviv
31	U IL Urbana Champaign	U Tel Aviv	Carnegie Mellon U
32	U Toronto	MI State U	U Southern CA
33	U FL	U FL	MI State U
34	Cornell U	Carnegie Mellon U	U FL
35	U Stockholm	U Cambridge	PA State U
36	U MN	U College London	U Cambridge
37	Carnegie Mellon U	U Southern CA	IN U, Bloomington
38	U Tel Aviv	U Toulouse I	U College London
39	U British Columbia	IN U, Bloomington	U IA
40	ENPC	U IA	Brown U
41	Johns Hopkins U	U Montreal	TX A&M U
42	U WA	TX A&M U	U WA
43	Boston U	U WA	U NC Chapel Hill
44	TX A&M U	PA State U	U VA
45	IN U, Bloomington	U NC Chapel Hill	Hebrew U
46	Boston College	U VA	Rutgers U NJ
47	Queens U, Canada	Queens U, Canada	U Tilburg
48	U NC Chapel Hill	U Tilburg	U Montreal
49	U AZ	Hebrew U	U Pittsburgh
50	U Southern CA	Vanderbilt U	U Western Ontario

TABLE 8. CONTINUED

	Top 5	Top 20	Top 50
51	EHESS	Johns Hopkins U	Vanderbilt U
52	Vanderbilt U	Rutgers U NJ	Queens U, Canada
53	U VA	U Pittsburgh	U Warwick
54	U CA Santa Barbara	EHESS	Washington U, MO
55	U Essex	Boston College	Johns Hopkins U
56	PA State U	U Western Ontario	U Toulouse I
57	U CA Santa Cruz	Dartmouth College	Australian National U
58	U Pittsburgh	U Essex	U AZ
59	CA Institute of Technology	U Warwick	EHESS
60	Free U Brussels ULB	U AZ	Georgetown U, DC
61	U Tilburg	U CA Irvine	Boston College
62	U Western Ontario	U CA Santa Barbara	U CO Boulder
63	Rutgers U NJ	Australian National U	Dartmouth College
64	Catholic U Louvain	Washington U, MO	U CA Irvine
65	Dartmouth College	Catholic U Louvain	U GA
66	U IL Chicago	U CO Boulder	NC State U
67	U GA	U GA	Catholic U Louvain
68	Australian National U	U Stockholm	U Essex
69	Hebrew U	NC State U	VA Polytechnic Inst. & St. U
70	AZ State U	CA Institute of Technology	U CA Santa Barbara
71	U CA Irvine	Georgetown U, DC	IA State U
72	INSEE	AZ State U	Erasmus U Rotterdam
73	ENS	IA State U	U Amsterdam
74	NC State U	FL State U	AZ State U
75	Syracuse U, NY	U Amsterdam	London Business School
76	McMaster U	U York, UK	U Stockholm
77	FL State U	Syracuse U, NY	U York, UK
78	U Autonoma Barcelona	U CA Santa Cruz	Purdue U in
79	U CO Boulder	London Business School	FL State U
80	U Amsterdam	U Autonoma Barcelona	U Autonoma Barcelona
81	U Zurich	Erasmus U Rotterdam	McMaster U
82	London Business School	Free U Brussels ULB	CA Institute of Technology
83	LA State U	VA Polytechnic Inst. & St. U	Syracuse U, NY
84	U Nottingham	U Nottingham	U Nottingham
85	U Warwick	ENPC	U New S Wales
86	Erasmus U Rotterdam	McMaster U	Hong Kong U of Science & T.
87	Washington U, MO	INSEE	INSEE
88	Brandeis U	Purdue U in	U Houston
89	U York, UK	LA State U	LA State U
90	U E Anglia	GA State U	Southern Methodist U
91	Free U Amsterdam	Birkbeck College, U London	Free U Brussels ULB
92	Birkbeck College, U London	Southern Methodist U	U Pompeu Fabra
93	IA State U	U Pompeu Fabra	U CT
94	Georgetown U, DC	U CT	U Southampton
95	U Copenhagen	U IL Chicago	GA State U
96	GA State U	U Houston	U Paris I
97	VA Polytechnic Inst. & St. U	McGill U	Stockholm School of Econ
98	Simon Fraser U CN	Simon Fraser U CN	U Alberta
99	U Marseille II	Stockholm School of Econ	McGill U
100	McGill U	U OR	Birkbeck College, U London

TABLE 9. RANKING OF ECONOMISTS BY PUBLICATIONS

	Name	Department	KMS	LPpaga	Impact	SM	Min	Max
1	Phillips, Peter-C.-B.	Yale U	2	2	26	1	1	27
2	Tirole, Jean	U Toulouse I	4	3	14	3	3	53
3	Heckman, James J.	U Chicago	6	4	4	7	2	68
4	Krueger, Alan B.	Princeton U	8	8	6	11	6	116
5	Stiglitz, Joseph E.	World Bank	81	42	5	44	5	81
6	Andrews, Donald W. K.	Yale U	1	1	18	2	1	204
7	Viscusi, W. Kip	Harvard U	140	66	3	21	3	140
8	Laffont, Jean-Jacques	U Toulouse I	42	16	55	19	8	106
9	Sen, Amartya	U Cambridge	24	37	57	48	22	115
10	Smith, Bruce D.	U TX Austin	35	32	118	8	8	118
11	Campbell, John Y.	Harvard U	10	6	30	9	6	315
12	Feldstein, Martin	Harvard U	56	69	15	87	15	136
13	Caballero, Ricardo J.	MIT	3	5	32	16	3	298
14	Poterba, James M.	MIT	144	51	9	76	9	144
15	Card, David	U CA Berkeley	11	9	22	25	8	315
16	Neumark, David	MI State U	147	59	29	5	5	178
17	Matsuyama, Kiminori	Northwestern U	18	28	35	38	6	255
18	Gruber, Jonathan	MIT	20	13	37	18	13	332
19	Acemoglu, Daron	MIT	7	11	62	10	4	342
20	Borjas, George J.	Harvard U	84	33	17	23	11	239
21	Besley, Timothy	LSE	21	27	59	27	16	261
22	Shleifer, Andrei	Harvard U	364	30	13	43	8	364
23	Rosenzweig, Mark R.	U PA	16	17	73	12	12	415
24	Blanchard, Olivier-Jean	MIT	118	74	27	223	27	223
25	Hansen, Bruce E.	U WI Madison	152	83	83	26	26	152
26	Lott, John R., Jr.	Yale U	380	190	28	4	4	380
27	Gali, Jordi	U Pompeu Fabra	23	44	88	128	23	178
28	Lazear, Edward P.	Stanford U	27	24	50	33	24	494
29	Alesina, Alberto	Harvard U	37	50	68	105	37	292
30	Lewbel, Arthur	Boston College	87	71	67	80	22	369
31	Rodrik, Dani	Harvard U	141	112	16	300	16	362
32	Horowitz, Joel L.	U IA	36	35	92	42	24	400
33	Diamond, Peter A.	MIT	60	48	46	170	32	306
34	Glaeser, Edward L.	Harvard U	78	82	76	60	50	289
35	Weitzman, Martin L.	Harvard U	29	49	25	133	25	390
36	Angrist, Joshua D.	MIT	14	12	75	30	12	513
37	Hamermesh, Daniel S.	U TX Austin	203	168	41	58	38	263
38	Barro, Robert J.	Harvard U	48	68	123	200	48	200
39	Stein, Jeremy C.	MIT	90	10	58	13	7	735
40	Krugman, Paul R.	MIT	210	177	1	442	1	442
41	McAfee, R. Preston	U TX Austin	13	19	194	53	13	451
42	Moulin, Herve	Rice U	40	54	295	74	40	298
43	Slemrod, Joel	U MI Ann Arbor	340	212	63	109	63	340
44	Woodford, Michael	Princeton U	34	45	114	136	34	529
45	Levitt, Steven D.	U Chicago	22	21	90	55	21	513
46	Dixit, Avinash	Princeton U	212	194	70	140	68	212
47	Fudenberg, Drew	Harvard U	15	20	154	35	14	688
48	Keane, Michael P.	NYU	75	56	199	28	28	405
49	Edwards, Sebastian	UCLA	307	291	33	148	18	307
50	Maskin, Eric S.	Harvard U	12	18	103	39	12	559
51	Cochrane, John H.	Fed. Res. Chicago	19	23	144	82	19	655
52	Svensson, Lars E. O.	U Stockholm	33	29	128	66	18	886
53	Gale, Douglas	NYU	31	41	177	40	20	598

TABLE 9. CONTINUED

	Name	Department	KMS	LPpaga	Impact	SM	Min	Max
53	Gale, Douglas	NYU	31	41	177	40	20	598
54	Rotemberg, Julio J.	Harvard U	32	43	230	86	32	439
55	Manski, Charles F.	Northwestern U	272	153	36	112	17	522
56	Summers, Lawrence H.	US Treasury	165	165	64	368	64	394
57	Robinson, Peter M.	LSE	28	34	121	56	12	853
58	Feenstra, Robert C.	U CA Davis	98	91	109	102	70	513
59	Helpman, Elhanan	Harvard U	25	25	115	108	25	808
60	Gorton, Gary	U PA	114	40	227	32	32	710
61	Sappington, David E. M.	U FL	275	124	207	153	124	275
62	Bohn, Henning	U CA Santa Barbara	132	141	268	101	92	459
63	Kaplow, Louis	Harvard U	682	648	23	20	20	682
64	Katz, Lawrence F.	Harvard U	168	105	49	230	49	580
65	Hubbard, R. Glenn	Columbia U	564	125	40	103	20	564
66	Obstfeld, Maurice	U CA Berkeley	103	64	71	248	36	974
67	Innes, Robert	U AZ	366	355	110	99	74	368
68	Cutler, David M.	Harvard U	51	39	44	177	25	827
69	Freeman, Richard B.	Harvard U	503	244	31	342	31	503
70	Canova, Fabio	U Pompeu Fabra	332	232	290	22	22	332
71	Fuhrer, Jeffrey C.	Fed. Res. Boston	86	101	203	124	86	403
72	Rustichini, Aldo	Boston U	128	138	278	212	87	320
73	Lewis, Karen K.	U PA	106	57	145	69	31	929
74	Gale, William G.	Brookings Instit.	237	192	117	96	49	481
75	Ravallion, Martin	World Bank	853	592	19	121	4	853
76	Kahn, Lawrence M.	Cornell U	345	198	141	15	14	567
77	Ruhm, Christopher J.	U NC Greensboro	387	253	60	67	60	387
78	Jorgenson, Dale W.	Harvard U	216	156	124	427	124	446
79	Auerbach, Alan J.	U CA Berkeley	325	271	74	266	71	537
80	Samuelson, Larry	U WI Madison	55	81	396	137	55	493
81	Romer, Paul M.	Stanford U	116	102	81	469	64	694
82	Bertola, Giuseppe	U Torino	85	117	214	227	85	392
83	DeLong, J. Bradford	U CA Berkeley	352	239	56	306	56	371
84	Irwin, Douglas A.	Dartmouth College	208	246	158	196	88	626
85	Moffitt, Robert A.	Johns Hopkins U	1,087	333	48	70	48	1,087
86	Turnovsky, Stephen J.	U WA	828	543	170	6	6	828
87	Perron, Pierre	Boston U	392	181	311	61	61	405
88	Fama, Eugene F.	U Chicago	1,261	22	96	17	9	1,261
89	Wright, Randall	U PA	142	197	355	158	142	408
90	Haltiwanger, John	U MD College Park	73	75	143	359	54	598
91	Grossman, Gene M.	Princeton U	26	46	152	168	26	752
92	Quiggin, John	Australian Nat. U	510	580	47	398	2	580
93	Mishkin, Frederic S.	Columbia U	241	137	54	245	52	1,397
94	Kocherlakota, Narayana R.	Fed. Minneapolis	176	171	162	270	57	576
95	Morris, Stephen	Yale U	77	126	178	166	77	598
96	Stock, James H.	Harvard U	47	52	265	88	47	880
97	Weil, David N.	Brown U	93	87	133	191	71	688
98	Segal, Uzi	U Western Ontario	68	78	275	219	34	640
99	Pesaran, M. Hashem	Cambridge U	1,246	396	107	24	24	1,246
100	Shavell, Steven	Harvard U	844	590	7	37	4	844

Notes: KMS: 10 top journals of Kalaitzidakis et al.; LPpaga: Laband–Piette adjusted page count; Impact: article count weighted by impact factor; SM: 36 journals of Scott and Mitias; Min: minimum over eleven methodologies; Max: maximum over eleven methodologies. One of the disadvantages of averaging over methods is that those people that score zero on one criteria are penalized. People such as Longstaff, Francis A., Saffran, Bernard, Schwert, G. William, Denis, David J., Graham, John R., and Schultz, Paul H. are in that category: they score high on some rankings but do not score at all in others.

the most productive economist in the period 1990–2000, even though his mean rank (over the different methodologies) is 7.6. This specialist in Quantitative Methods succeeded in publishing eleven articles in *Econometrica,* eleven in the *Journal of Econometrics,* and several articles in "smaller" journals. Note that with his score, he would be about 133rd in the SM ranking of departments. Second is Jean Tirole with an average rank of 10.1. The 2000 Nobel Prize winner James Heckman, Alan Krueger, 2001 Nobel Prize winner Joseph Stiglitz, Donald Andrews, W. Kip Viscusi, Jean-Jacques Laffont, 1998 Nobel Prize winner Amartya Sen, and Bruce Smith complete the top ten.

Jean Tirole at number two is the highest ranked economist that is affiliated to a European department. Note that of the top 100 economists only fourteen are (principally) affiliated to a non-U.S.-based department![26] Not only the lack of non-U.S. economists is remarkable, the same can be said about the lack of women at the top. If we use the name as an indicator of gender, we find only one woman in the top 100: Karen K. Lewis has been the most productive female economist at place 73.

4.2 Rankings of Economists Based on Citations[27]

Next we look at citation counts. Table 10 is sorted on the total number of citations, weighted for coauthorship, to articles published between 1990 and 2000. The second column gives the rank if we weigh (inversely) citations by the number of years since publication; the third column gives the rank if we use unweighted citation counts.

First in the citation ranking is Soren Johansen. Thanks to his top cited papers (887 and 615 citations) on cointegration written at the beginning of the 1990s, he is first on the three different citation rankings. In the overall publication ranking he was only at place 302, which indicates that one or two breakthrough papers can place you very high in the ranking. Second comes Robert Barro, before Paul Krugman, Donald Andrews, Peter Phillips (the number 1 of the publication ranking), Paul Romer, Eugene Fama, Katarina Juselius (coauthor with Johansen of one of the cointegration papers), Ross Levine, and Andrei Schleifer.

As was the case with different methodologies for publication counts, different citation count methods give different (though highly correlated) results. More aggregate statistics, however, remain more stable: there is only one

26. Of the top 500, 77 percent are U.S.-based.

27. One of the disadvantages of citations is that one paper can be sufficient to be at the top of the ranking. As a consequence, noneconomists having written a highly cited paper that is included in EconLit will be included in this list.

woman in the top 100 and the share of non-U.S.-based economists in the top 100 remains very low (15 in the top 100, 100 in the top 500).

5. Some Concluding Observations

This paper has presented worldwide rankings of both economics departments and economists. Several ranking methods were used: some rankings were based on publication counts, others on citation counts; some methods counted pages, others counted articles, some methods weighed for quality differences, others did not.

Several stylized facts can be derived from these rankings. First, the same universities tend to show up at the top whatever the ranking methodology one uses. But as one goes further down the ranking, the influence of the specific weighting methodology becomes larger. Second, the ranking of departments is, at the top, quite stable over time, but large jumps are possible just below the top of the ranking. Third, all rankings show a dominance of the United States in terms of the production of economics literature; both the top-producing departments and the top-producing individuals are mainly located in the United States. Fourth, looking at the evolution over time, all ranking methodologies indicate that Europe is catching up, steadily increasing its share in the top 100 departments.

While these conclusions are fairly robust, one should keep in mind some limitations. First, there is the variance of rankings over methodologies: even a top ten university will sometimes be ranked first, third, or seventh depending on the methodology so it is very difficult to defend a general statement such as "we are number five in the world" without mentioning the specific ranking methodology. This becomes even more true as one goes further down the ranking. Second, our rankings of departments are based on affiliations at the time of publication. Hence, they measure past performance rather than current potential. Third, we do not provide per capita measures, meaning that small but productive departments will not be identified by our rankings. Fourth, we used several methodologies but it is easy to come up with many more ways to rank departments and departments.

So far we have not touched the issue of the use of rankings. Rankings have their use as guides for students choosing graduate school and scholars evaluating job offers. More importantly, rankings provide incentives. A past president of the European Economic Association, Jean-Jacques Laffont (1999) notes: "Economics is today an international science for which there is a large consensus about the evaluation of quality. Journals with international editorial boards are a powerful instrument of objective, noncaptured

TABLE 10. RANKING OF ECONOMISTS BY CITATIONS

	Name	Department	Citescoyw	Cites	Citescoau	Citescoauyw	Cites
1	Johansen, Soren	European U Inst.	1	1	1538.0	160.2	2104
2	Barro, Robert J.	Harvard U	3	2	1179.2	126.5	1535
3	Krugman, Paul R.	MIT	2	7	1084.3	154.8	1187
4	Andrews, Donald	Yale U	5	10	914.2	110.6	1161
5	Phillips, Peter C. B.	Yale U	6	5	887.0	105.7	1331
6	Romer, Paul M.	Stanford U	9	16	832.8	91.1	937
7	Fama, Eugene F.	U Chicago	4	9	821.0	111.9	1182
8	Juselius, Katarina	U Copenhagen	19	8	618.0	65.0	1183
9	Levine, Ross	U MN	7	12	614.7	105.6	1097
10	Shleifer, Andrei	Harvard U	8	3	599.2	94.3	1448
11	Kahneman, Daniel	Princeton U	14	4	595.3	72.9	1349
12	Krueger, Alan B.	Princeton U	11	14	589.8	83.5	1012
13	Hansen, Bruce E.	U WI Madison	13	31	572.0	77.1	752
14	Rebelo, Sergio	Northwestern U	23	27	548.3	60.5	802
15	Nelson, Daniel B.	U Chicago	34	48	545.7	55.4	611
16	Milgrom, Paul	Stanford U	21	13	533.5	61.8	1096
17	Tirole, Jean	U Toulouse I	10	15	516.7	88.9	966
18	Lucas, Robert E., Jr.	U Chicago	30	62	516.0	57.2	542
19	Murphy, Kevin M.	U Chicago	25	6	493.3	58.5	1189
20	Card, David	U CA Berkeley	28	37	490.8	57.5	701
21	Svensson, Lars E. O.	U Stockholm	12	56	482.7	83.4	572
22	Helpman, Elhanan	Harvard U	17	17	481.5	67.3	923
23	Moffitt, Robert A.	Johns Hopkins U	26	60	468.8	58.2	555
24	Sala I Martin, Xavier	U Pompeu Fabra	16	30	456.8	67.7	770
25	Viscusi, W. Kip	Harvard U	24	39	453.0	59.5	650
26	Borjas, George J.	Harvard U	18	58	448.2	65.6	559
27	Vishny, Robert W.	U Chicago	20	11	444.5	64.7	1108
28	French, Kenneth R.	MIT	22	22	418.5	60.9	840
29	Stock, James H.	Harvard U	32	18	416.8	56.6	918
30	Quah, Danny T.	LSE	31	100	406.0	57.1	419
31	Heckman, James J.	U Chicago	15	42	398.3	68.3	640
32	Campbell, John Y.	Harvard U	29	41	396.3	57.3	646
33	Caballero, Ricardo J.	MIT	61	54	396.2	46.1	582
34	Alesina, Alberto	Harvard U	39	26	395.3	53.5	810
35	Bound, John	U MI Ann Arbor	37	19	394.2	54.0	879
36	Bollerslev, Tim	Duke U	33	21	386.7	56.1	853
37	Tversky, Amos	Stanford U	68	24	384.3	43.5	823
38	Mankiw, N. Gregory	Harvard U	70	20	380.8	43.3	862
39	Thaler, Richard H.	U Chicago	62	22	373.0	45.8	840
40	Katz, Lawrence F.	Harvard U	42	29	369.5	51.9	771
41	Griliches, Zvi	Harvard U	65	71	366.0	44.6	521
42	Jensen, Michael C.	Harvard U	81	61	365.5	39.8	549
43	Perron, Pierre	Boston U	53	66	361.8	48.9	531
44	Grossman, Gene M.	Princeton U	56	33	359.2	47.2	726
45	Rodrik, Dani	Harvard U	27	77	359.0	57.9	496
46	Harvey, Campbell R.	Duke U	46	57	357.8	50.9	567
47	Young, Alwyn	U Chicago	40	147	354.0	52.3	354
48	King, Robert G.	U VA	74	28	347.6	42.5	800
49	Nordhaus, William	Yale U	79	98	346.0	41.0	422
50	Taylor, Mark P.	U Warwick	38	59	344.3	53.6	558
51	Osterwald Lenum, M.	U Copenhagen	91	158	338.0	37.6	338
52	Pindyck, Robert S.	MIT	92	141	337.5	37.5	358

TABLE 10. CONTINUED

	Name	Department	Citescoyw	Cites	Citescoau	Citescoauyw	Cites
53	Aghion, Philippe	U College London	49	32	335.9	50.3	751
54	Scharfstein, David S.	MIT	87	25	331.0	37.9	813
55	Rajan, Raghuram G.	U Chicago	36	75	324.7	54.5	514
56	Berger, Allen N.	Fed. Res. System	43	36	323.3	51.7	712
57	Stein, Jeremy C.	MIT	52	40	322.7	49.2	648
58	Chib, Siddhartha	Washington U, MO	45	79	318.2	50.9	487
59	Moravcsik, Andrew	Harvard U	44	184	313.8	50.9	317
60	Poterba, James M.	MIT	60	74	313.0	46.3	515
61	Engle, Robert F.	U CA San Diego	71	35	312.2	43.2	715
62	Obstfeld, Maurice	U CA Berkeley	47	89	312.0	50.8	452
63	Heston, Alan	U PA	139	49	308.5	31.9	610
64	Becker, Gary S.	U Chicago	83	71	308.0	38.5	521
65	Summers, Lawrence	US Treasury	94	46	307.5	37.1	621
66	Rogoff, Kenneth	Harvard U	51	118	307.5	49.6	389
67	Cochrane, John H.	Fed. Res. Chicago	73	179	304.5	42.9	321
68	Holmstrom, Bengt	MIT	54	45	303.3	48.4	624
69	Summers, Robert	U PA	153	50	301.5	30.9	603
70	Knetsch, Jack L.	Simon Fraser U	140	38	298.3	31.8	652
71	Christiano, Lawrence	Northwestern U	98	67	295.2	36.3	530
72	Stiglitz, Joseph E.	World Bank	63	111	294.3	45.5	402
73	Shavell, Steven	Harvard U	50	103	292.5	50.0	415
74	Breslow, N. E.	U WA	123	77	292.5	33.5	496
75	Fudenberg, Drew	Harvard U	89	47	291.8	37.8	615
76	Murphy, Kevin J.	U Southern CA	146	55	287.0	31.5	577
77	Hanemann, W.	U CA Berkeley	114	132	286.5	34.7	375
78	Fearon, James D.	Stanford U	41	192	286.5	52.3	312
79	Edwards, Sebastian	UCLA	64	140	286.3	45.3	359
80	Romer, David H.	U CA Berkeley	90	44	283.0	37.7	632
81	Watson, Mark W.	Princeton U	88	53	281.8	37.8	583
82	Eichenbaum, Martin	Fed. Res. Chicago	96	52	278.7	36.9	585
83	Diebold, Francis X.	NYU	77	51	277.0	41.2	594
84	Schwert, G. William	U Rochester	144	124	274.0	31.6	381
85	Kaplow, Louis	Harvard U	72	147	273.5	43.2	354
86	Lott, John R., Jr.	Yale U	86	108	272.0	38.0	405
87	Rabin, Matthew	U CA Berkeley	35	209	268.8	54.7	304
88	Lakonishok, Josef	U IL Urbana Ch.	106	34	268.8	35.6	724
89	Roberts, John	Stanford U	162	63	268.7	30.3	540
90	Meyer, Bruce D.	Northwestern U	175	153	267.7	29.6	347
91	Ravallion, Martin	World Bank	59	91	266.0	46.5	448
92	Tabellini, Guido	U Bocconi	122	69	263.7	33.6	525
93	Dixit, Avinash	Princeton U	112	204	263.2	34.8	305
94	Laffont, Jean-Jacques	U Toulouse I	76	80	262.8	41.8	486
95	Nickell, S.	LSE	66	113	261.3	44.2	397
96	Constantinides, G. M.	U Chicago	213	187	260.8	25.9	315
97	Angrist, Joshua D.	MIT	80	86	260.2	40.7	463
98	Freeman, Richard B.	Harvard U	84	109	258.7	38.4	403
99	Hart, Oliver	Harvard U	105	71	258.0	35.8	521
100	Lo, Andrew W.	MIT	127	94	254.5	33.0	431

Notes: Citescoau: citation count weighted for coauthorship and multiple affiliations. Citescoauyw: citation count weighted for coauthorship, multiple affiliations, and differences in years since publication. Cites: citation count.

measurement that we do not use enough in Europe. . . . The European Economic Association wishes to make easily available measures of performance to promote excellence in research and teaching." Hence, like any academic article, this article should stimulate others to produce new, more, and better academic articles.

Appendix

A.1 Construction of the Database

For each year XX, I searched for "journal in dt and py = 19XX" in EconLit and downloaded the results. At the end of 1999, I downloaded the data for the period 1994–1998, then I added the years 1988–1993, then 1969–1987 to finish mid 2001 with 1999–2000. EconLit sometimes adds less important articles/journals with a lag. Therefore, especially for the later years, not all articles included in EconLit are included in my database. Table A1 compares the number of articles in my database with the number of articles in EconLit at the end of May 2002.

Until 1995 almost all articles in EconLit are included in my database. For more recent years, coverage is slightly smaller (ranging from 80 percent in 2000 to 96 percent in 1997). Note however that the missing articles are always those in smaller journals.

TABLE A1. NUMBER OF ARTICLES IN THE DATABASE

Year	# My database	# ECONLIT
1969–1988	151,302	151,302
1989	10,767	10,768
1990	11,190	11,254
1991	11,833	11,885
1992	13,000	13,059
1993	13,362	13,475
1994	14,265	14,355
1995	15,634	15,818
1996	17,327	17,675
1997	17,580	18,336
1998	17,208	19,578
1999	19,365	20,298
2000	16,572	20,482

For each of these articles I downloaded information on the

- names of the authors
- affiliations of the authors
- journal in which it was published
- number of pages
- publication year
- JEL code

Note that the JEL code is the EconLit JEL code, which can differ from the JEL code mentioned on the printed paper. An EconLit team assigns JEL codes to the articles, taking account of, but often deviating from, the original codes chosen by the authors.

One disadvantage of EconLit is that names of authors and departments are not standardized. For example, the Free University of Brussels appears in EconLit under a number of different titles (ECARE, DULBEA, Free U Brussels, ULB, etc.). All these different names were uniformed to Free U Brussels.[28]

A difficult problem was the mapping of research centers that belong to several universities. For example, the Dutch Tinbergen Institute is a cooperation of the Erasmus U Rotterdam, the U Amsterdam, and the Free U Amsterdam. If an author mentioned as affiliation "Tinbergen Institute, U Amsterdam," we attributed the article to the U Amsterdam. If only Tinbergen Institute was mentioned, we attributed one-third of the article to each of the three universities. The same strategy was used for the French CNRS-centers (which explains why the French departments have faculty with on average a lot of affiliations). Funding agencies and research networks such as NBER, CEPR, CNRS etc. are not considered separately when they are combined with a normal department. Only if the funding agency is the sole affiliation mentioned, it is considered as a department.

There also exist campuses with the same name but on different locations. For example, there are several 'U Paris' and several CUNYs. This poses a problem if the number (e.g., Paris I) or the exact place CUNY (e.g., Baruch . . .) has not been specified. We solved this by a two-step procedure: first, we looked whether authors that had given such unspecified names in one article had given a fully specified name in another article. If so we replaced the unspecified by the fully specified name (if the full specification differed, we took the most cited one, if tie, we randomly picked one). Those that could not be attributed are then, in the second step, divided proportionally over the "places/numbers." Note that that some campuses have branch campuses, such as Penn State U. Though we

28. An additional difficulty arose in this specific case as there is another Belgian university with exactly the same name in English. We separated the two by looking up each author on the Internet, which was also used to attribute centers to universities and universities to countries.

consider the branches as different, we do not distribute, in such cases, the central campus over the branches. Finally, for authors that did not list their affiliation, we applied the first step of the above procedure.

Economists' names have also been standardized: we listed all names alphabetically and then standardized (for example John Doe and John D. Doe all become John Doe). Of course, if a name is misspelled in EconLit (for example, John D. Ode) it is unlikely that I will have noticed it. Similarly, two people with the same name will have been considered as one individual. Note that EconLit uses full names (including initials), which reduces this problem to a large extent.

At the end of 2001, I downloaded the information from the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI). Data on the total number of citations were downloaded by journal (The Web of Science does not allow downloads of more than 500 articles at a time). Using the journal name, the volume number and the first page of each article, I connected each article in EconLit to the corresponding article in the SSCI. On my web page you will find a page with for each journal the time period it is included in EconLit and in the SSCI. The following journals (mostly recently added to EconLit) have not been included: *Agricultural Economics, Canadian Journal of Development Studies, Desarrollo Economico, Finance a Uver, Financial Management, Food Policy, Health Economics, Health Services Research, Housing Studies, Inquiry, Journal of African Economies, Journal of Royal Statistical Society Series A, Law and Contemporary Problems, Macroeconomic Dynamics, Nationalokonomisk Tidsskrift, New England Economic Review, Papers in Regional Science, Politicka Ekonomie, Resource and Energy Economics, Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, Transportation, Economic Development Quarterly,* and *Transportation Research: Part A, B, and D.*

A.2 Influence of the Methodology on the Rankings (period 1990–2000)

We have fourteen different rankings of economists (see Table A2) and fourteen different rankings of economics departments (see Table A3). As one could expect, different methodologies give quite different results. To get an idea of the degree of these differences, we took those 5,282 people and those 697 departments that scored points in each ranking and then calculated the rank-correlation.[29]

Note that the correlation of the rankings is quite high and tends to be bigger for departments than for persons. In other words, a ranking of economic departments is more robust than a ranking of economists, which is not surprising given that the production of the average department is much bigger than the production of the average economist.

29. Taking only those that scored on all methodologies implies that we only take the bigger producers.

TABLE A2. RANK CORRELATION BETWEEN METHODOLOGIES, BASED ON 5,282 ECONOMISTS

	Articles	Bauw	Impact	Lpart	Lparta	Pages	Lppag	Lppaga	KMS	HABM	SM	Cites	Citesco	Citesyw
Articles	1.00	0.96	0.83	0.76	0.50	0.94	0.65	0.44	0.29	0.52	0.59	0.63	0.66	0.64
Bauw	0.96	1.00	0.93	0.88	0.64	0.93	0.78	0.59	0.41	0.63	0.71	0.71	0.76	0.75
Impact	0.83	0.93	1.00	0.94	0.75	0.84	0.86	0.71	0.54	0.69	0.75	0.75	0.81	0.81
LPart	0.76	0.88	0.94	1.00	0.85	0.78	0.91	0.79	0.62	0.74	0.80	0.71	0.77	0.77
LParta	0.50	0.64	0.75	0.85	1.00	0.56	0.83	0.94	0.83	0.69	0.74	0.55	0.61	0.63
Pages	0.94	0.93	0.84	0.78	0.56	1.00	0.73	0.56	0.39	0.62	0.70	0.67	0.70	0.70
LPpag	0.65	0.78	0.86	0.91	0.83	0.73	1.00	0.89	0.72	0.79	0.86	0.70	0.75	0.77
LPpaga	0.44	0.59	0.71	0.79	0.94	0.56	0.89	1.00	0.89	0.74	0.79	0.57	0.62	0.65
KMS	0.29	0.41	0.54	0.62	0.83	0.39	0.72	0.89	1.00	0.65	0.63	0.42	0.47	0.50
HABM	0.52	0.63	0.69	0.74	0.69	0.62	0.79	0.74	0.65	1.00	0.88	0.56	0.60	0.63
SM	0.59	0.71	0.75	0.80	0.74	0.70	0.86	0.79	0.63	0.88	1.00	0.62	0.66	0.69
Cites	0.63	0.71	0.75	0.71	0.55	0.67	0.70	0.57	0.42	0.56	0.62	1.00	0.97	0.92
Citesco	0.66	0.76	0.81	0.77	0.61	0.70	0.75	0.62	0.47	0.60	0.66	0.97	1.00	0.96
Citesyw	0.64	0.75	0.81	0.77	0.63	0.70	0.77	0.65	0.50	0.63	0.69	0.92	0.96	1.00

Notes: Articles: article count. Bauw: article count weighted by Bauwens' weights. Impact: article count weighted by impact factor. LPart: Laband–Piette article count. LParta: Laband–Piette adjusted article count. Pages: page count. LPpag: Laband–Piette page count. LPpaga: Laband–Piette adjusted page count. KMS: ten journals of Kalaitzidakis et al. using corrected weights. HABM: twenty-four journals of Hirsch et al. SM: thirty six journals of Scott and Mitias. Citescoau: citation count weighted for coauthorship and multiple affiliations. Citescoauyw: citation count weighted for coauthorship, multiple affiliations, and differences in years since publication. Cites: citation count.

TABLE A3. RANK CORRELATION BETWEEN METHODOLOGIES, BASED ON 967 DEPARTMENTS

	Articles	Bauw	Impact	Lpart	Lparta	Pages	Lppag	Lppaga	KMS	HABM	SM	Cites	Citesco	Citesyw
Articles	1.00	0.99	0.94	0.91	0.82	0.99	0.89	0.79	0.66	0.82	0.85	0.88	0.89	0.91
Bauw	0.99	1.00	0.98	0.96	0.86	0.98	0.93	0.83	0.70	0.86	0.89	0.92	0.94	0.95
Impact	0.94	0.98	1.00	0.98	0.88	0.93	0.95	0.86	0.72	0.89	0.91	0.95	0.96	0.97
Lpart	0.91	0.96	0.98	1.00	0.92	0.90	0.98	0.90	0.76	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.96
Lparta	0.82	0.86	0.88	0.92	1.00	0.82	0.94	0.98	0.88	0.90	0.93	0.87	0.87	0.87
Pages	0.99	0.98	0.93	0.90	0.82	1.00	0.88	0.79	0.67	0.81	0.84	0.87	0.88	0.90
Lppag	0.89	0.93	0.95	0.98	0.94	0.88	1.00	0.94	0.81	0.94	0.96	0.93	0.94	0.94
Lppaga	0.79	0.83	0.86	0.90	0.98	0.79	0.94	1.00	0.91	0.90	0.93	0.86	0.85	0.86
KMS	0.66	0.70	0.72	0.76	0.88	0.67	0.81	0.91	1.00	0.81	0.81	0.73	0.72	0.73
HABM	0.82	0.86	0.89	0.92	0.90	0.81	0.94	0.90	0.81	1.00	0.96	0.89	0.89	0.88
SM	0.85	0.89	0.91	0.94	0.93	0.84	0.96	0.93	0.81	0.96	1.00	0.90	0.90	0.90
Cites	0.88	0.92	0.95	0.94	0.87	0.87	0.93	0.86	0.73	0.89	0.90	1.00	0.99	0.98
Citesco	0.89	0.94	0.96	0.95	0.87	0.88	0.94	0.85	0.72	0.89	0.90	0.99	1.00	0.99
Citesyw	0.91	0.95	0.97	0.96	0.87	0.90	0.94	0.86	0.73	0.88	0.90	0.98	0.99	1.00

Notes: Articles: article count. Bauw: article count weighted by Bauwens' weights. Impact: article count weighted by impact factor. LPart: Laband–Piette article count. LParta: Laband–Piette adjusted article count. Pages: page count. LPpag: Laband–Piette page count. LPpaga: Laband–Piette adjusted page count. KMS: ten journals of Kalaitzidakis et al. using corrected weights. HABM: twenty-four journals of Hirsch et al. SM: thirty six journals of Scott and Mitias. Citescoau: citation count weighted for coauthorship and multiple affiliations. Citescoauyw: citation count weighted for coauthorship, multiple affiliations, and differences in years since publication. Cites: citation count.

References

Bauwens, Luc (1998). "A New Method to Rank University Research and Researchers in Economics in Belgium," working paper, CORE, Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain, Belgium.

Bommer, Rolf and Heinrich Ursprung (1998). "Spieglein, Spieglein an der Wand: Eine Publikationsanalytische Erfassung der Forschleistungen volkswirtschaftlicher Fachbereiche in Deutschland, Osterreich und der Schweiz." *Zeitschrift fur Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften,* 118, pp. 1–28.

De Ruyter van Steveninck, M. A. (1998). "Opmars der Econometristen." *Economische en Sociale Berichten,* nr. 4180, p. 965.

Dusansky, Richard and Clayton Vernon (1998). "Rankings of U.S. Economics Departments." *Journal of Economic Perspectives,* 12(1), pp. 157–170.

Frey, Bruno (1993). "An Economic Analysis of the New Institutional Economics." *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics,* 149, pp. 351–359.

Frey, Bruno and Reiner Eichenberger (1993). "American and European Economics and Economists." *Journal of Economic Perspectives,* 7(4), pp. 185–193.

Garfield, Eugene (1990). "Who Will Win the Nobel Prize in Economics? Here's a Forecast Based on Citation Indicators." *Current Contents,* 11, pp. 3–7.

Harris, Geoffrey (1990). "Research Output in Australian University Economics Departments: An Update for 1984–1988." *Australian Economic Papers,* 29, pp. 249–259.

Hirsch, Barry, Randall Austin, John Brooks, and J. Bradley Moore (1984). "Economics Departmental Rankings: Comments." *American Economic Review,* 74(4), pp. 822–826.

Hogan, Timothy (1984). "Economics Departmental Rankings: Comments." *American Economic Review,* 74(4), pp. 827–833.

Jin, Jang and Louis Yau (1999). "Research Productivity of the Economics Profession in East Asia." *Economic Inquiry,* 37(4), pp. 706–710.

Johnson, Dan (1997). "Getting Noticed in Economics: The Determinants of Academic Citations." *American Economist,* 41(1), pp. 42–53.

Kalaitzidakis, Pantelis, Theofanis Mamuneas, and Thanasis Stengos (1999). "European Economics: An Analysis Based on Publications in the Core Journals." *European Economic Review,* 43, pp. 1150–1168.

Kalaitzidakis, Pantelis, Theofanis Mamuneas, and Thanasis Stengos (2003). "Rankings of Academic Journals and Institutions in Economics," *Journal of the European Economic Association,* 1(6), pp. 1346–1366.

Kocher, Martin and Matthias Sutter (2001). "The Institutional Concentration of Authors in Top Journals of Economics during the Last Two Decades." *The Economic Journal,* 111, pp. 405–421.

Laband, David and Michael Piette (1994). "The Relative Impact of Economics Journals." *Journal of Economic Literature,* 32, pp. 640–666.

Laffont, Jean-Jacques (1999). "Economics Research in Europe." *European Economic Review,* 43, p. 1149.

Lubrano, Michel, Luc Bauwens, Alan Kirman, and Camelia Protopopescu (2003). "Ranking European Economic Departments: A Statistical Approach," *Journal of the European Economic Association,* 1(6), pp. 1367–1401.

Lucas, Robert (1995). "Contributions to Economics Journals by the Canadian Economics Profession, 1981–1990." *Canadian Journal of Economics,* 28(4), pp. 949–960.

Mason, Paul, Jeffrey Steagall, and Michael Fabritius (1997). "Economics Journal Rankings by Type of School: Perceptions Versus Citations." *Quarterly Journal of Business and Economics,* 36(1), pp. 69–79.

Medoff, Marshall (1996). "A Citation-Based Analysis of Economists and Economics Programs." *The American Economist,* 40, pp. 46–59.

Portes, Richard (1987). "Economics in Europe." *European Economic Review,* 31, pp. 1329–1340.

Sauer, Raymond (1988). "Estimates of the Returns to Quality and Coauthorship in Economic Academia." *Journal of Political Economy,* 96(4), pp. 855–866.

Scott, Loren and Peter Mitias (1996). "Trends in Rankings of Economics Departments in the U.S.: An Update." *Economic Inquiry,* 34, pp. 378–400.

This article has been cited by:

1. Franklin G Mixon, Kamal P Upadhyaya. 2012. Blogometrics. *Eastern Economic Journal* **36**:1, 1-10. [CrossRef]
2. Ana Rute Cardoso, Paulo Guimarães, Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2010. Comparing the early research performance of PhD graduates in labor economics in Europe and the USA. *Scientometrics* . [CrossRef]
3. Jang C. Jin. 2009. Publications in mathematical economics and econometrics: ranking of Asian universities and an application of Zipf's law. *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature* **23**:2, 116-122. [CrossRef]
4. Kam C Chan, Kartono Liano. 2009. Ranking of Institutions in Economic Research: a Threshold Citation Approach. *Eastern Economic Journal* **34**:3, 347-363. [CrossRef]
5. Peter Schneider, Dieter Sadowski. 2009. The impact of new public management instruments on PhD education. *Higher Education* . [CrossRef]
6. Rolf Ketzler, Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2009. Publications: German economic research institutes on track. *Scientometrics* **80**:1, 231-252. [CrossRef]
7. Jang C. Jin. 2009. Asian University Rankings in International and Development Economics: An Application of Zipf's Law. *Review of International Economics* **17**:1, 137-143. [CrossRef]
8. Yong Bao, Melody Lo, Franklin G. Mixon. 2009. General-interest versus specialty journals: Using intellectual influence of econometrics research to rank economics journals and articles. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* n/a-n/a. [CrossRef]
9. Michael Rauber, Heinrich W. Ursprung. 2008. Life Cycle and Cohort Productivity in Economic Research: The Case of Germany. *German Economic Review* **9**:4, 431-456. [CrossRef]
10. Günther G. Schulze, Susanne Warning, Christian Wiermann. 2008. What and How Long Does It Take to Get Tenure? The Case of Economics and Business Administration in Austria, Germany and Switzerland. *German Economic Review* **9**:4, 473-505. [CrossRef]
11. Klaus Ritzberger. 2008. A Ranking of Journals in Economics and Related Fields. *German Economic Review* **9**:4, 402-430. [CrossRef]
12. Ofer H. Azar, David M. Brock. 2008. A Citation-Based Ranking of Strategic Management Journals. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* **17**:3, 781-802. [CrossRef]
13. Bruno S Frey. 2008. Awards as compensation. *European Management Review* **4**:1, 6-14. [CrossRef]
14. Javier Ruiz-Castillo. 2008. Economics research in Spain during the 1990s: a literature review. *Spanish Economic Review* **10**:3, 221-249. [CrossRef]

15. Klaus Ritzberger. 2008. Eine invariante Bewertung wirtschaftswissenschaftlicher Fachzeitschriften. *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* **9**:3, 267-285. [CrossRef]
16. Günther G. Schulze, Susanne Warning, Christian Wiermann. 2008. Zeitschriftenrankings für die Wirtschaftswissenschaften - Konstruktion eines umfassenden Metaindexes. *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* **9**:3, 286-305. [CrossRef]
17. Marina Fiedler, Isabell M. Welpe, Kathrin Lindlbauer, Kathrin Sattler. 2008. Denn wer da hat, dem wird gegeben: Publikationsproduktivität des BWL-Hochschullehrernachwuchses und deren wissenschaftlicher Betreuer. *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft* **78**:5, 477-508. [CrossRef]
18. Rabah Amir, Malgorzata Knauff. 2008. Ranking Economics Departments Worldwide on the Basis of PhD PlacementRanking Economics Departments Worldwide on the Basis of PhD Placement. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **90**:1, 185-190.
19. Anton J. Nederhof. 2008. Policy impact of bibliometric rankings of research performance of departments and individuals in economics. *Scientometrics* **74**:1, 163-174. [CrossRef]
20. BRIAN DOLLERY, JOEL BYRNES, GALIA AKIMOVA. 2007. AN EMPIRICAL NOTE ON CRITICAL COMMENTARY IN AUSTRALIAN ECONOMICS JOURNALS. *Australian Economic Papers* **46**:3, 300-303. [CrossRef]
21. Christiana Hilmer, Michael Hilmer. 2007. Women Helping Women, Men Helping Women? Same-Gender Mentoring, Initial Job Placements, and Early Career Publishing Success for Economics PhDs. *American Economic Review* **97**:2, 422-426. [CrossRef]
22. John Hudson. 2007. Be known by the company you keep: Citations — quality or chance?. *Scientometrics* **71**:2, 231-238. [CrossRef]
23. Raúl Ramos, Vicente Royuela, Jordi Suriñach. 2007. An analysis of the determinants in Economics and Business publications by Spanish universities between 1994 and 2004. *Scientometrics* **71**:1, 117-144. [CrossRef]
24. Jacques H. Drèze , Fernanda Estevan . 2007. Roundtable on Research and Higher Education in Economics Research and Higher Education in Economics: Can We Deliver the Lisbon Objectives?Roundtable on Research and Higher Education in Economics Research and Higher Education in Economics: Can We Deliver the Lisbon Objectives?. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **5**:2-3, 271-304.
25. JOAN R. RODGERS, FRANK NERI. 2007. RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY OF AUSTRALIAN ACADEMIC ECONOMISTS: HUMAN-CAPITAL AND FIXED EFFECTS. *Australian Economic Papers* **46**:1, 67-87. [CrossRef]
26. Christiana E. Hilmer, Michael J. Hilmer. 2007. On the Relationship between the Student?Advisor Match and Early Career Research Productivity for Agricultural

and Resource Economics Ph.D.s. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **89**:1, 162-175. [CrossRef]

27. David Rodríguez. 2006. Publishing performance of Spanish academics: 1970—2004. *Spanish Economic Review* **8**:4, 255-270. [CrossRef]
28. Richard Münch. 2006. Drittmittel und Publikationen. *Soziologie* **35**:4, 440-461. [CrossRef]
29. E. Han Kim, Adair Morse, Luigi Zingales. 2006. What Has Mattered to Economics Since 1970. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **20**:4, 189-202. [CrossRef]
30. Murat Cokgezen. 2006. Publication Performance of Economists and Economics Departments in Turkey (1999-2003). *Bulletin of Economic Research* **58**:3, 253-265. [CrossRef]
31. Paul Oyer. 2006. Initial Labor Market Conditions and Long-Term Outcomes for Economists. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **20**:3, 143-160. [CrossRef]
32. JOAN R. RODGERS, ABBAS VALADKHANI. 2006. A Multidimensional Ranking of Australian Economics Departments. *Economic Record* **82**:256, 30-43. [CrossRef]
33. Jean L. Heck, Peter A. Zaleski. 2006. The most frequent contributors to the elite economics journals: Half century of contributions to the "Blue ribbon eight". *Journal of Economics and Finance* **30**:1, 1-37. [CrossRef]
34. Joseph Macri, Dipendra Sinha. 2006. Rankings Methodology for International Comparisons of Institutions and Individuals: an Application to Economics in Australia and New Zealand. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **20**:1, 111-156. [CrossRef]
35. Vanessa Proudman. 2006. The Nereus international subject-based repository: Meeting the needs of both libraries and economists. *Library Hi Tech* **24**:4, 620-631. [CrossRef]
36. Hendrik P. van Dalen, Arjo Klamer. 2005. Is Science A Case of Wasteful Competition?. *Kyklos* **58**:3, 395-414. [CrossRef]
37. Michel Lubrano , Luc Bauwens , Alan Kirman , Camelia Protopopescu . 2003. Ranking Economics Departments in Europe: A Statistical ApproachRanking Economics Departments in Europe: A Statistical Approach. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **1**:6, 1367-1401.
38. Pantelis Kalaitzidakis , Theofanis P. Mamuneas , Thanasis Stengos . 2003. Rankings of Academic Journals and Institutions in EconomicsRankings of Academic Journals and Institutions in Economics. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **1**:6, 1346-1366.
39. J. Peter Neary , James A. Mirrlees , Jean Tirole . 2003. Evaluating Economics Research in Europe: An IntroductionEvaluating Economics Research in Europe: An Introduction. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **1**:6, 1239-1249.