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Introduction

After many years of discussion, the back issue catalogue of the *Australian Economic History* Review (AEHR or the Journal) has recently been digitized and made available online. This is a great achievement for the Journal, the Economic History Society of Australia and New Zealand (the Society), and for scholars in the field. The editors of the Journal are grateful for all those who made this possible, particularly Lionel Frost, the current Society President. The on-line publication of the back issue catalogue provides an opportunity to explore developments in the Journal and to reflect on its recent accomplishments and the challenges it faces going forward.

This article uses bibliometric data from the AEHR dating from 1956 through November 2017 to explore research trends at the Journal. The data set is every article published in the AEHR. Morgan and Shanahan (2010) (henceforth MS) collected data covering page count, methodological approach, JEL classification codes, country of study, and author information for every article published through 2009. I have extended this data forward through the November 2017 issue. In addition, I have added three new pieces of information for every article: the citation count collected from *Publish or Perish* or from *Google Scholar*, whether each article uses econometric analysis, and (if so) the number of observations in the largest regression. These data are used to examine trends in research strategy, methodological approach, and impact of articles published in the Journal. Finally, in order to examine the position of the AEHR relative to other journals, I have collected similar data on co-authorship, citation, and use of econometrics from three of the oldest and arguably leading ‘general’ economic history journals, *Journal of Economic History* (JEH), *Explorations in Economic History* (EEH), and *Economic History Review* (EHR); two of the oldest and arguably leading business history journals, *Business History Review* (BHR) and *Business History* (BH); and two long-running ‘regional’ economic history journals, the *Scandinavian Economic History Review* (SEHR) and *Revista de Historia Economica* (RHE). These data have been collected for 1963, 1973, 1983, 1993, 2003, and 2011.

The approach of this article is similar to MS, the most recent paper to contain bibliometric work on the AEHR and editors’ reflection on publication trends. Because only eight years have passed since the MS article was published, many of the issues outlined there remain more-or-less the same as at that time. These include the development of the Journal since 1956, increased internationalization of authorship and article content, increased Asian expertise among the editorial team and on the Editorial Board, the ranking of the most published authors and institutions.[[1]](#footnote-1) Because the history of the journal and many of the basic publishing trends have changed relatively little since 2010, I will not attempt to document them further in this article, rather I will focus on things which weren’t covered in MS, such as citations, use of econometrics, and comparisons to other economic history journals, or things that have changed substantially since 2010, such as the extent of co-authorship. Finally, I offer some personal views on the challenges and opportunities facing the AEHR and economic history in the Antipodes more generally.[[2]](#footnote-2)

*Use of econometrics and big data*

The cliometric revolution, bringing the methodology of applied economics into the study of economic history, began in the United States in the late-1950s and early-1960s. During the initial stages of the cliometric period, the tools being used were relatively simple economic theory and statistics, but these methodologies have become more sophisticated over time. Simple statistics has given way to ever-more-sophisticated econometrics. While few would doubt that the use of cliometric techniques in Australia and New Zealand has lagged behind the United States, I am not aware of any study to date providing evidence on the diffusion of these techniques in the Antipodes. To examine changing methodology and the growth of cliometric approaches in the AEHR, I look at the use of econometrics in published articles. Examining use of econometrics does not imply any value judgements about this or other approaches to economic history, rather I am using it because it is it is an objective methodological measure, which is comparable across both time and journals. While use of econometrics is only a single measure of methodology, it is likely that it is strongly correlated with other aspects of cliometrics, such as use of economic theory.

I consider two pieces of information about each article: 1) whether it contains a regression[[3]](#footnote-3) and 2) the number of observations in the largest regression in the paper (zero if there are no regressions). This approach represents a shift in focus from MS who look at the use of tables and figures and a broader, but more subjective, approach to article classification. A major advantage of measuring methodological approach by use of econometrics, rather than tables or figures, is that it reflects a level of technical sophistication that has increasingly characterised cliometric work, not just a decision on how to best present numerical information (Collins 2015, Mitchener 2015).[[4]](#footnote-4)

The use of econometrics in the AEHR dates back to two articles in 1971 by two of the giants of Australian economic history: David Pope and Boris Schedvin. Figure 1 shows the share of articles in each year containing at least one regression. The annual share varies considerably from year to year, so figure 1 also shows the five-year centred moving average (i.e. the value for 2010 is the average for all articles over the period 2008-12). It can be seen from figure 1 that, despite the considerable year-on-year variation, there has been a strong upward trend in the use of econometrics since about 2007. This implies that formal approaches to statistical modelling have become more important over time, although it should be noted that the AEHR remains eclectic in terms of methodological approach.

In addition to becoming more commonplace, the nature of econometric data and techniques used in economic history journals have changed considerably over time. Collins (2015) and Mitchener (2015) argue that the growth of ‘big data’ in economic history has been among the most important trends of the past couple of decades. Improvements in the technology for gathering and analysing data has revolutionised the types of questions that economic historians can address. In addition, there has been a shift in econometric techniques from those that show mere association to those that can be interpreted as showing causal economic relationships.

Observationally, the growth of big data and the use of increasingly sophisticated econometric techniques also holds to some extent for the AEHR. The earliest articles using econometrics published in the Journal mostly contained time series regressions using a relatively small number of data points. Early econometric work was hampered by technological limitations (such as having to programme on punch cards, low computing power, rudimentary software, and less sophisticated available statistical techniques). More sophisticated econometric approaches and larger data sets have become more prominent over time, particularly since about 2000.

To more formally examine the growth of ‘big data’ in the AEHR, I consider the number of observations in the largest regression in each paper. The distribution of number of observations is very skewed right, and thus the mean is sensitive to large outliers. Table 1 shows the mean, median, and maximum number of observations in papers that include at least one regression over the five decades since the 1970s. Table 1 shows an increase in size of data sets over time, with both the mean and median number of observations increasing with each decade. After 2000 ‘big data’ had arrived to the AEHR, and there was a step change in both the median number of observations and the size of the largest regressions. All of the 13 papers published in the AEHR containing a regression with at least 1,000 observations have been published since 2001. All of the four with at least 10,000 observations have been published since 2009. The figures on the median number of data points also hint at an important methodological change after 2000. The median number of observations in earlier years is under 50 for each decade, a figure consistent with time series regressions on annual data being the primary regression technique. Since 2000, the majority of papers have had data sets with over 150 observations, a number too large for an annual time series covering Australia.

A final observation is that overseas scholars are largely responsible for the increase in the number of cliometric papers published in the AEHR. The first author of approximately 62 percent of all papers published since 2000 have a primary institutional affiliation in Australia or New Zealand. However, the comparable figure for papers using econometrics is only approximately 28 percent.

Citations

Morgan and Shanahan (2010) address only the supply of economic history in Australia. I am unaware of any study to date that addresses the demand. The most common measure of demand for academic output is citations. I use data on citations from *Publish or Perish* and *Google Scholar* collected in October and November 2017 to examine the impact of scholarship in the AEHR.[[5]](#footnote-5) Citations do not fully capture the impact of scholarship. Many of the articles which received fairly few citations have informed economic history teaching in Australia for decades, but do not have the same scholarly impact because of the small size of the Australian economic history community. Nevertheless, I have decided to examine citations as the sole measure of impact, as citations capture an important part of scholarly impact and are 1) objective and 2) easy-to-measure.

In general, the distribution of citations in economics and economic history journals is highly skewed to the right. Across all journals, most papers receive few if any citations and a handful of ‘blockbuster’ papers dominate citation counts (Hamermesh 2013 and 2018). To some degree the AEHR also follows this pattern, although the distribution is much less skewed than for other leading journals. The top one percent of papers in the AEHR citation distribution account for 9.6 percent of the Journal’s total citations, the top ten percent for 43.2 percent, and the top half for 92.1 percent. Over 22 percent of papers published in the AEHR have never been cited.

Figure 2 shows mean and median total citations for all articles published in each year. The mean is above the median in almost every year, reflecting the skewed right distribution. Although there is considerable year-on-year variation in citations, a casual inspection of the data suggests that the rate of citation increased dramatically around 1997, the first year in which the AEHR became available on line. This impression is confirmed by a formal econometric test.[[6]](#footnote-6) To visualize the trend in citations and the impact of digital publication, figure 2 also shows best fit lines for citations calculated using data before and after 1997. To calculate the predicted citations I ran OLS regressions on the number of citations per article on the age and age squared of the article. The regressions were split into the periods 1956-1996 (for which there is only hard copy of the AEHR) and 1997-2017 (for which the AEHR is online). The regression results were (standard errors in parentheses, bold indicates significance at a five percent level):

Cites5696 = -3.78 + **0.68AGE** - **0.01AGE2** N=319, F=7.23, R2=0.044

(6.65) **(0.34)** **(0.004)**

Cites9617 = -0.81 + **2.17AGE** - **0.07AGE2** N=271, F=22.98, R2=0.146

(2.01) **(0.48)** **(0.02)**

Two important patterns are evident from the best fit lines. First, the level of citations is higher after 1997 than before. On-line access to the journal appears to matter for producing citations. Second, there are two plateaus in the citation data, one lasting from the early-1960s to 1996 and the other from 1997 to about 2008. The number of citations declines after 2008, but this likely reflects the fact that citations accrue over time and more recently published articles simply have not been around long enough to reach a ‘steady state’ level of citations, not that the overall citation rate has been declining in recent years.[[7]](#footnote-7) It is likely that this second plateau will be extended over time as recent papers have longer to accumulate citations.

The data can also be used to examine which papers and authors have been most cited. Table 2 shows the 15 most cited papers ever published in the AEHR. As with the overall average number of citations, the most cited papers were disproportionately published since 1997. Table 3 shows the 20 most cited authors.[[8]](#footnote-8) John McCarty is the only author who appears twice in the top 15 most cited papers, and, as a consequence, he is also the most cited author in the history of the AEHR, despite having published only three papers in the Journal. It has been noted by others that McCarty’s impact on the profession was far greater than his publication record alone would suggest, and the citation data confirms this (Morgan and Shanahan 2010; Wright and Ville 2017). The observation of increased citation beginning in 1997 (from figure 2) also applies to the most cited articles and scholars. All but three of the most cited papers have been published since 1997. All but three of the most cited authors (McCarty, Noel Butlin, Shlomowitz) have published at least one paper since 1997. Another observation is that ‘blockbuster’ papers matter more than frequent publications for the total citation list. The list of most cited authors overlaps more closely with the list of most cited papers than with the list of most published authors.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Co-authorship

Morgan and Shanahan (2010) document increasing co-authorship rates in the years immediately prior to 2010. Prior to 2000 the overwhelming majority of papers in the AEHR were sole authored, although there was some variation year-to-year. It would be fair to say that scholarship in the AEHR more closely resembled the ‘lone-scholar’ model of history than the much more collaborative process of economics (Seltzer and Hamermesh 2017). Co-authorship at the Journal remained relatively rare into the 1990s – the five year average number of authors per paper remained below 1.1 as late as 1995 – but increased sharply between 2000 and 2010. This increase has continued to the present day. Between 2013 and 2017 the number of authors per paper averaged 1.66. A majority of papers over this time were co-authored.[[10]](#footnote-10) Figure 3 shows the number of authors per paper and its five year centred moving average to smooth out year-on-year variation.

The growth in co-authorship is a sufficiently striking trend that it deserves explanation. Examining the case of the *Journal of Economic History*, Whaples (1991) quotes Robert Fogel as stating that the nature of cliometric work facilitates specialization and exchange. For example, junior authors may be more likely to specialize in technical data-related work and senior authors in historical context and institutional background. The importance of data collection in cliometric work may also facilitation specialization and collaboration. However, looking at published articles in the JEH, EEH, and EHR, Seltzer and Hamermesh (2017) show that neither use of econometrics nor size of data set has a strong relationship to co-authorship, once time period and journal are controlled for. Thus the growth in cliometric work and the growth in co-authorship in the leading economic history journals appear to have been parallel trends with no causal relationship.

To formally examine the growth of co-authorship over time at the AEHR and whether this was, at least in part, due to the growth in cliometric work documented above, I have run a logit regression on whether a paper is sole-authored on the age and age squared of the paper and whether it includes a regression. The results are as follows (standard errors in parentheses \* and \*\* indicate significance at a 10 percent and 1 percent level, respectively).[[11]](#footnote-11)

SOLE = 0.458\* + .087AGE\*\* - .00086AGE2\* - 1.13REGRESS\*\*

(0.25) (0.025) (0.0004) (0.29)

N=590, χ2=68.49

The age of the article is strongly significant, showing that co-authorship has increased over time, even controlling for article content. The inclusion of econometric analysis is also strongly associated with an increase in the probability of co-authorship. The results are consistent with the discussion in Whaples (1991), but not the formal results presented in Seltzer and Hamermesh (2017). Why would the relationship between econometrics and co-authorship be so strikingly different in the AEHR than in the leading international economic history journals? Although a formal examination of this question is beyond the scope of this paper, one explanation that is consistent with this seemingly surprising result is that the largest American and European data sets are freely available on line, but this is not true of historical Australian data sets. It may be that the gains to specialization and co-authorship are from the *collection* of data, rather than the *use* of data and thus there is less need to co-author when appropriate data is more easily available. Another possible explanation is that, because economic history is a much smaller discipline in Australia than in the US or Europe, the disciplinary differences between history and economics may have a larger impact on research strategy. In other words, the level of interaction between economic historians based in history departments and those based in economics departments may be quite low in Australia simply because there aren’t many economic historians in total. Thus economic historians may adopt the norms of their parent disciplines – non-quantitative sole-authored work for those in history departments and quantitative co-authored work for those in economics departments.

Finally, unlike the case of cliometric methodology, there is little difference between Antipodean and overseas scholars in terms of co-authorship patters. Among papers published since 2000, the first author has had a primary institutional affiliation in Australia or New Zealand in 56 percent of sole-authored papers and 53 percent of co-authored papers.

Comparisons to other economic history journals

Economic history in the Antipodes did not evolve in isolation. Many of the leading Antipodean scholars undertook PhD’s or have held faculty positions overseas. Many leading overseas economic historians have spent time visiting Australian universities. Scholars have mingled at conferences. Thus the trends at the AEHR outlined above may simply reflect what is happening in economic history elsewhere. To examine the extent to which the AEHR is similar to or differs from other economic history journals, I compare the recent trends outlined above to those in three of the oldest, and arguably three leading economic history journals (*Journal of Economic History*, *Explorations in Economic History*, and *Economic History Review*); to two of the oldest, and arguably leading business history journals (*Business History Review* and *Business History*); and to two long-running regional economic history journals (the *Scandinavian Economic History Review* and *Revista de Historia Economica*). The data for these journals were collected from *Publish or Perish* and *Google Scholar* and were collected for 1963, 1973, 1983, 1993, 2003, and 2011. The use of one year per decade is necessary to economise on resource inputs, but does imply that some of the results presented below may be influenced by the sort of considerable year-on-year variation that is evident in figures 1-3.

Table 4 shows the proportion of papers using econometrics and the average sample size for papers that use econometrics in the six economic history journals.[[12]](#footnote-12) The AEHR is clearly the least cliometric of the six journals listed here, having both the lowest proportion of papers with regressions and the smallest data sets. While the papers published in the AEHR in 2011 and, to a lesser degree in 2003, were atypically non-quantitative, the broader picture is confirmed by looking at the 5-year centred moving average proportion of papers with a regression, which are 0.09 and 0.17 for 2003 and 2011, respectively. A higher proportion of papers since 2015 have contained regressions, although it remains to be seen if this is a trend or a short-lived outlier. The relative lack of econometric focus in the Journal is mirrored elsewhere in Australian economic history; the forerunner of the Cliometric Society Conference in the United States was held in 1957, whereas the Australian Cliometric Society Conference only dates back to 2014 (<http://cliometrics.org/about.htm>).

Table 5 shows the average number of citations for articles published in the selected years in the eight journals. The three general journals receive the most citations by a considerable distance, followed by the two business history journals and the three regional economic history journals. The gap between the general economic history journals and the business history journals is larger than the gap between the business history journals and the regional economic history journals. This holds for both the mean and median number of citations, suggesting that the differences between journals are not just due to ‘blockbuster’ articles. The AEHR fares reasonably well against the other two regional journals; there is annual variation in the number of citations for all three journals, but over time the citation rate of the AEHR is comparable to that of the SEHR and REH.

Finally, table 6 shows the number of authors per paper in the selected years in the eight journals. The regional journals lagged a decade behind the general journals and BH in the growth of co-authored papers, although in recent years there has been a strong increase in co-authorship at all the included journals. The AEHR appears to have considerably less co-authorship than the other journals except BHR, particularly in recent years. However, 2003 and particularly 2011 were atypical years, and the five year centred moving average for 2015 of 1.66 is very much in line with the other journals.

Future Challenges

A symposium on the future of economic history in Australia published in the November 1997 issue of the AEHR (volume 37, issue 3) has been described by MS as ‘anguished’. At the time it was clear that there would be no departmental future for economic history, as the last free standing departments of economic history at Melbourne and ANU were about to be closed. There remained deep questions about whether there would be teaching and research futures for the discipline and whether the journal could survive in its current form. MS argued that by 2010 the worst fears had been proven to be unfounded. Overall the conclusions from 2018 are at least as positive as those from 2010. Economic historians continue to hold positions in economics, business, and history departments. In recent years there has been increased hiring, particularly in economics departments. The journal continues to receive high quality submissions from both within and outside Australia and New Zealand. The citation rate is comparable to other regional journals. The favourable comparison to the *Scandinavian Economic History Review* is particularly encouraging as the SEHR benefits from the continued existence of large free-standing economic history departments and economic history groups within other departments in Scandinavian countries.

While the overall message of this comment is positive, nevertheless, many of the concerns expressed in 2010 are as true or more-so today than eight years ago. One consequence of the demise of economic history departments has been a decline in the number of economic historians in Australia. This decline was not immediate. When departments were shut, existing staff merged into departments of history, business, and economics. However, unlike free-standing economic history departments, these departments did not replenish the stock of economic historians as individuals retired, went overseas, or left for the civil service or private sector. This has left a ‘missing cohort’ of economic historians - scholars who would have been hired after 1998 in free-standing departments, but were not hired under actual circumstances. Only in the very recent past has regular hiring of economic historians resumed at Australian universities. These years of little or no hiring pose a particular problem for the AEHR at present, as pre-1998 hires are gradually retiring and the ‘missing cohort’ has reached the career stage that for previous cohorts has normally been the prime years for contributing to the journal.

The problems associated with lower numbers of economic historians based in Australia have so far not proven to be critical. Morgan and Shanahan (2010) document an increase in submissions from authors based overseas or on topics covering countries other than Australia or New Zealand. The growth in research on or based in Asian countries has been particularly noteworthy. This trend has continued to present day, and the Journal has explicitly re-defined itself as an Asia-Pacific journal. The contributions of scholars based in Asia or working on Asian topics have been vital to the output of the Journal, and in several recent years, the Coghlan Prize for the best paper has been awarded to a paper covering an Asian topic.

While the editors very much welcome the internationalisation of the Journal, it does present a new set of challenges. Authors based in Australia and New Zealand have a strong vested interest in the Society and the Journal, and many have spent a substantial portion of their professional career contributing to the Journal with articles, work on the editorial team, and providing referee reports. Almost all of the leading contributors to the AEHR (based on number of papers or pages published) have been based in Australia or New Zealand for a substantial portion of their careers. This continues even for the period since the closure of the last economic history departments in Australia.[[13]](#footnote-13) On the other hand, to date scholars outside Australia and New Zealand have not maintained the same sort of ongoing relationship with the Society or the Journal. Only a handful of Asian-based authors have published more than one paper in the AEHR and none have published more than two. Given the decline in the number of economic historians based in Australia, it is likely that the share of papers being submitted by scholars based overseas will have to continue to increase for the journal to remain healthy. Thus developing relationships and encouraging repeat submissions from overseas scholars, particularly those based in Asia, is probably the biggest and most important challenge facing current and future editorial teams.

A second issue facing the journal is the extent to which articles in the AEHR are regarded as important research outputs by leading economics, history, and business departments. MS quote earlier AEHR editors as stating that one factor that limited the quality of the journal was that many of the ‘giants’ of post-war economic history in Australia preferred to publish ‘big books’ than journal articles. While some of the leading scholars of earlier generations, such as the Butlin brothers, are among the most published authors in the Journal, many others are not. In history departments books are still seen as the most prestigious output and are rewarded more highly (in terms of pay and promotions) than journal articles (Townsend 2012). This was almost certainly true for the earlier generations of economic historians, and most of the leading figures of the discipline from the 1950s through the 1990s are better known for their books than their journal articles.

The number of big books being written has declined in recent years. Margo (2017) shows that in the United States younger cohorts of leading economic historians are writing far fewer books than earlier cohorts. He also argues that the decline in the number of books written is largely due to what he terms ‘the integration of economic history into economics’, which has a professional norm rewarding articles in top ranked journals, rather than books. Australia seems to have followed a similar pattern. The closure of economic history departments and the resulting placement of economic historians in economics or business departments has brought about a change in norms, with emphasis shifting from books to articles in leading journals. The shift to a focus on publication in journals has been accompanied by a greater importance being attached to journal rankings. Economists, in particular, have long had a well-understood ranking of top general and field journals. The importance of journal rankings in economics and business departments has been formalised with the publication of the Australian Business Deans Council list of journals (ABDC). The AEHR was ranked as an ‘A’ journal on the first ABDC list in 2009, but downgraded to ‘B’ in 2013. Consequently, the old path to promotion for an economic historian of publishing big books has been replaced by a new path of publishing in top ranked journals such as the JEH, EEH, EHR, BH, BHR, or other leading economics or business journals. The net result of these changes is that the AEHR continues to receive relatively few submissions by the very best young economic historians.

Table 7 shows the citation counts for 20 leading books in Australian economic history.[[14]](#footnote-14) Table 8 shows the citation count for 61 articles published in the three general economic history journals, the two business history journals, or in other leading economics journals. The articles on this list (which may not be comprehensive) all have at least one author whose primary institutional affiliation was in Australia or New Zealand for at least part of their career and cover a topic within the current remit of the Journal. Although the list of books is not random, table 7 provides evidence of a recent decline in the publication of big books in economic history, as only three books on the list were published since 2000. Conversely, the number articles published in leading journals appears to have increased since 2000, and particularly since the recent arrival of several new hires with PhD training in economics departments. It should also be noted that most of the authors listed in table 8, particularly those publishing in leading economics or economic history journals, either undertook PhD training overseas or have spent a significant portion of their careers overseas, particularly in the United States. The Journal benefits enormously from internationalisation, not just in terms of submissions, but also from the flow of ideas and methodologies. Tables 7 and 8 also confirm the greater visibility of alternative publication outlets. It is evident that many of the books listed in table 7 were cited more, and in some cases much more, than even the most cited articles in the AEHR. Although the prevalence of very recent publications in table 8 makes it difficult to assess the impact of journal articles in other outlets, it is evident that all of the older papers in the general economic history or other economics journals on the list have more citations than is typical for an AEHR publication, and several have more citations than even the most cited article in the Journal. By contrast the citation count for articles published in the business history journals is on par with that for articles published in the AEHR.

I will conclude on a note of cautious optimism. The frequency with which economic historians based in Australia, particularly recent appointments, have published in leading international journals provides clear evidence that high quality scholarship has survived the closure of free-standing economic history departments. While soliciting papers for the AEHR remains a challenge, there have been many high quality submissions from both within and outside the Antipodes during my tenure as editor. Most of the younger generation of economic history scholars in Australia and New Zealand have engaged with the AEHR either as an outlet for their research, work on the editorial team or editorial board, or by reviewing papers. The founding of the Australasian Cliometrics Workshop suggests that quantitative work in economic history has reached a certain critical mass. Finally, there have been several Australian-based PhD students working on economic history topics for the first time in two decades. The potential supply of papers into the future looks to be at least at the levels seen in the recent past.
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**Figure 1: Share of papers containing a regression**

**Figure 2: Citations**

**Figure 3: Co-authorship**

**Table 1: Number of observations in the largest regression**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Decade | Mean | Median | Maximum |
| 1970-79 | 53.2 | 27 | 204 |
| 1980-89 | 87.0 | 30 | 307 |
| 1990-99 | 132.9 | 48 | 682 |
| 2000-09 | 3875.2 | 157 | 32026 |
| 2010-17 | 4707.0 | 228 | 73586 |

Note: Includes only papers which contain at least one regression.

**Table 2: Most cited papers in the AEHR**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Authors** | **Title** | **Year** | **Citations** |
| McCarty, J.W. | Australian capital cities in the nineteenth century | 1970 | 94 |
| Athukorala, P.C. | Foreign direct investment in crisis and recovery: lessons from the 1997-1998 Asian crisis | 2003 | 87 |
| Altman, M. | Staple theory and export-led growth: constructing differential growth | 2003 | 85 |
| Dollery, B.L. and Ho, W. | Measuring the transaction sector in the Australian economy, 1911-1991 | 1998 | 81 |
| Harvie, C. and Lee, H.H. | Export-led industrialisation and growth: Korea's economic miracle, 1962-1989 | 2003 | 62 |
| Haig, B. H. | New estimates of Australian GDP: 1861-1948/49 | 2001 | 58 |
| Sugihara, K. | The second Noel Butlin Lecture: labour-intensive industrialisation in global history | 2007 | 57 |
| Altman, J.C., Biddle, N., Hunter, B.H. | A historical perspective on indigenous socioeconomic Outcomes in Australia, 1971-2001 | 2005 | 50 |
| McCarty, J.W. | The staple approach in Australian economic history | 1964 | 50 |
| Spearritt, P. | The 200 km city: Brisbane, the Gold Coast and Sunshine Coast | 2009 | 49 |
| Ma, D. | Growth, institutions and knowledge: a review and reflection on the historiography of 18th-20th century China | 2004 | 47 |
| Lloyd, P. | 100 years of tariff protection in Australia | 2008 | 47 |
| Merrett, D. | Australian banking practice and the crisis of 1893 | 1989 | 43 |
| Lloyd, C. | Regime change in Australian capitalism: towards a political economy of regulation | 2002 | 42 |
| Austin, G. | Labour and land in Ghana, 1874-1939: a shifting ratio and an institutional revolution | 2007 | 41 |

Note: Citations collected in November 2017.

Sources: *Publish or Perish* and *Google Scholar*.

**Table 3: Most cited authors in the AEHR**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| author | citations |
| McCarty, J.W. | 183 |
| Hunter, B.H. | 123 |
| Merrett, D.T. | 116 |
| Athukorala, P.C. | 87 |
| Altman, J.C. | 87 |
| Butlin, N.G. | 86 |
| Robertson, P. | 85 |
| Altman, M. | 85 |
| Oxley, L. | 84 |
| Haig, B.D. | 82 |
| Dollery, B. | 81 |
| Leong, W.H. | 81 |
| Frost, L. | 76 |
| Inwood, K. | 73 |
| Singleton, J. | 71 |
| Ville, S. | 69 |
| Harvie, C. | 62 |
| Lee, H.H. | 62 |
| Lloyd, C. | 61 |
| Shlomowitz, R. | 60 |

**Table 4: Use of econometrics in economic history journals**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AEHR | REH | SEHR | JEH | EEH | EHR |
| 1963 | 0.0  (---) |  | 0.0  (---) | 0.0  (---) |  | 0.0  (---) |
| 1973 | 11.1  (27.0) |  | 0.0  (---) | 27.8  (44.0) | 12.5  (31.5) | 0.0  (---) |
| 1983 | 12.5  (307.0) | 9.1  (47.5) | 0.0  (---) | 20.8  (171) | 45.8  (120.5) | 13.6  (43.0) |
| 1993 | 11.1  (48.0) | 20.0  (492.3) | 14.3  (78.5) | 54.8  (911.3) | 85.7  (1784.0) | 7.4  (2037.5) |
| 2003 | 7.7  (84.0) | 4.3  (78.0) | 7.7  (1490.0) | 59.33  (9672.3) | 77.8  (948.4) | 29.4  (2338) |
| 2011 | 0.0  (---) | 40.0  (439.5) | 33.0  (1396.3) | 57.6  (2426.4) | 69.4  (42694.3) | 43.1  (765.9) |

Notes: Each cell reports the percentage of papers containing a regression and the average number of data points in the largest regression (in parentheses).

**Table 5: Citations per year in economic and business history journals**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AEHR | REH | SEHR | JEH | EEH | EHR | BH | BHR |
| 1963 | 5.4  (0.0) |  | 6  (5.5) | 108.3  (20.0) |  | 58.5  (34.5) | 7.1  (2.0) | 24.7  (6.0) |
| 1973 | 9.1  (1.0) |  | 15.5  (7.0) | 163.2  (28.0) | 46.3  (21.0) | 50  (42.5) | 15.4  (8.0) | 18.2  (15.0) |
| 1983 | 6.1  (5.5) | 17.2  (9.5) | 7.1  (4.0) | 67.7  (55.0) | 52.2  (18.5) | 72.9  (33.5) | 15.8  (8.0) | 32.3  (14.0) |
| 1993 | 7.6  (5.0) | 18.4  (8.0) | 9.6  (3.5) | 62.7  (39.0) | 32.2  (24.0) | 39.3  (27.0) | 31.0  (12.5) | 34.2  (2.0) |
| 2003 | 26.4  (13.0) | 8.3  (6.0) | 4.9  (3.0) | 67.2  (48.0) | 47.6  (39.5) | 45.4  (28.0) | 14.9  (12.0) | 12.4  (9.0) |
| 2011 | 7.3  (3.0) | 4.5  (3.0) | 6.3  (5.0) | 22.2  (16.0) | 24.9  (17.5) | 28.0  (17.0) | 12.6  (7.5) | 18.7  (14.0) |

Notes: Each cell reports mean citations and median citations (in parentheses).

**Table 6: Co-authorship in economic history and business history journals**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AEHR | REH | SEHR | JEH | EEH | EHR | BH | BHR |
| 1963 | 1.00  (100) |  | 1.00  (100) | 1.00  (100) |  | 1.10  (90.0) | 1.11  (88.9) | 1.11  (88.9) |
| 1973 | 1.00  (100) |  | 1.00  (100) | 1.17  (83.3) | 1.13  (87.5) | 1.00  (100) | 1.00  (100) | 1.05  (94.7) |
| 1983 | 1.25  (75.0) | 1.41  (81.8) | 1.00  (100) | 1.13  (87.5) | 1.50  (58.3) | 1.18  (81.8) | 1.31  (68.8) | 1.13  (87.5) |
| 1993 | 1.00  (100) | 1.13  (86.7) | 1.14  (85.7) | 1.55  (48.4) | 1.33  (66.7) | 1.22  (77.8) | 1.38  (75.0) | 1.11  (88.9) |
| 2003 | 1.15  (84.6) | 1.30  (73.9) | 1.31  (69.2) | 1.44  (63.0) | 1.89  (44.4) | 1.41  (70.6) | 1.43  (66.7) | 1.08  (92.3) |
| 2011 | 1.38  (61.5) | 1.53  (60.0) | 1.75  (41.7) | 1.82  (39.4) | 1.92  (36.1) | 1.74  (49.0) | 1.86  (43.2) | 1.31  (75.0) |

Notes: Each cell reports the average number of authors per paper and the percentage of papers that are sole-authored (in parentheses).

**Table 7: Citations of leading books in Australian economic history**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Author(s) | Year | Title | Cites |
| Alford, K. | 1984 | *Production or Reproduction: An Economic History of Women in Australia* | 86 |
| Butlin, N.G. | 1962 | *Australian Domestic Product, Investment and Foreign Borrowing, 1861-1938/39* | 270 |
| Butlin, N.G. | 1964 | *Investment in Australian Economic Development, 1861-1900* | 376 |
| Butlin, N.G. | 1993 | *Economics and the Dreamtime: a Hypothetical History* | 156 |
| Butlin, N.G., Barnard, A., Pincus, J.J. | 1982 | *Government and Capitalism: Private and Public Choice in Twentieth Century Australia* | 274 |
| Butlin, S.J. | 1953 | *Foundations of the Australian Monetary System, 1788-1851* | 164 |
| Coghlan, T.A. | 1918 | *Labour and Industry in Australia* | 259 |
| Fleming, G., Merrett, D.T., Ville, S. | 2004 | *The Big End of Town: Business and Corporate Leadership in the Twentieth Century* | 61 |
| Forster, C. | 1970 | *Australian Economic Development in the Twentieth Century* | 39 |
| Gregory, R.G. and Butlin, N.G. | 1988 | *Recovery from the Depression: Australia and the World Economy in the 1930s* | 30 |
| Maddock, R. and McLean, I.W. | 1987 | *The Australian Economy in the Long Run* | 91 |
| McLean, I.W. | 2012 | *Why Australia Prospered: The Shifting Sources of Economic Growth* | 87 |
| Nicholas, S. | 1988 | *Convict Workers: Reinterpreting Australia's Past* | 200 |
| Schedvin, C.B. | 1970 | *Australia and the Great Depression* | 256 |
| Schedvin, C.B. | 1992 | *In Reserve: Central Banking in Australia, 1945-75* | 82 |
| Shann, E.O.G. | 1930 | *An Economic History of Australia* | 217 |
| Sinclair, W.A. | 1976 | *The Process of Economic Development in Australia* | 160 |
| Snooks, G.D. | 1994 | *Portrait of the Family within the Total Economy* | 91 |
| Ville, S. and Withers G. | 2014 | *The Cambridge Economic History of Australia* | 8 |
| Whitwell, G. | 1986 | *The Treasury Line* | 173 |

**Table 8: Australia/New Zealand economic and business history articles in leading journals**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author(s)** | **Short Title** | **Journal** | **Year** | **Cites** |
| Alston, L.J. Harris, E., Mueller, B. | The development of property rights | JEH | 2012 | 41 |
| Baten, J., Ma, D., Morgan, S.L., Wang, Q. | Evolution of living standards in China | EEH | 2010 | 74 |
| Forster, C. | Australian manufacturing and the war of 1914-18 | ER | 1953 | 23 |
| Frost, L., Lightbody, M., Carter, A., Halabi, A.K. | A cricket ground or a football stadium? | BH | 2016 | 0 |
| Greasley, D., Oxley, L. | A tale of two dominions | EHR | 1998 | 58 |
| Greasley, D., Oxley, L. | Globalization and real wages | EEH | 2004 | 37 |
| Greasley, D., Oxley, L. | The pastoral boom | EHR | 2009 | 34 |
| Keneley, M.J. | In the service of the society | BH | 2006 | 7 |
| Keneley, M.J. | Organisational capabilities and the role of routines | BH | 2009 | 12 |
| Keneley, M.J. | The path to Project Darwin | BH | 2012 | 6 |
| Keneley, M.J. | Does organizational heritage matter | BHR | 2013 | 1 |
| Keneley, M.J. | The breakdown of the workplace 'family' | BH | 2017 | 0 |
| Johns, L., van der Eng, P. | Networks and business development | BH | 2010 | 6 |
| Maddock, R., McLean, I.W. | Supply-side shocks | JEH | 1984 | 69 |
| Magee, G. | Technological development and foreign patenting | EEH | 1999 | 10 |
| McDonald, J., Snooks, G. | Where the tax assessment of Domesday? | EHR | 1985 | 34 |
| McDonald, J., Snooks, G. | The determinants of manorial income in Domesday | JEH | 1985 | 28 |
| McLean, I.W. | Saving in settler economies | EEH | 1994 | 31 |
| McLean, I.W. | Australian economic growth | ER | 2004 | 69 |
| McLean, I.W. | Why was Australia so rich? | EEH | 2007 | 32 |
| McLean, I.W., Pincus, J.J. | Did Australian living standards stagnate | JEH | 1983 | 37 |
| McLean, I.W., Richardson, S. | More or less equal | ER | 1986 | 32 |
| Merrett, D.T. | Global reach by Australian banks | BH | 1995 | 21 |
| Merrett, D.T. | Australian firms abroad before 1970 | BH | 2002 | 17 |
| Merrett, D.T. | Sugar and copper | BHR | 2007 | 4 |
| Merrett, D.T. | The Australian bank crashes of the 1890s | BHR | 2013 | 13 |
| Merrett, D.T, Morgan, S., Ville, S. | Industry associations as facilitators | BH | 2008 | 19 |
| Merrett, D.T., Seltzer, A.J. | Work in the financial services industry | BH | 2000 | 9 |
| Merrett, D.T., Ville, S. | Financing growth | BHR | 2009 | 4 |
| Merrett, D.T., Ville, S. | Industry associations and non-competitive behaviour | BH | 2012 | 3 |
| Merrett, D.T., Ville, S. | Accounting for nonconvergence | BHR | 2015 | 1 |
| Morgan, S.L. | The biological standard of living in China | EHB | 2004 | 66 |
| Onji, K., Tang, J.P. | Taxes and the choice of optimal form | JEH | 2017 | 3 |
| Oxley, L., Greasley, D. | A time series perspective on convergence | ER | 1995 | 190 |
| Panza, L., Ville, S., Merrett, D.T. | The drivers of firm longevity | BH | 2018 | 0 |
| Panza, L., Swee, E.L. | Good geography, good institutions? | EER | 2016 | 1 |
| Pope, D,. Withers, G. | Do migrants rob jobs? | JEH | 1993 | 125 |
| Reveley, J. | Reciprocity, associability and cartelization | BH | 2012 | 3 |
| Seltzer, A.J. | Did firms cut nominal wages? | EEH | 2010 | 6 |
| Seltzer, A.J., Borland, J. | The impact of the 1896 Factories and Shop Act | JEH | 2018 | 2 |

**Table 8, continued**

**Australia/New Zealand Economic and Business History Articles in Leading Journals**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author(s)** | **Short Title** | **Journal** | **Year** | **Cites** |
| Seltzer, A.J, Merrett, D.T. | Personnel policies at the Union Bank of Australia | JoLE | 2000 | 121 |
| Seltzer, A.J., Simons K. | Salaries and career opportunities | EEH | 2001 | 39 |
| Shanahan, M.P., Round, D.K. | Serious cartel conduct, criminalisation and evidentiary standards | BH | 2009 | 7 |
| Shanahan, M.P., Round, D.K. | Transforming Australian business attitudes to competition | BH | 2014 | 0 |
| Siminski, P., Ville, S. | Long-run mortality effects of Vietnam-era service | AER | 2011 | 17 |
| Singleton, J. | British engineering and the New Zealand market | BH | 2002 | 2 |
| Singleton,J., Verhoef, G. | Regulation, deregulation, and internationalisation | BH | 2010 | 28 |
| Tang, J.P. | Technological leadership and late development | EHR | 2011 | 28 |
| Tang, J.P. | Railroad expansion and industrialization | JEH | 2014 | 22 |
| Tang, J.P. | The engine and the reaper | JHE | 2017 | 0 |
| van der Eng, P. | The real domestic product of Indonesia | EEH | 1992 | 54 |
| van der Eng, P. | Sources of long-term growth in Indonesia | EEH | 2010 | 74 |
| van der Eng, P. | Managing political imperatives in war time | BH | 2017 | 2 |
| van der Eng, P., Leigh, A. | Inequality in Indonesia | JPubE | 2009 | 63 |
| Ville, S. | An historiographical assessment of New Zealand business history | BH | 1992 | 9 |
| Ville, S. | Networks and venture capital | BH | 1996 | 9 |
| Ville, S. | Rent seeking or market strengthening? | BHR | 2007 | 16 |
| Ville, S., Merrett, D.T. | The development of large scale enterprise | BH | 2000 | 35 |
| Ville, S., Fleming, G. | Locating Australian corporate memory | BHR | 1999 | 3 |
| Ville, S., Fleming, G. | The nature and structure of trade–financial networks | BH | 2000 | 9 |
| Withers, G., Pope, D. | Immigration and unemployment | ER | 1985 | 105 |

Notes: The journal abbreviations are as follows: *Journal of Economics History* (JEH), *Explorations in Economic History* (EEH), *Economic History Review* (EHR), *Economic Record* (ER), *Economics and Human Biology* (EHB), *European Economic Review* (EER), *Journal of Labor Economics* (JoLE), *Journal of Public Economics* (JPubE), *American Economic Review* (AER), *Business History* (BH), *Business History Review* (BHR).

**Appendix (Not for Publication): The AEHR “Hall of Fame”**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rank | author | pages |  | Rank | author | adjusted for # of authors |  | Rank | author | Since 1998 |
| 1 | Merrett, David | 252 |  | 1 | Merrett, David | 172.8 |  | 1 | Ville, Simon | 177 |
| 2 | Ville, Simon | 207 |  | 2 | Butlin, S.J. | 153 |  | 2 | Singleton, John | 167 |
| 3 | Singleton, John | 185 |  | 3 | Butlin, N.G. | 151 |  | 3 | Merrett, David | 138 |
| 4= | Butlin, N.G. | 171 |  | 4 | Ville, Simon | 150.5 |  | 4 | Shanahan, M. P. | 126 |
| 4= | Frost, Lionel | 171 |  | 5 | Frost, Lionel | 141.5 |  | 5 | Abbott, Malcolm | 122 |
| 6 | Robertson, Paul | 160 |  | 6 | Singleton, John | 134.5 |  | 6 | Keneley, Monica | 111 |
| 7 | Shanahan, M. P. | 156 |  | 7 | Pope, David | 128 |  | 7 | Frost, Lionel | 102 |
| 8 | Butlin, S.J. | 153 |  | 8 | Abbott, Malcolm | 123.5 |  | 8 | Hunter, Boyd H. | 100 |
| 9 | Abbott, Malcolm | 133 |  | 9 | Robertson, Paul | 122 |  | 9= | Inwood, Kris | 96 |
| 10 | Pope, David | 128 |  | 10 | Shanahan, M. P. | 113.5 |  | 9= | Lloyd, Peter | 96 |
| 11 | Keneley, Monica | 111 |  | 11 | Snooks, G.D. | 103 |  | 11 | Oxley, Les | 88 |
| 12= | Forster, Colin | 105 |  | 12= | Forster, Colin | 101 |  | 12 | Roy, Tirthankar | 83 |
| 12= | McLean, Ian W. | 105 |  | 12= | Sheridan, Tom | 101 |  | 13 | Robertson, Paul | 76 |
| 14 | Oxley, Les | 103 |  | 14 | Keneley, Monica | 100 |  | 14 | Greasley, David | 70 |
| 15 | Snooks, G.D. | 103 |  | 15 | McLean, Ian W. | 98.3 |  | 15 | Ploeckl, Florian | 67 |
| 16 | Cain, Neville | 102 |  | 16 | Lloyd, Peter | 96 |  | 16 | Reveley, James | 66 |
| 17 | Jackson, R.V. | 101 |  | 17 | Haig, B.D. | 94 |  | 17 | Millmow, Alex | 61 |
| 18 | Sheridan, Tom | 101 |  | 18 | Cain, Neville | 92 |  | 18 | Smith, Tony | 60 |
| 19 | Hunter, Boyd H. | 100 |  | 19 | Jackson, R.V. | 87.5 |  | 19= | Fahey, Charles | 57 |
| 20= | Inwood, Kris | 96 |  | 20 | Hawke, G.R. | 84 |  | 19= | Griggs, Peter | 57 |
| 20= | Lloyd, Peter | 96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: the adjustment for number of authors comprised dividing the total pages for each paper by the total number of authors.

1. I have compiled an updated list of the most published authors in the AEHR. I have also adjusted this list for co-authorship (by dividing pages by number of authors for each article) and compiled a list for the past 20 years. These lists are available on request from the author. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. These views are entirely my own. Inevitably they will be shaped by my own experiences of having spent virtually my entire career in economics departments and having never held a position in a history or business/management department. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. I excluded linear regressions on a time trend when classifying the regression variable. This is because, unlike other regressions, a linear regression on a time trend is just a tool to facilitate visualizing the data rather than a means of exploring an underlying economic relationship. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Another advantage of using econometrics as a measure of the extent of cliometric analysis is that the information contained in my econometrics variables (regression and observations) is invariant to the way the information is presented in the original papers. On the other hand, authors’ decisions on, for example, whether to have three figures with one time series or one figure with the same three time series would affect the number of tables and figure in a paper without affecting the information conveyed in the paper. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. In the first instance all citation data was collected using *Publish or Parish* software. Several older articles appear to have zero citations and I checked these articles using *Google Scholar*. I use these sources in preference to other bibliometric tools such as *Web of Science* because they include yet-to-be-published sources, such as working papers, and thus provide a better indicator of the impact of more recently published articles. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. To formally examine the impact of digitization I ran a regression of the number of citations for each article on the age and age squared of the article using the full 1956-2017 data set. I then tested for a structural break in the rate of citations, with the break point specified as volume 37, issue 1 (March 1997), the first issue available on line. The null hypothesis of no structural break is rejected by a Wald test at any standard significance level. Full regression results are available from the author upon request. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. In fact the recent citation rate appears to be increasing, and the journal has had its highest ever impact factor in the past three years. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. I have not adjusted for co-authorship in the citation data. The total citations of a paper are added to each author’s total citations for the calculations in table 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Twelve of the most cited authors also appear on the most cited papers list shown in table 2. On the other hand, only 9 of the 21 most published authors listed are among the most cited authors (appendix table, available from the author). Six of the most cited authors only published a single paper in the AEHR. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The share of papers that are sole-authored (not shown) almost perfectly mirrors the number of authors per paper, implying that the trends shown in figure 3 are not driven by a handful of papers with more than two or three authors. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. I have also run the regression adding variables for size of data set and gender and country of first author. The coefficients on these variables are statistically insignificant and the overall results are qualitatively similar to those presented above. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Regression analysis is a much less integral methodology to business history than to economic history and I did not collect data on use of regressions in the business history journals. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Eighteen of the 20 leading authors in the AEHR (by pages published) since 1998 have their primary academic appointment in Australia or New Zealand. None are based in Asia. Only one (Tirthankar Roy) works primarily on Asian topics. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. This list focuses solely on Australia for two reasons: the limits of my own expertise and the fact that until very recently authors of scholarly books on Asian economic history would not have generally considered the AEHR to be an appropriate outlet for their work. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)