

**DOCUMENTS DE TREBALL  
DE LA DIVISIÓ DE CIÈNCIES JURÍDIQUES,  
ECONÒMIQUES I SOCIALS**

*Col· lecció d'Economia*

**AUTHORS', INSTITUTIONS' AND COUNTRIES' RANKINGS IN  
REGIONAL AND URBAN SCIENCE. AN ANALYSIS FOR NINE  
TOP INTERNATIONAL JOURNALS FROM 1991 TO 2000.**

Jordi Suriñach\*

Juan Carlos Duque\*

Raúl Ramos\*

Vicente Royuela\*

**Dirección correspondencia**

Grup d'Anàlisi Quantitativa Regional

Departament d'Econometria, Estadística i Economia Espanyola

Facultat de Ciències Econòmiques i Empresariales, Universitat de Barcelona

Avda. Diagonal 690 - 08034 Barcelona, Espanya

Tel: 934021980 Fax: 934021821

E-mail: surinach@eco.ub.es, jduque@eco.ub.es, rrlobo@eco.ub.es, vroyuela@eco.ub.es,

**Recibido:** Abril 2002

---

\* The authors wish to thank Hyun Hong and Isabel Cortés for their dedicated assistance during the short time they worked with us on this project, and Assumpta Pujol of the Library of the University of Barcelona for her help with the Econlit database. Support from DGICYT SEC 2002-00165 project is also gratefully acknowledged.

## **RESUMEN:**

El siguiente artículo examina los autores, instituciones y países más productivos en la ciencia regional y urbana desde 1991 hasta 2000 usando información sobre artículos (y páginas) publicados de una muestra de revistas ampliamente reconocida en este campo: ARS, JUE, JRS, IJURR, IRSR, PRS, RSUE, RS y US. También se analiza la relación existente entre el país de la institución en que el autor desarrolla su investigación y el país de edición de las revistas donde se publican los trabajos con el objetivo de analizar si existe “sesgo doméstico”. El análisis se realiza para toda la década y por subperíodos lo que permite una interpretación dinámica de los resultados.

**Palabras clave:** Investigación regional y urbana, rankings, análisis bibliométrico.

**Clasificación JEL:** R10, A10, A11, A14

**ABSTRACT:**

This paper examines the most productive authors, institutions and countries in regional and urban science from 1991 to 2000 using information on published articles (and pages) from a sample of widely recognized journals in this field: ARS, JUE, JRS, IJURR, IRSR, PRS, RSUE, RS and US. We also consider the relation between the country of the institution named in articles and the country in which the journal is published, in order to know if there are a home publication bias in regional and urban science. Analysis was made for the whole decade and by subperiods, this allowed us to make a more dynamic interpretation of the results.

**Keywords:** Regional and urban research, rankings, bibliometric analysis.

**JEL Classification:** R10, A10, A11, A14

# **Authors', Institutions' and Countries' Rankings in Regional and Urban Science. An Analysis for Nine Top International Journals from 1991 to 2000.**

## **1. Introduction and objectives**

Our purpose in this paper is to analyse the publications in leading international regional and urban journals in order to establish rankings of authors, institutions and countries from 1991 to 2000 on the basis of their contributions to the literature. We will then examine the relationships between the country of the institution where the research is carried out and the countries where the various journals are published. The paper's main contribution is that it covers a wider set of journals and a longer time period than previous studies. Two subperiods (from 1991 to 1995 and from 1996 to 2000) are considered in order to provide a dynamic analysis of the main contributors in regional and urban science. The empirical analyses performed are based on the use of bibliometric techniques.

Bibliometrics involves the application of mathematical and statistical methods to measure quantitative and qualitative changes in publications. Quantitative techniques of this kind make it possible to analyse the publication patterns of academic institutions or authors in different journals and to measure the relevance of different subject fields or topics in published research . It can also help in the study of regional patterns of research or the extent of cooperation between researchers in different institutions or countries.

The most frequently used bibliometric methods involve analysing the patterns in the number of articles, pages, citations and co-words published in a selection of journals. These methods have been widely used in a range of scientific fields, and economics is no exception. These analyses have highlighted

aspects such as trends in co-authorship or the establishment of multi-national research collaboration networks, but the most important application of bibliometrics in economics has involved the establishment of rankings of institutions and authors on the basis of their productivity (understood as articles or pages published in different samples of journals).

The first rankings of US economic departments were published by Fusteld in 1956. Since then a number of studies have been conducted with the same aim, and have used two main approaches: opinion surveys administered at departments and institutions, and studies based on publications by faculty members or Ph. D. graduates in top journals. Ranking departments in terms of recent publications has two functions for faculty and students<sup>1</sup>: Job searchers can evaluate the quality of the research environment at each institution, and students can gain an idea of the skills and specializations of faculty members.

For these reasons, the rankings have been updated (see Graves et al. 1982, Bairam 1994, Laband-Piette, 1994, Conroy and Dusansky 1995, Scott and Mitias 1996, Dusansky and Vernon 1998 or Cribari-Neto et al. 1999), the applied methodological approach has been refined and a number of studies have extended these rankings to new geographical areas and to new fields of economics.

The initial assessments concentrated on academic institutions in the US, but more recent studies have broadened their geographical scope. For example, Kirman and Dahl (1994) collected and compared data on financing economic research and output in European countries. One of the output measures was the number of published articles in the Social Science Citations Index for the period 1987-1991. Kalaitzidakis et al. (1999) presented another ranking of European economics institutions and countries in a core set of 10 economic journals from 1991 to 1996 but they used a more complex indicator than Kirman and Dahl,

---

<sup>1</sup> These rankings have not been exempt from criticism. See, for example, Beed and Beed (1996).

which was based on the number of pages published adjusted for the impact factor of each journal. More recently, the European Economics Association (EEA)<sup>2</sup> has financed different works with the aim of establishing European institutions rankings and of comparing its relative positions with American institutions. Kalaitzidakis et al. (2001), Coupé (2001) and Bauwens et al. (2002) are three examples of these works<sup>3</sup>. The three of them establish rankings for the second half of the nineties using different sets of journals and different bibliometric indicators.

More detailed analysis in more specialized fields has also been undertaken. For instance, Hall (1987, 1991) ranked institutional activity in econometrics over the periods 1980-1985 and 1980-1988 in 14 journals, distinguishing between theoretical and non-theoretical econometrics. Baltagi (1998, 1999) updated these rankings in econometrics and Dirkmaat (2001) analysed the articles published from 1981 to 1999 in the Journal of Econometrics taking into account the country of the authors and most frequented cited articles.

This kind of analysis has only rarely been applied to regional science, and the studies that have been performed have focused on particular journals. For example, O'Kelly (1999) analysed the topics in papers by frequent contributors and the most frequently cited papers in the last thirty years but only for articles in Geographical Analysis. Allen and Kau (1991) examined the relative importance of authors and institutions using the number of pages published from 1974 to 1989 as the main relevant variable, but limited their analysis to the Journal of Urban Economics. Taylor and Jones (1992) compared the number of citations received by articles published in Regional Studies during the period 1980-1989 with the citations received by articles in other academic journals in the field of urban and regional studies.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.eeassoc.org>

<sup>3</sup> Other papers financed by EEA are: Lubrano (2001) and Combes and Linnemer (1999, 2000). The first one establishes rankings inside each country for Belgian, French and Spanish institutions. Whereas, the second one analyses the French economic research situation.

Only two studies have adopted a more general approach. First, Kau and Johnson (1983) calculated the output of academic institutions and authors from 1965 to 1980 in selected regional journals, finding a wide-spread interest in regional science; and second, Rey and Anselin (2000) (following the classification by Anselin, Rey and Talen 2000) examined the publication patterns in five regional science journals during the nineties, establishing rankings for authors using article counts, page counts and citation indices.

As we mentioned above, we expand on this research in three ways: first, by considering not only regional but also urban journals (i.e. a set of nine top international journals) and using a more up-to-date database; second, by considering the institution to which authors are affiliated and the country where the institution is located and, third, by analysing the relationships between the country of the institution and the country in which the various journals are published. The above information is analysed not only for the whole decade but also for two subperiods of five years, thus enabling us to perform a more complete dynamic analysis.

To our understanding, this approach permits to identify which have been the most relevant changes in this field in terms of researchers and institutions during the last ten years and also it permits to analyse if there are differences between “regional” and “urban” research and if these differences have widened or not.

With these objectives in mind, the rest of the paper is organised as follows: first, the methodological approach in the paper is clearly described; next, the empirical results are presented; finally, we conclude with some remarks on the results.

## **2. Methodological approach**

Conroy and Dusansky (1995) argue that there are several fundamental conceptual problems in designing a study of this sort. The first is the selection of

the set of journals on which the analysis will be based. The second is to ensure that the publications of each author are correctly identified. This problem arises because many authors publish under slightly different names, and journals sometimes abbreviate the names of their authors. The third problem is to do with the assignation of authors and their articles to institutions and countries. The fourth problem concerns the unit of analysis in the study: should productivity be measured on the basis of the number of articles published, or on the number of pages in each article? A last point to take into account is the country in which the journal is edited. This section describes our solutions to these problems.

## **2.1. Selection of journals and articles**

Taking into account the objectives of the study, we initially considered every international journal published between the years 1991 and 2000 in the field of urban and regional science. However, as the number of journals (and articles) was relatively high and the quality uneven, we decided to limit our analysis to a selected sample of top journals. The criteria applied to select this sample can be summarised as follows: First, we chose journals included in the Econlit database<sup>4</sup> (for at least part of the time period considered). We then reduced this sample of journals further to those included in the Social Science Citation Index database<sup>5</sup> in one or more of the following categories: Demography, Economics, Environmental Studies, Geography, Planning and Development, Transportation and Urban Studies. Next, we revised the “aim and scopes” section of all these journals to select only those that deal with urban, local, and/or regional problems. The final result of this process was the list of nine journals shown in table 1.

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.econlit.org](http://www.econlit.org).

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.isinet.com/isi/products/citation/ssci/index.html>.



## TABLE 1

The next step was to obtain detailed information about all articles published in the journals selected over the ten-year period. The standard source for this kind of information is the Econlit database<sup>6</sup>. However, not every journal in our list was recorded in Econlit over the entire period, and so we compiled these data directly from the journal contents pages<sup>7</sup>. As is standard practice in this kind of analysis, we only accepted refereed articles; for this reason, book reviews, book and publication notes, short comments, debates and surveys, and related sections (where available) were not considered. Some other articles were also excluded. as will be explained in section 3.1

### **2.2. Author's name**

Our preliminary data analysis showed that articles published in the period considered included one permutation or more of authors' names. We examined every record in which there was the possibility of ambiguity and made manual corrections when possible. Before corrections, the database had 3973 different author's names. After correction, this figure fell by more than 20%, to 3172.

Equally important is the fact that the Econlit database only provides information about the first three authors in each paper. If there are four or more authors, Econlit only attributes the text to, say, "Smith et al.". For these articles, we assumed that there were four authors.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Econlit database in the analysis includes bibliographical information from 1969 to January 2001.

<sup>7</sup> The International Journal of Urban and Regional Research was only available in Econlit from 1996 to 2000 and the Papers of Regional Science was only available in this database from 1995 to 1998.

### 2.3. Author's affiliation

Respect the third problem, We took the affiliation of the authors to be that recorded in the articles published. As Conroy and Dusansky (1995) point out, this approach may yield rankings that do not reflect the current composition of departments. This approach assigns faculty affiliation based on department residence at the date of assessment, rather than at different points in time during the publication period covered. To solve the problem Scott and Mitias (1996) offer separate measures according to faculty “stocks” and to faculty “flows”, where “stock” attributes publications to the university of current appointment and “flow” attributes publications to the university where the research was conducted<sup>8</sup>. However, we preferred to consider the affiliation of the author indicated in the published article as it is a good indicator of that particular moment of research. As the time period we considered was relatively long, the effects of changes in author's affiliation could be collected in a natural way (only changes that occurred in the final years of the period would not be considered).

Like authors, institutions may be entered in the database under different names. We therefore examined every record in which there was the possibility of ambiguity and, as with the author's name, we made manual corrections when required. We also assigned the same entry to different research centres or departments in the same university. Before corrections, the database had 2037 different author's affiliations. After correction, this figure fell by more than 45% to 1117.

---

<sup>8</sup> Bauwens et al. (2002) make a similar differentiation. They distinguish between two definitions: a short term definition that discounts the past affiliations of its members and assign all their scientific achievements to their present affiliation and legalistic definition that implies that an academic research institution has the intellectual ownership of all the present and past research hosted in its walls. They chose the second definition because the first one was very difficult to apply with the current available information.

## 2.4. Unit of analysis

Another issue in need of definition was the unit of measurement to use in order to evaluate the output of the research activity of the different authors and institutions.

There are three aspects that should be considered when defining the unit of analysis in this kind of work: The first one is related with how to measure an author's output; the second one is related with co-authorship; and the third one, is related with quality differences among the considered publication.

Regarding the first one, the measurement of an author's output, we could choose either the number of articles, or the number of pages per article. Using the number of articles as a criterion would give equal weight to long and short papers. However, as journal editors have a limited number of pages per issue and a limited number of issues per year, during the evaluation process they are likely to allocate more pages to papers of higher quality and to shorten those of lower quality papers. As a result, the number of papers published may not be a good indicator of quality research.

In this context, another possible source of distortion is the disparity of characters and page size in the different journals. To avoid this effect we expressed all journal pages in terms of American Economic Review equivalents. Although the American Economic Review was not in our sample, we chose that journal's format as our basis for two reasons: first, because it had been extensively used in the literature (see for example, Conroy and Dusansky 1995); and, second, because the format had remained unchanged throughout the time period<sup>9,10</sup>. In the standardization process we took great care to consider any

---

<sup>9</sup> Two procedures were applied to calculate the number of equivalent pages. The first consisted in multiplying the number of lines per page (on a representative page with no footnotes, figures, equations or other interruptions) by the average number of typed characters per line (an average of three full lines). The second consisted in using a scanner in conjunction with OCR software and counting the number of characters for this representative

changes in the format of the journals. For this reason, the weights differ over time for four of the journals analysed.<sup>11</sup>

The second previously mentioned problem regarding the unit of analysis is the question of how to deal with multi-authored papers. The standard procedure is to assign to each author the number of pages of the articles multiplied by  $1/n$  where  $n$  is the total number of authors in each paper. Coupé (2001) chose this criterion following Sauer (1988)'s economic justification based on the monetary value of papers. However, Cribari-Neto et al. (1999) calculated the page count in a different way. They see professional collaboration and co-authorship as a major pillar of academic research and state that dividing an article's page count by the number of authors imposes an excessive penalty on authors who publish with colleagues and current or former graduate students. For this reason, they divided the number of published pages by the square root of the number of joint authors. The problem with this weight is that the sum of pages assigned to each individual author in a paper will not be the total number of pages of the article. For this reason, we used the first criterion in order to assign not only the number of pages but also the number of articles and standardized pages.

The same approach was applied to assign pages when an author belonged to more than one institution according to the information published in the article. Kalaitzidakis et al. (2001) used the same procedure to solve both,  $n$  co-authors ( $1/n$ ) and  $m$  affiliations ( $1/m$ ) cases.

The third aspect, related with the consideration of quality differences in order to ensure a right measure of authors contributions was proposed by Eric van Damme (1996). His proposal consisted in weighting up the relationship between

---

page using the Microsoft Word 2000 "Word count" utility. The results, which were quite similar, are available from the authors on request.

<sup>10</sup> In Kau and Johnson (1983) the Journal of Regional Science was the standard but its format underwent changes during the period considered.

<sup>11</sup> The following journals changed their format: Annals of Regional Science (1992/1993 and 1999/2000), International Regional Science Review (1996/1997 and 1998/1999), Papers in Regional Science (1999/2000) and Regional Studies (1999/2000).

the length of the publication and the number of authors by a measure of the quality of the publication. This weight is useful when the size and heterogeneity of the journals sample are high.

In this sense, in the literature different approaches have been considered to take into account the unequal quality of articles and journals.

A first option consists in analysing the number of citations received by every article. The idea is that authors whose articles have received a lot of citations should be in a higher position than when it is assumed that every article has the same quality. Anselin and Rey (2001) use this kind of approach. However, this type of analysis is difficult. The difficulty is related with the fact that most recent articles would receive less citations than the ones published at the beginning of the considered period and also with the need of combining different data bases (in this case, Econlit and Social Science Citation Index). So, a very detailed data base is required to follow this approach. In particular, information about citations received by articles in the full sample of journals and years considered in the analysis is required.

A second option consists in ranking journals according to their quality. These differences in journals quality would be later applied to establish authors or institutions rankings. The idea is that the characteristics of the process of revision and selection of articles in every journal determine the quality of the published articles. So, authors who have published in high quality journals should be in higher positions than authors who have published in low quality journals. To approximate quality differences among journals, several alternatives have been proposed.

A first alternative consists in making a survey to a panel of experts. As Cerviño et al. (2001) highlight, this method is the most commonly used when the objective of the analysis consists in establishing a first list of relevant journals in a research field. The panel of experts can be defined in several ways: professors, department directors, researchers, members of associations, etc.

However, this method is not exempted from criticism. A first criticism deals with the objectivity of the method as expert opinions could be biased or even some of them can assure that they know the journals when this is not the case<sup>12</sup>. A second criticism was stated by Extejt and Smith (1990) and Salancik (1986) who showed that the experts usually give a better punctuation to that group of journals where they focus their research interests or publish their works.

A second alternative consists in identifying quality differences among journals using the total number of citations received by the articles published in every journal. Taking this idea as a starting point, different indexes have been proposed. Among the most known indexes, the one elaborated by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) for the different research fields should be highlighted. From the different indexes, we will focus our interest in two of them: the total number of citations given in a particular year by all the articles published in a journal and the impact factor index, calculated from the citations received by an article during the first two years after its publication.

The first index could be understood as a measure of “historical” differences in quality. The total number of citations received in one year can be a good measure of the prestige of the journal, but it could be a result of the quality of articles published a long time ago<sup>13</sup>.

The second index considers the number of citations in relation to the total number of articles published in one journal, but the delimitation of the analysis to only two years after publication can be inapropiated to some research fields<sup>14</sup>.

---

<sup>12</sup> To show the relevance of these problems, Hawkings et al. (1973) include to inexistent journals to the list of 85 journals that they wanted to classify from the opinion of experts. One of these two journals had a “theoretical-oriented-research” title while the second has a “applied-research-oriented” title. The first one was classified among the top ten journals while the second was classified among the last ten.

<sup>13</sup> A recently created journal would have less citations than a journal being published for a long time.

<sup>14</sup> It is also important to highlight that the use of citations as a measure of quality has also been criticised: self-citations, policy-motivated citations (to colleagues or friends), strategic-motivated citations (to the editor of the journal where the article is sent to be published), among others.

Combes and Linnemer (1999, 2000) analysed the publication patterns of economic research in France using all these approaches and also without taking into account the possible differences of quality of published articles. The correlations among the obtained results using the different criteria were very high.

In this paper, we will present the rankings using five criteria: the number of published articles (in terms of the one-author equivalent), the number of published pages, the number of journal standardized pages, the number of “journal citations adjusted” standardized pages and the number of “journal impact adjusted” standardized pages”<sup>15</sup>. Table 2 shows the values of the weights that are applied to the number of standardized pages to obtain the number of “journal citations adjusted” standardized pages and the number of “journal impact adjusted” standardized pages. To interpret them easier, both groups of weights have been normalized taken as base the value for “Regional Science and Urban Economics”.

TABLE 2

As it can be seen from this table, the results for both groups of weights have similarities but also differences. According to both group of weights, the journals with lower quality are “Annals of Regional Science” and “Papers of Regional Science”. There is also a coincidence that “International Regional Science Review” and “Regional Science and Urban Economics” are medium-quality journals while the “Journal of Urban Economics” is a high quality journal. However, the results for the rest of journals are quite unequal: while “Regional Studies”, “Urban Studies” and “International Journal of Urban and

---

<sup>15</sup> To calculate the average value for the whole decade, we have taken into account the differences in the number of published articles in the two-years period used in the elaboration of the impact indexes.

Regional Research” are high-quality journals according to the second group of weights, using the first weights the results would be different.

The procedure to establish rankings of authors, institutions and countries would consist in applying these weights to the values of the standardized pages. So, in the next section of the papers, three different rankings based on standardized pages would be provided: one based on “quality unadjusted” standardized pages, a second one based on “citation adjusted” standardized pages and a third one based on “impact adjusted” standardized pages.

## **2.5. Country of publication**

We also recorded the country in which the journal was published. Only three different possibilities were considered: the United States, the United Kingdom and Continental Europe. Table 3 shows the results of this classification.

TABLE 3

## **3. EMPIRICAL RESULTS**

In this section we first analyse the publication patterns in regional and urban articles; second, we produce rankings for authors and institutions; third, we present a detailed analysis for the countries with the highest presence in these journals; and last, we analyse the relationships between the country of the institution where the research is carried out and the country where the journals are published.

The results shown in this section, and due to obvious reasons, only include authors and institutions for the first twenty positions according to every considered indicator and country rankings do not include full results.



### 3.1. Publication patterns in regional and urban articles

First, it should be borne in mind that although the journals analysed focus on regional and urban topics, some may also publish articles on non-regional or non-urban themes. One way of excluding these non-regional or non-urban articles would be via the subject field in the Econlit database. Indeed, in the Econlit subject classification there is a category for regional and urban analysis (R code). However, the Econlit classification usually reflects the author's vision of his/her own article and there is a limit on the number of subjects that can be indicated; so, when an article is published in a regional or urban journal, it may be the case that the R code is not indicated, and this space may be assigned another more informative code. For this reason, we started by inspecting every article in the sample and established whether it considered the territory under analysis from a regional or an urban perspective? We defined three categories: "regional" articles, "urban" articles and "regional & urban" articles. However, when establishing rankings, and in order to simplify the analysis, only two possibilities were considered: "regional" or "urban"; the other category, "regional & urban", was assigned to both categories<sup>16</sup>.

The final number of articles, pages and standardized pages included in the analysis are shown in table 4. Table A1 in the appendix shows the same information but includes the non-regional or non-urban articles (i.e., the whole data set). We should note that during the period studied some journals increased the number of volumes (and articles) published per year.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> This means that the sum of articles, pages and standardized pages of the regional and urban rankings will not be equal to the total number of articles, pages and standardized pages considering territory.

<sup>17</sup> Urban Studies has increased the number of volumes published per year from 6 to 13, and Regional Studies from 6 to 9. However, Regional Science and Urban Economics, which increased the number of volumes per year from 4 to 6, is one of the journals which now

## TABLE 4

Comparison of tables 4 and A1 shows that the articles that consider territory account for more than 85% of all articles and approximately the 95% of all pages and all standardized pages. Both percentages remained stable over the ten-year period.

### **3.2. Major contributors to regional and urban articles during the considered period**

As mentioned above, one possible application of bibliometric analysis is to establish authors' rankings on the basis of their publication performance.

During the ten years considered, a total of 3170 authors published in the selected journals. Table 5 shows the first 20 authors<sup>18</sup> (out of these 3170) in terms of their publication performance during the decade. In order to list the first 20 authors according to all the considered criteria (the number of published articles, pages, standardized pages and quality adjusted standardized pages), it was necessary to include 36 different researchers in the ranking. To appear in this top-20 ranking, an author had to have published 6.33 articles, 124 pages, 98.69 standardized pages, 99.15 citation adjusted standardized pages or 129.03 impact adjusted standardized pages during the decade.

## TABLE 5

---

publishes fewer articles. The other six journals produced 3 or 4 volumes per year during the ten considered years.

<sup>18</sup> The affiliation in the table is the one reported by the author in his/her last published paper in our database.

Henderson, Nijkamp and Braid occupy the first three positions in terms of articles, pages and standardized pages. Henderson came first in the ranking by articles and pages, while Nijkamp was first in terms of the number of standardized pages. When looking at quality adjusted rankings, Braid is the first in terms of citation adjusted standardized pages while Nijkamp and Henderson are still among the six major contributors. In terms of impact adjusted standardized pages, the first three positions are for Wu, Congdon and Henderson. As for affiliations of the top authors, the Free University of Amsterdam, the University of Syracuse and the University of Glasgow appeared twice, while the rest of institutions only once.

Dividing up the articles in the database on the basis of the territorial focus, “regional” articles<sup>19</sup> were written by 1788 authors and “urban” articles were written by 2081. 699 authors published both “regional” and “urban” articles. The rankings obtained using these two datasets are shown in tables 6 and 7. For regional articles, it was necessary to list 43 authors in order to include the first 20 authors according to each of the five criteria whereas for the urban articles ranking, only 34 authors had to be listed. To appear in the top-20 regional ranking, an author had to have published at least 3.50 articles, 65.50 pages, 56.29 standardized pages, 51.07 citations adjusted standardized pages or 87.33 impact adjusted standardized pages. To appear in the top-20 urban ranking, the corresponding figures were 5.50 articles, 108.50 pages, 78.50 standardized pages, 93.11 citations adjusted standardized pages or 107.05 impact adjusted standardized pages.

#### TABLES 6 AND 7.

---

<sup>19</sup> As mentioned above, the articles in the category “regional & urban” has been taking into account to elaborate both rankings: the “regional” ranking and the “urban” ranking.

The first position in the regional ranking was held by Nijkamp, using articles, pages and standardized pages, and by Parr in terms of citation adjusted and impact adjusted standardized pages. In the urban ranking, Braid came first on the basis of number of articles, pages, standardized pages and citation adjusted standardized pages and Congdon in terms of impact adjusted standardized pages.

Two authors were included among the 20 first regional authors and the 20 first urban authors simultaneously: Congdon and Parr.

The three databases (the full set, and the “regional” and the “urban” subsets) were split according to time. We analysed two subperiods: 1991-1995 and 1996-2000.

In the full set of articles, 1689 authors appeared in the first subperiod database, a figure that rose to 2008 in the second subperiod. 527 published in both subperiods. The rankings for the two subperiods are shown in tables 8 and 9.

#### TABLES 8 AND 9.

To list the first 20 authors according to the number of published articles, pages or standardized pages, 36 different researchers had to be included in the ranking for the first subperiod and 35 in the second. To appear in the first top-20 ranking, an author had to have published 4.00 articles, 71.00 pages, 53.75 standardized pages, 58.62 citation adjusted standardized pages or 81.54 impact adjusted standardized pages between 1991 and 1995 and to appear in the second top-20 ranking, the figures required were 3.50 articles, 73.00 pages, 56.03 standardized pages, 57.26 citation adjusted standardized pages or 83.87 impact adjusted standardized pages between 1996 and 2000.

Henderson and Congdon, in the first subperiod, and Nijkamp and Wu, in the second, occupied the first and second place in the different rankings. But these

were not the only changes in the rankings: in fact, only seven of the first twenty authors between 1991-1995 were among the first twenty authors for 1996-2000.

In the ranking for regional articles, 983 authors appeared in the first subperiod database and 1037 in the second. 232 authors published in both subperiods. The rankings for the two subperiods are shown in tables 10 and 11.

#### TABLES 10 AND 11.

To list the first 20 authors according to the number of published articles, pages or standardized pages, 38 different researchers had to be included in the ranking for the first subperiod and 36 in the second. To appear in the first ranking, an author had to have published 2.50 articles, 42.00 pages, 36.86 standardized pages, 33.24 citation adjusted standardized pages or 55.83 impact adjusted standardized pages between 1991 and 1995 and to appear in the second, he/she had to have published 2.17 articles, 45.33 pages, 39.85 standardized pages, 35.25 citation adjusted standardized pages or 58.74 impact adjusted standardized pages between 1996 and 2000.

Hansen, Isserman, Nijkamp, Parr, Harris and Hart occupied the first three positions according to the different criteria during the first subperiod while in the second subperiod these positions were occupied by Nijkamp, Anselin, Rey, Parr, Batabyal, Boyer and Yeung. Only four of the first twenty authors between 1991-1995 appeared among the first twenty authors for 1996-2000.

Lastly, 1059 authors appeared in the database for urban articles in the first subperiod and 1323 in the second. 301 published in both subperiods. The rankings for the two subperiods are shown in tables 12 and 13.

#### TABLES 12 AND 13

To list the first 20 authors according to the number of published articles, pages, standardized pages, citation adjusted standardized pages or impact adjusted standardized pages, 31 different researchers had to be included in the ranking for the first subperiod and also 31 in the second. To appear in the first ranking, an author had to have published 3.00 articles, 62.50 pages, 44.94 standardized pages, 53.02 citation adjusted standardized pages or 64.28 impact adjusted standardized pages between 1991 and 1995 while to appear in the second, he/she had to have published 3.00 articles, 58.33 pages, 48.76 standardized pages, 51.13 citation adjusted standardized pages or 71.07 impact adjusted standardized pages between 1996 and 2000.

In the first subperiod, the three first positions according to the different criteria were occupied by Henderson, McMillen, Alperovich, Braid, Congdon and Bovaird, while in the second these positions were occupied by Wu, Arnott, Braid, Skaburskis and Pugh. From the first 20 authors in the first subperiod, only eight were placed among the first 20 authors in the second.

Comparing the “regional” and “urban” articles by subperiods, only two authors, Chen and Fielding, appeared in the first twenty positions of both rankings for the first subperiod (between 1991 and 1995, 353 authors published “regional” and “urban” articles) and in the second subperiod (between 1996 and 2000, 352 authors published “regional” and “urban” articles) four authors appeared: Congdon, Henderson, Jessop and Nijkamp.

### **3.3. Recognized institutions in regional and urban research**

As for authors, rankings for institutions are usually provided. In this section, academic institutions are listed according to the publication performance of their researchers in the regional and urban journals under consideration.

Authors from a total of 1117 institutions published in the selected journals during the decade. The rankings for the top 20 institutions according to the three

criteria selected are shown in table 14. To list the top 20 institutions according to the five criteria 27 institutions had to be included.

#### TABLE 14

The first three institutions according to the different criteria are the University of Glasgow, the University of Illinois, the Free University of Amsterdam and the University of Wales.

Authors from 761 institutions published regional articles, and authors from 844 institutions published urban articles. 488 published at least one article in both fields of research. The rankings in terms of regional and urban production are shown in tables 15 and 16.

#### TABLES 15 AND 16.

The first three positions in the regional rankings were occupied by the University of Cambridge, the Free University of Amsterdam, the University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, the University of Glasgow and the West Virginia University.

The first three positions in the urban rankings were occupied by the University of Glasgow, the University of Illinois, the University of Connecticut, the University of British Columbia, the London School of Economic and Political Science and the University of Wales.

Fourteen institutions were included in both rankings during the period 1991-2000.

Splitting the total sample into subperiods, members of 677 institutions published articles in the set of journals from 1991 to 1995 and 818 institutions were represented between 1996 to 2000. 378 institutions appeared in both databases. The rankings by subperiods are shown in tables 17 and 18.

## TABLES 17 AND 18

In the first subperiod, to list the top 20 institutions according to the three criteria 29 institutions had to be included, while in the second subperiod it was necessary to include 30. During the first subperiod, the first three positions were held in the different rankings by the University of Glasgow, the University of Illinois, The University of Newcastle Upon Tyne and the University of British Columbia. In the second, these positions were held by the University of Illinois, the University of Glasgow, the Free University of Amsterdam, the University of Wales and the National University of Singapore. Fourteen institutions appear in the first 20 positions in the ranking for both subperiods.

Looking at the regional rankings by subperiods, members of 456 institutions published articles in the set of journals from 1991 to 1995 and 530 institutions were represented from 1996 to 2000. 225 institutions published in both subperiods. The rankings are shown in tables 19 and 20.

## TABLES 19 AND 20

In the first subperiod, to include the top 20 institutions according to the three criteria 29 institutions had to be listed, while in the second this figure is 30. The first three institutions in the ranking for 1991-1995 according to the different criteria were the the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, the University of Glasgow, the University of Texas, the University of Cambridge and the West Virginia University, and in the second period, the University of Cambridge, the Free University of Amsterdam, the University of Groningen, the University of Glasgow and the University of Wales. Thirteen institutions appeared in the first 20 positions in the ranking in both subperiods.



Lastly, regarding urban rankings by subperiods, 491 institutions were represented in the journals from 1991 to 1995 and 613 from 1996 to 2000. 260 institutions published in both subperiods. The rankings are shown in tables 21 and 22.

## TABLES 21 AND 22

To include the top 20 institutions according to the three criteria in both subperiods, 28 institutions had to be listed. The first three institutions in the ranking for 1991-1995 were the University of Glasgow, the University of Illinois and the University of British Columbia. For the second period, these positions were held by the University of of Illinois, the University of Glasgow, the National University of Singapore and the University of Glasgow. Fourteen institutions appeared in the first 20 positions in the ranking for the first subperiod and also for the second.

Comparing regional and urban rankings by subperiods, eight institutions appeared simultaneously in the first 20 positions in both rankings for 1991-1995 and eleven for 1996-2000.

As regards the positions occupied by universities in each subperiod, the universities that rose most places in the regional ranking were the University of Hong Kong, Universidad de Barcelona and the Universidad de Zaragoza. Neither of these institutions appeared in the first subperiod ranking but in the second subperiod, Hong Kong came 29th, Barcelona 38th and Zaragoza 44th in terms of standardized pages. Another climber was the University of Houston, in USA, which rose 301 positions from one subperiod to the other.

As regards the urban article rankings, in the second subperiod South Bank University was in 15th place and Cardiff University was in 17th place. The Cleveland State University climbed 375 positions from one subperiod to the other.

### **3.4. Relative performance of US versus European authors. Country rankings in regional and urban science**

In this section, we establish rankings by country in regional and urban science, following an approach similar to the one in the previous sections (i.e., the country of the institution indicated in the article). We should make it clear at this point that the analysis in this section (and also in the next) will only focus on articles by three or fewer authors. As the analysis of countries relies on the information about the author's affiliation, and taking into account that in articles by more than three authors only information about the first one is provided, we excluded these articles from the analysis.

Table 23 shows the number of standardized pages (and the percentage of the total number of standardized pages) by country<sup>20</sup>.

TABLE 23

The results show that for the full dataset, including regional and urban articles, the United States was the major contributor with 39% of the total published pages during 1991-2000. Second came the United Kingdom with 26% and third Continental Europe with 19%. When considering the two subperiods, the relative importance of the United States fell (43% for 1991-1995 and only 36% for 1996-2000) and the presence of the United Kingdom and Continental Europe increased (from 25% to 28% and from 16% to 20% respectively). Inside Continental Europe, the countries with the largest number of publications were the Netherlands (3,8%), Germany (2.83%), France (2.00%) and Israel (1.49%):

---

<sup>20</sup> Only standardized pages results are presented as the results using citation adjusted or impact adjusted standardized pages are quite similar. These results are available from the authors on request.

these four countries accounted for 50% of the total Continental European production.

Considering only regional articles, the results were similar though the position of the United States was less predominant. The analysis by subperiods shows that the USA and the United Kingdom lost importance towards the end of the analysis; their contribution fell, while that of Continental Europe increased substantially in terms of standardized pages published. Inside Continental Europe, one notable difference was that Spain has taken up a place alongside the Netherlands, Germany and France. The contribution by Spanish researchers increased substantially throughout the decade: from 0.71% in 1991-1995 to 3.19% in 1996-2000. This result is similar to that found by Bergantiños et al. (2000) for general economics research<sup>21</sup> and by Kalaitzidakis et al. (2001) who underline the improvements of research in economics in Spain and Netherlands over the last decade and, also, the European relevance of UK in terms of the number of institutions placed in the top positions.

As far as urban articles are concerned, the United States again came first (43%), followed by the United Kingdom (24%) and then by Continental Europe (15%). In relative terms, Continental Europe lost ground compared with the previous analysis. The United States also contributed proportionally less than at the beginning of the decade, while the contribution of the United Kingdom increased substantially, from 19% to 28%. Inside Continental Europe, the first four positions were for Netherlands, Germany, France and Israel.

### **3.5. Is there a home publication bias in regional and urban science?**

Elliot et al. (1998) analysed the national composition of contributors in four US and four European economic journals between 1970 and 1990. The study

---

<sup>21</sup> However, it is important to note that this increase is higher in regional research.

found that US economists publish more extensively in the leading European journals than do European economists in the leading US journals.

In this section, we analyse whether similar results are found in regional and urban science research. Table 24 shows the results of considering the relation between the country of the institutions named in articles and the country in which the journal is published (see table 3 for the equivalences) in terms of standardized pages<sup>22</sup>.

#### TABLES 24, 25 and 26

Looking at table 24 where the full dataset is considered, a first result to highlight is that the 75%<sup>23</sup> of the standardized pages published in the USA were by authors from that country. This figure is around 39% in the United Kingdom and only 27% in Continental Europe.

There were a number of important changes during the decade: in 1991-1995, 82% of American published standardized pages were published by American authors, while in 1996-2000, this proportion had fallen to 70%. In British journals, British authors published 37% in 1991-1995 and 40% in 1996-2000. In European journals, European published 22% in 1991-1995 and only 20% in 1996-2000. These results were similar when we analysed regional and urban articles separately.

So these results show that American authors find it easier to publish in British journals (accounting for 26% of standardized pages throughout the decade) and in European journals (48% of standardized pages) than do British or European authors in American journals (3% and 9% respectively). The situation,

---

<sup>22</sup> Only standardized pages results are presented as the results using citation adjusted or impact adjusted standardized pages are quite similar. These results are available from the authors on request.

<sup>23</sup> The percentages in the text have been calculated without taking into account the “et-al” field.

however, is changing and non-American authors are starting to publish in increasing quantities in American journals.

To explain the first result (the predominance of the USA), four possible reasons can be put forward according to de la Dehesa (2001):

- The North-American market is more integrated and far more competitive than the European one
- English is the language of Economics
- Ph.D. programmes are more modern and advanced in US universities
- US universities have more funds to attract the best students and PhDs.

Bearing in mind the second result (the increasing role of non-American research), and following a line of reasoning similar to that of de la Dehesa (2001), it seems that the situation is changing because several universities and research centres in Europe have adopted North American practices. The scope of research is also broadening towards different economic topics where European researches have a higher specialisation: in this case, regional and urban science.

#### **4. FINAL REMARKS**

In this paper, we have identified the most productive authors, institutions and countries in regional and urban science from 1991 to 2000 using information on articles published (and pages) from a sample of widely recognized journals in this field, formed by ARS, JUS, JRS, IJURR, IRSR, PRS, RSUE, RS and US. The application of bibliometric techniques has also enabled us to analyse publication patterns in American, British and European journals.

Between our two subperiods, the number of authors who published urban articles rose significantly, by 24.93%. In regional research, the number also increased, though by only 5.49%. For regional research, the increase in terms of

the number of standardized pages – 13.72% - was five times greater than in terms of authors. For urban articles, this increase was almost double - 38.45%. The increase between subperiods in the number of institutions named in published urban articles was 24.85%, while this figure was 16.23% for regional articles. For regional and urban articles, 13% of authors and 30% of institutions that published in the nineties appeared in the database in both subperiods. These percentages show a greater variation in authors than in institutions over the decade.

The most important universities in terms of regional publications during the decade were: the University of Cambridge (with four outstanding authors among the first 20, who contributed more than 60% of its total “regional” production: McCann, Fingleton, Keeble and Martin), the Free University of Amsterdam (with two authors among the first 20, who contributed more than 55% of its total regional production: Nijkamp and Rietveld), the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, the University of Glasgow (with three authors among the first 20, who contributed more than 55% of its total number of regional articles: Parr, Turok and Hart) and the West Virginia University.

The most important universities in terms of urban publications during the decade were: the University of Glasgow, the University of Illinois (where, Brueckner and McDonald contributed a third of its urban articles), the University of Connecticut, the University of British Columbia, the London School of Economics and Political Science and the University of Wales.

Nijkamp was the author with the highest regional article production during the nineties. He contributed more than a third of the total regional production in the Free University of Amsterdam. Braid had the highest production of urban articles and he contributed to the 70% of the urban articles produced by the Wayne State University.

In terms of countries, the major contributor to regional and urban research was the United States with 39% of total published pages during the 1991-2000

period. The second was the United Kingdom with 26% followed by Continental Europe with 19%. When considering the two subperiods, the relative importance of the United States decreased, while the presence of the United Kingdom and Continental Europe has increased. Comparing subperiods, there were some significant changes during the decade. Among them, one of the most notable is the case of Spain: the contribution by Spanish researchers to regional research increased substantially, from 0.71% of total regional production in 1991-1995 to 3.19% in 1996-2000.

Lastly, regarding the relationships between the country of the author and the country where the journal is edited, the results show that American authors find it easier to publish in British journals and in European journals than British or European authors in American journals. The situation, however, is changing, and non-American authors are starting to publish in increasing quantities in American journals.

## 5. REFERENCES

- Aiginger, Karl, Dennis C. Mueller, and Christoph Weiss. 1998. "Objectives, Topics and Methods in Industrial Organization during the Nineties: Results from a Survey," *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 16, 799-830.
- Allen, Marcus T, and James B. Kau. 1991. "Contributing Authors and Institutions to the Journal of Urban Economics: 1974-1989," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 30, 373-384.
- Anselin, L. 1995. "Editorial," *Papers in Regional Science*, 74, 295-296.
- Anselin, L., S. Rey, and E. Talen. 2000. "The Expanded and Revised IRSR Subject and Author Index," *International Regional Science Review*, 23, 345-349.
- Axhausen, K. W. 2000. "Geographics of Somewhere: a Review of Urban Literature," *Urban Studies*, 10, 1849-1864.
- Bailly, A. and W. Coffey. 1994. "Regional Science in Crisis: A Plea for a More Open and Relevant Approach," *Papers in Regional Science*, 73, 3-14.
- Bairam, E. I. 1994. "Institutional Affiliation of Contributors to Top Economic Journals 1985-1990," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 32, 674-679.
- Baltagi, B. 1998. "Worldwide Institutional Rankings in Econometrics: 1989-1995," *Econometric Theory*, 14, 1-43.
- Baltagi, B. 1999. "Applied Econometrics Rankings 1989-1995," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 14, 423-441.
- Bauwens L., A. Kirman, M. Lubrano, and C. Protopopescu. 2002. "Ranking European Economic Departments: A Statistical Approach," CORE (available at <http://www.core.ucl.ac.be/econometrics/Bauwens/Rankings/EuropeanRanking.pdf>).
- Beckmann, Martin J. 1994. "On Knowledge Networks in Science: Collaboration Among Equals," *Annals of Regional Science*, 28, 233-42.
- Beed, C, and C. Beed. 1996. "Measuring the Quality of Academic Journals the Case of Economics," *Journal of Post-keynesian economics*, 18, 369-396.
- Bergantiños, G., J. M. Da Rocha, and P. Polome. 2000. "La Investigación Española en Economía 1995-1999," mimeo (available at [www.fedea.es](http://www.fedea.es)).
- Cahlik, T. 2000. "Search for Fundamental Articles in Economics," *Scientometrics*, 49, 389-402.



Cerviño, J., Cruz, I. and Gómez, M. (2001), "Valoración y preferencia de las revistas académicas en el área de marketing: Una aplicación del análisis conjunto", *ICE. Revista de Economía*, vol. 795, pp. 155-178.

Collins, J. T, Pos. G. Cox, and V. Stango. 2000. "The Publishing Patterns of Recent Economics Ph. D. Recipients," *Economic Inquiry*, pp. 358-367.

Combes, P. and Linnemer, L. (1999), "La publication d'articles de recherche en économie en France, une approche par la qualité des revues", *Document de Travail CERAS*, 99-13.

Combes, P. and Linnemer, L. (2000), "La publication d'articles de recherche en économie en France, une approche par les citations", *Document de Travail CERAS*, 00-04.

Conroy, M. and R. Dusansky. 1995. "The Productivity of Economics Departments in the U. S.: Publications in Core Journals," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 33, 1966-1971.

Cox, Raymond A. K. and Kee H. Chung. 1991. "Patterns of Research Output and Author Concentration in the Economics Literature," *Review of Economics & Statistics*, 73, 740-47.

Coupé, T. 2000. "Revealed Performances. Worldwide Rankings of Economists and Economic Departments," Université Libre de Bruxelles, *mimeo*.

Cribari-Neto, F., M. J. Jensen, and A. A. Novo. 1999. "Research in Econometric Theory: Quantitative and Qualitative Productivity Rankings," *Econometric Theory*, 15, 719-752.

de la Dehesa, R. 2001. "Enhancing Economic Research in Europe and Spain," *mimeo* (available at [www.obce.org](http://www.obce.org)).

Dirkmaat, Joop. 2001. "Some Publishing Facts, Figures, and Observations on the Occasion of Volume 100, Number 1 of the Journal of Econometrics," *Journal of Econometrics*, 100, 99-112.

Durden, Garey C. and Hugh W. Knox. 2000. "The Southern Regional Science Association and The Review of Regional Studies: History and Characteristics," *Review of Regional Studies*, 30, 93-114.

Dusansky, R. and C. J. Vernon. 1998. "Rankings of US Economics Departments," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12, 157-170.

Elliot, C., D. Greenaway, and D. Sapsford. 1998. "Who's Publishing Who? The National Composition of Contributors to Some Core US and European Journals," *European Economic Review*, 42, 201-206.

Engers, M., J. S. Gans, S. Grant, and S. P. King. 1999. "First Authors Conditions," *Journal of Political Economy*, 107, 859-883.

Extejt, M. and Smith, J. (1990), "The Behavioral Sciences and Management: An evaluation of relevant journals", *Journal of Management*, vol. 16, pp. 539-551.

- Figlio, D. 1994. "Trends in the Publication of Empirical Economics," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8, 179-187.
- Florax, R. 1999. "Editorial Policy," Paper presented at the North American Regional Science Council Meeting, Montreal, CA.
- Fusteld, D. R.. 1956. "The Program of American Economic Association Meetings," *American Economic Review*, 46, 642-644.
- Glanzel, W. 2001."National Characteristics in International Scientific Co-authorship Relations," *Scientometrics*, 51, 69-115.
- Graves, P. E., J. R. Marchand, and R. Thompson. 1982. "Economics Departmental Rankings: Research Incentives, Constraints and Efficiency," *American Economic Review*, 72, 1131-1141.
- Hall, A. D. 1987. "Worldwide Rankings of Research Activity in Econometrics: 1980-1985," *Econometric Theory*, 3, 171-194.
- Hall, A. D. 1990. "Worldwide Rankings of Research Activity in Econometrics: An Update 1980-1988," *Econometric Theory*, 6, 1-16.
- Hawkings, R. G., Ritter, L. S. and Walter, I. (1973), "What Economists Think of Their Journals", *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 81, pp. 1017-1032.
- Heck, Jean L. 1993. "Eight Decades of Contributing Authors and Institutions to the American Economic Review," *Journal of Economic Education*, 24, 163-170.
- Heck, Jean L. and Peter A. Zaleski. 1991. "Trends in Economic-Journal Literature: 1969-89," *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 19, 27-32.
- Hoesli, Martin, and Bryan D. MacGregor. 1997. "European Real Estate Research and Education: Development, Globalization, and Maturity," *Journal of Real Estate Finance & Economics*, 15, 5-9.
- Isard, Walter. 1999. "Regional Science: Parallels From Physics and Chemistry," *Papers in Regional Science*, 78, 5-20.
- Isserman, A. M. 1995. "The History, Status, and Future of Regional Science: An American Perspective," *International Regional Science Review*, 17, 249-96.
- Kalaitzidakis, P., T. P. Mamunaeas, and T. Stengos. 1999. "European Economics: An Analysis Based On Publications in the Core Journals," *European Economic Review*, 43, 1150-1168.
- Kalaitzidakis, P., T. P. Mamunaeas, and T. Stengos. 2001. "Rankings of Academic Journals and Institutions in Economics," Department of Economics University of CYPRUS, Discussion Paper 2001-10, (available at <http://www.le.ac.uk/economics/research/rankings/earank.pdf>)

- Kau, J. B. and L. L. Johnson. 1983. "Regional Science Programs: A Ranking Based on Publication Performance," *Journal of Regional Science*, 23, 177-186.
- Kirman, A. and M. Dahl. 1994. "Economic Research in Europe," *European Economic Review*, 38, 505-522.
- Laband, D. N. and M. J. Piette. 1994. "The Relative Impacts of Economics Journals: 1970-1990," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 32, 640-666.
- Lubrano, M. 2001. "Ranking Economic Departments in Belgium, France and Spain: partial results from a more general report", mimeo (available at <http://durandal.cnrs-mrs.fr /PP /lubrano /rankings /ranking.htm>)
- Mathiessen, C. W. and A. W. Schwarz. 1999. "Scientific Centres in Europe: An Analysis of Research Strength and Patterns of Specialisation Based on Bibliometric Indicators," *Urban Studies*, 36, 453-477.
- Meyer, Dirk. 1999. "Publishing Articles- Findings and Open Questions of an Empirical Study Conducted Among Editors of Economic Journals," *Zeitschrift fur Wirtschafts und Sozialwissenschaften*, 119, 531-59.
- Meyer, Dirk. 2000. "On the Information and Selection Function of Economics Articles- Claims and Reality," *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 23, 49-75.
- O'Kelly, M. E. 1999. "Introduction to the Thirtieth Anniversary Special Issue," *Geographical Analysis*, 31, 311-317.
- Rey, S. J. and L. Anselin. 2000. "Regional Science Publication Patterns in the 1990s," *International Regional Science Review*, 23, 323-344.
- Román Román, A. and E. Giménez Toledo. 2000. "Las Revistas Españolas de Economía: Una Propuesta de Evaluación Científica," *Información Comercial Española. Revista de Economía*, 783, 133-162.
- Rupp, N. G. and C. N. McKinney. 2000. "The Publication Patterns of the Elite Economics Departments: 1995-2000," mimeo (available at [www.ecu.edu/econ/wp/01/ecu0112.pdf](http://www.ecu.edu/econ/wp/01/ecu0112.pdf)).
- Salancik, G. R. (1986), "An Index Of Subgroup Influence In Dependency Networks", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 31, pp. 194-211.
- Sauer, R. D. 1988. "Estimates of the Returns to Quality and Coauthorship in Economic Academia," *Journal of Political Economy*, 96, 855-866.
- Scott, L. C. and P. M. Mitias. 1996. "Trends in Rankings of Economics Departments in the US: An Update," *Economic Inquiry*, 34, 378-400.
- Stigler, G. J., S. M. Stigler, and C. Friedland. 1995. "The Journals of Economics," *Journal of Political Economy*, 103, 331-359.

Stratham, J. G. 1992. "Analysis of Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Research in the Journal of Regional Science," *Journal of Regional Science*, 32, 501-509.

Taylor, Jim, and Jill Johnes. 1992. "The Citation Record of Regional Studies and Related Journals, 1980-89," *Regional Studies*, 26, 93-97.

Urrutia, J. 1993. "La Investigación Española en Economía," *Política Científica*, 36, 41-47.

van Damme, Eric. 1996. "Measuring Quality of academic journals and scientific productivity of researchers", Unpublished mimeo, Cen Ter, Tilburg University.

Whitfield, Keith, and George Strauss. 2000. "Methods Matter: Changes in Industrial Relations Research and Their Implications," *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 38, 141-51.

## **6. APPENDIX**

TABLE A1.

## TABLES

**TABLE 1. Top international regional and urban journals included in the analysis**

Annals of Regional Science (ARS)	Papers in Regional Science (PRS)
International Journal of Urban and Regional Research (IJURR)	Regional Studies (RS)
Int. Regional Science Review (IRSR)	Regional Science and Urban Economics (RSUE)
Journal of Regional Science (JRS)	Urban Studies (US)
Journal of Urban Economics (JUE)	

**TABLE 2. Weights approximating quality differences among journals**

Journals	Citations received during 2000	Average "impact index" 1991-2000
Annals-of-Regional-Science (ARS)	0.43	0.69
International-Journal-of-Urban-and-Regional-Research (IJURR)	1.01	2.09
International-Regional-Science-Review (IRSR)	0.73	1.00
Journal-of-Regional-Science (JRS)	1.19	0.92
Journal-of-Urban-Economics (JUE)	1.59	1.43
Papers-in-Regional-Science (PRS)	0.73	0.49
Regional-Science-and-Urban-Economics (RSUE)	1.00	1.00
Regional-Studies (RS)	0.91	1.82
Urban-Studies (US)	0.85	1.62

Source: Own elaboration from SSCI data.

**TABLE 3. Country where the journals are published**

Journal	Country of publication
ARS PRS RSUE	CONTINENTAL EUROPE
JRS RS IJURR US	UK
IRSR JUE	USA

**TABLE 4. Description of the sample of articles that consider territory (articles, pages and standardized pages)**

<b>Articles</b>									
<b>Journal</b>	<b>1991-2000</b>			<b>1991-1995</b>			<b>1996-2000</b>		
	<b>Regional</b>	<b>Reg &amp; Urb</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Regional</b>	<b>Reg &amp; Urb</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Regional</b>	<b>Reg &amp; Urb</b>	<b>Urban</b>
ARS	175	42	31	65	29	14	110	13	17
IJURR	86	31	195	42	17	88	44	14	107
IRSR	120	12	30	71	5	18	49	7	12
JRS	120	48	120	61	28	49	59	20	71
JUE	41	21	376	10	9	198	31	12	178
PRS	125	36	67	64	22	35	61	14	32
RSUE	85	32	231	46	21	120	39	11	111
RS	348	29	43	147	16	21	201	13	22
US	163	95	656	99	46	242	64	49	414
<b>TOTAL</b>	1263	346	1749	605	193	785	658	153	964

  

<b>Pages</b>									
<b>Journal</b>	<b>1991-2000</b>			<b>1991-1995</b>			<b>1996-2000</b>		
	<b>Regional</b>	<b>Reg &amp; Urb</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Regional</b>	<b>Reg &amp; Urb</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Regional</b>	<b>Reg &amp; Urb</b>	<b>Urban</b>
ARS	3104	694	509	1036	486	212	2068	208	297
IJURR	1567	583	3350	740	282	1512	827	301	1838
IRSR	1999	210	450	1017	92	245	982	118	205
JRS	2376	877	2210	1089	463	798	1287	414	1412
JUE	782	455	7337	178	180	3510	604	275	3827
PRS	2277	635	1284	1095	368	613	1182	267	671
RSUE	1737	600	4748	868	385	2311	869	215	2437
RS	4441	419	596	1923	234	296	2518	185	300
US	2889	1655	11658	1721	776	3970	1168	879	7688
<b>TOTAL</b>	21172	6128	32142	9667	3266	13467	11505	2862	18675

  

<b>Std pages</b>									
<b>Journal</b>	<b>1991-2000</b>			<b>1991-1995</b>			<b>1996-2000</b>		
	<b>Regional</b>	<b>Reg &amp; Urb</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Regional</b>	<b>Reg &amp; Urb</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Regional</b>	<b>Reg &amp; Urb</b>	<b>Urban</b>
ARS	2294.83	513.13	376.52	761.32	361.57	155.39	1533.51	151.56	221.13
IJURR	1519.99	565.51	3249.50	717.80	273.54	1466.64	802.19	291.97	1782.86
IRSR	1313.60	138.66	293.53	640.71	57.96	154.35	672.89	80.70	139.18
JRS	1795.98	663.82	1671.83	827.64	351.88	606.48	968.34	311.94	1065.35
JUE	500.48	291.20	4695.68	113.92	115.20	2246.40	386.56	176.00	2449.28
PRS	1715.41	478.01	968.04	821.25	276.00	459.75	894.16	202.01	508.29
RSUE	1146.42	396.00	3133.68	572.88	254.10	1525.26	573.54	141.90	1608.42
RS	5669.12	535.00	761.56	2461.44	299.52	378.88	3207.68	235.48	382.68
US	2657.88	1522.60	10725.36	1583.32	713.92	3652.40	1074.56	808.68	7072.96
<b>TOTAL</b>	18613.71	5103.93	25875.70	8500.28	2703.69	10645.55	10113.43	2400.24	15230.15

**TABLE 5. Ranking of authors who published regional or urban articles (1991-2000)**

Full data set 1991-2000		Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
Author	Affiliation	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
Henderson,-J.-Vernon	Brown University	1	12.50	1	262.50	2	170.85	2	215.41	3	204.54
Nijkamp,-Peter	Free University of Amsterdam	2	12.33	3	239.33	1	182.83	6	141.33	6	187.61
Braid,-Ralph-M.	Wayne State University	3	11.50	2	240.00	3	163.50	1	219.36	5	191.79
McMillen,-Daniel-P.	Santa Clara University	4	11.33	4	210.50	7	142.15	3	201.22	9	181.64
Evans,-Alan-W.	University Reading	5	10.50	16	129.50	9	116.72	18	103.03	7	182.72
Turnbull,-Geoffrey-K.	Los Angeles State University	6	9.83	8	163.33	12	108.34	5	146.86	17	132.32
Parr,-John-B.	University of Glasgow	7	9.50	6	177.00	5	156.08	8	136.84	4	200.76
Alperovich,-Gershon	Bar Ilan University	8	8.50	35	97.50	35	77.25	43	75.44	59	97.44
Voith,-Richard	FRB of Philadelphia	9	8.33	13	147.67	18	102.08	7	139.50	24	124.12
Rietveld,-Piet	Free University of Amsterdam	10	8.25	15	131.08	21	96.75	26	95.30	32	116.13
Congdon,-Peter	Queen Mary College	11	7.33	10	161.00	4	156.09	9	132.94	2	241.73
Sasaki,-Komei	Tohoku University	12	7.17	21	122.83	28	85.59	46	74.65	96	81.23
Wu,-Fulong	George Manson University	13	7.00	7	166.50	6	150.78	10	127.49	1	246.60
Fujita,-Masahisa	Kyoto University	14	7.00	5	181.50	8	122.72	12	121.05	23	124.80
Pasha,-Hafiz-A.	University Karachi	15	7.00	52	83.00	56	63.90	44	75.35	58	98.03
Arnott,-Richard-J.	Boston College	16	6.92	12	154.17	15	105.51	11	126.34	20	129.03
Brueckner,-Jan-K.	University Illinois	17	6.50	18	129.50	26	86.97	16	106.19	51	99.49
Hoyt,-William-H.	Georgetown University	18	6.50	24	120.50	33	78.50	21	97.91	69	92.55
Yinger,-John	Syracuse University	19	6.33	9	161.83	16	103.88	4	159.04	15	143.79
Hansen,-Niles	University of Texas	20	6.33	61	77.33	92	54.78	179	40.84	276	48.96
Ihlanfeldt,-Keith-Pos..	Georgia State University	22	6.17	14	133.00	22	91.91	14	117.98	33	113.78
Harris,-Richard-I.-D.	University Portsmouth	23	6.00	42	93.00	17	102.80	25	95.50	12	171.96
Abdel-Rahman,-Hesham-M.	University New Orleans	24	6.00	17	129.50	25	87.76	19	102.91	67	93.48
Anas,-Alex	State University of NY at Buffalo	28	5.67	22	122.00	27	86.22	17	105.64	41	106.97
Turok,-Ivan	University of Glasgow	29	5.50	32	102.00	14	106.61	29	93.25	8	181.90
Strange,-William-C.	Bowdoin College	30	5.50	20	124.00	31	80.04	15	113.97	47	104.59
Ross,-Stephen-L.	Syracuse University	31	5.33	19	128.33	23	90.14	13	118.50	19	129.12
Skaburskis,-Andrejs	Queen's University Kingston	36	5.00	23	121.50	10	111.78	27	94.97	10	181.18
Wheaton,-William-C.	MIT	39	5.00	36	97.50	61	62.40	20	99.15	75	88.99
Gilbert,-Alan	Michigan State University	43	4.83	25	117.67	11	108.54	31	93.11	11	178.49
Isserman,-Andrew-M.	West Virginia University	48	4.50	11	155.50	13	106.81	35	83.56	25	123.49
O-hUallachain,-Breandan	Arizona State University	49	4.50	26	117.50	20	98.69	28	94.82	45	105.35
Pugh,-Cedric	Sheffield Hallam University	57	4.00	28	110.00	19	101.65	34	87.78	13	168.84
Jensen-Butler,-Chris	University Aarhus	58	4.00	44	91.00	24	89.46	39	78.06	14	145.50
Bennett,-Robert-J.	LSE	82	3.67	128	60.00	40	72.32	58	64.98	18	129.26
Clark,-Gordon-L.	Monash University	84	3.50	103	64.50	32	79.14	50	71.30	16	142.10



**TABLE 6. Ranking of authors who published regional articles (1991-2000)**

Regional 1991-2000		Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
Author	Affiliation	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
Nijkamp,-Peter	Free University of Amsterdam	1	9.83	1	186.00	1	141.70	2	92.97	3	124.47
Parr,-John-B.	University of Glasgow	2	6.50	3	123.50	2	112.16	1	100.51	1	154.61
McCann,-Philip	University Cambridge	3	5.50	42	55.00	26	52.24	24	48.69	26	79.20
Hansen,-Niles	University of Texas	4	5.33	16	70.33	34	50.37	55	37.63	104	44.54
Anselin,-Luc	University Illinois	5	5.25	5	93.17	11	64.62	9	59.86	47	63.43
Harris,-Richard-I.-D.	University Portsmouth	6	5.00	13	71.00	4	82.56	3	78.30	2	139.15
Fingleton,-Bernard	University Cambridge	7	5.00	6	91.00	6	71.15	6	60.97	30	75.88
Rickman,-Dan-S.	Southern Georgia University	8	4.83	4	107.17	5	77.06	4	69.52	24	80.94
Roy,-John-Pos..	CSIRO	9	4.83	8	80.50	18	59.01	92	30.33	158	37.30
Rietveld,-Piet	Free University of Amsterdam	10	4.58	18	67.75	28	52.14	37	41.13	75	53.02
Markusen,-Ann-Pos..	Rutgers University	11	4.33	9	78.83	24	54.01	44	40.52	57	59.67
Button,-Kenneth-J.	George Mason University	12	4.00	36	59.00	23	54.36	52	37.93	35	71.12
Zhang,-Wei-Bin	Institute for Futures Studies	13	4.00	21	65.00	40	47.93	153	24.30	270	30.53
Batabyal,-Amitrajeet-A.	Utah State University	14	4.00	33	60.00	54	44.86	93	30.32	217	34.22
Rey,-Sergio-J.	San Diego State University	15	3.83	7	81.17	15	61.75	29	46.53	55	60.43
Jackson,-Randall-W.	Ohio State University	16	3.83	56	49.83	82	36.22	119	27.92	385	25.45
Thisse,-Jacques-Francois	Universite Catholique de Louvain	17	3.67	32	60.33	62	42.15	23	49.25	103	44.55
Keeble,-David	University Cambridge	18	3.58	41	55.83	9	67.33	7	60.48	4	120.27
O'Farrell,-P.-N.	Heriot-Watt University	19	3.50	35	59.33	8	67.49	8	59.98	6	118.40
Fischer,-Manfred-M.	Vienna Univ. Econ & BA	20	3.50	27	63.67	21	56.28	32	44.96	52	61.52
Brocker,-Johannes	University Technology, Dresden	21	3.50	10	77.00	22	55.71	133	26.13	166	36.93
Turok,-Ivan	University of Glasgow	22	3.50	67	47.00	27	52.21	30	46.20	16	90.91
Griffith,-Daniel-A.	Syracuse University	24	3.50	15	70.50	30	51.31	36	41.46	224	32.75
Duffy,-Deno,-Kevin-T.	Dept of Natural Resources, Utah	25	3.50	20	65.50	32	50.80	12	58.48	65	56.98
Kelejian,-Harry-H.	University of Maryland	26	3.50	14	71.00	33	50.69	54	37.73	125	41.06
ten-Raa,-Thijs	Tilburg University	27	3.50	12	71.50	45	47.19	27	47.19	91	47.19
Dietzenbacher,-Erik	University Groningen	31	3.33	29	63.33	41	47.85	14	56.77	106	44.12
Bennett,-Robert-J.	LSE	32	3.17	62	48.00	17	61.28	16	55.60	7	111.36
Isserman,-Andrew-M.	Michigan State University	33	3.00	2	129.00	3	89.68	5	68.49	9	106.35
O-hUallachain,-Breandan	Arizona State University	34	3.00	11	76.50	7	69.57	15	55.90	34	73.02
Yiftachel,-Oren	Ben-Gurion University Negev	35	3.00	30	63.00	10	64.77	11	59.53	5	118.53
Jensen-Butler,-Chris	University Aarhus	36	3.00	24	64.00	12	64.62	13	56.95	11	105.24
Congdon,-Peter	Queen Mary College	37	3.00	31	62.00	13	63.52	17	55.30	8	107.48
Hart,-Tom	University of Glasgow	38	3.00	25	64.00	19	58.88	21	50.02	15	95.44
Green,-A.-E.	University Warwick	39	3.00	83	44.00	20	56.29	20	51.07	12	102.29
Martin,-Ron	University Cambridge	53	2.67	77	45.33	25	52.65	22	49.68	19	89.59
Suarez-Villa,-Luis	University of California, Irvine	54	2.50	19	67.00	14	62.19	19	52.09	17	90.84
Edgington,-David-W.	University of British Columbia	55	2.50	38	58.00	16	61.64	18	54.07	10	105.69
Smith,-Tony-E.	University Pennsylvania	56	2.50	17	68.50	31	51.21	10	59.71	90	47.66
Fan,-C.-Cindy	University of California, LA	57	2.50	63	48.00	37	49.64	34	43.66	20	87.33
Clark,-Gordon-L.	Monash University	90	2.00	106	39.00	35	49.92	31	45.29	18	90.72
Yeung,-Henry-Wai-chung	National University Singapore	91	2.00	78	45.00	36	49.85	26	47.78	14	97.16
Boyer,-Robert	CEPREMAP	291	1.00	59	49.00	43	47.53	25	48.11	13	99.26

**TABLE 7. Ranking of authors who published urban articles (1991-2000)**

Urban 1991-2000		Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
Author	Affiliation	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
Braid,-Ralph-M.	Wayne State University	1	11.50	1	240.00	1	163.50	1	219.36	3	191.79
McMillen,-Daniel-P.	Santa Clara University	2	11.33	3	210.50	4	142.15	2	201.22	4	181.64
Henderson,-J.-Vernon	Brown University	3	10.00	2	227.50	3	148.10	3	182.31	6	173.61
Turnbull,-Geoffrey-K.	Los Angeles State University	4	9.83	4	163.33	7	108.34	5	146.86	10	132.32
Evans,-Alan-W.	University Reading	5	8.50	21	102.50	11	93.32	25	80.84	8	149.57
Alperovich,-Gershon	Bar Ilan University	6	7.50	34	79.50	30	63.57	50	59.21	44	84.82
Congdon,-Peter	Queen Mary College	7	7.33	6	161.00	2	156.09	6	132.94	1	241.73
Voith,-Richard	FRB of Philadelphia	8	7.00	14	121.00	18	82.12	9	118.55	22	102.17
Arnott,-Richard-J.	Boston College	9	6.92	7	154.17	8	105.51	7	126.34	12	129.03
Brueckner,-Jan-K.	University Illinois	10	6.50	11	129.50	14	86.97	12	106.19	24	99.49
Hoyt,-William-H.	Georgetown University	11	6.50	15	120.50	20	78.50	16	97.91	35	92.55
Sasaki,-Komei	Tohoku University	12	6.50	18	111.50	22	77.43	32	71.11	59	75.62
Yinger,-John	George Mason University	13	6.33	5	161.83	9	103.88	4	159.04	9	143.79
Wu,-Fulong	University of Hong Kong	14	6.00	8	145.50	5	135.66	8	120.94	2	236.21
Abdel-Rahman,-Hesham-M.	University New Orleans	15	6.00	10	129.50	13	87.76	14	102.91	33	93.48
Pasha,-Hafiz-A.	University Karachi	16	6.00	44	74.00	42	55.62	36	68.31	45	84.61
Ihlanfeldt,-Keith-Pos..	Georgia State University	17	5.67	16	120.00	17	83.59	13	104.76	23	101.92
Parr,-John-B.	University of Glasgow	18	5.50	25	94.00	15	86.92	26	78.96	17	112.72
Strange,-William-C.	Bowdoin College	19	5.50	13	124.00	19	80.04	11	113.97	21	104.59
McDonald,-John-F.	University Illinois	20	5.50	22	101.00	24	70.69	21	88.45	37	91.83
Ross,-Stephen-L.	Syracuse University	22	5.33	12	128.33	12	90.14	10	118.50	11	129.12
Rosenthal,-Stuart-S.	Syracuse University	23	5.33	23	100.83	29	64.92	19	95.58	42	87.10
Anas,-Alex	State University of NY at Buffalo	24	5.17	19	111.00	23	76.10	17	97.04	39	90.57
Gilbert,-Alan	University College	25	4.83	17	117.67	6	108.54	20	93.11	5	178.49
Fujita,-Masahisa	Kyoto University	29	4.50	9	131.50	16	86.91	15	100.29	29	97.30
Graham,-Stephen	University Newcastle Upon Tyne	30	4.33	49	70.67	27	67.06	41	63.45	13	127.29
Skaburskis,-Andrejs	Queen's University Kingston	33	4.00	20	108.50	10	99.82	22	84.81	7	161.80
Sivitanidou,-Rena	University of Southern California	34	4.00	24	95.50	32	62.62	18	95.68	46	84.52
Scott,-Allen-J.	University of California, LA	35	4.00	69	60.00	33	60.81	52	57.69	15	116.29
Fujita,-Kuniko	Michigan State University	45	3.50	65	60.50	38	57.24	60	53.60	20	107.05
Bovaird,-Tony	University Aston	65	3.00	29	85.00	21	78.20	39	66.44	14	126.75
Drakakis-Smith,-David	University of Liverpool	66	3.00	43	75.00	26	69.00	51	58.62	18	111.84
Pugh,-Cedric	Sheffield Hallam University	92	2.50	40	76.00	25	69.92	48	59.40	16	113.33
Filion,-Pierre	University of Waterloo	129	2.33	74	56.33	46	54.13	61	53.25	19	108.59

**TABLE 8. Ranking of authors who published regional or urban articles (1991-1995)**

Full data set 1991-1995 Author	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
Henderson,-J.-Vernon	1	7.00	1	160.00	2	104.05	1	133.26	4	125.19
Evans,-Alan-W.	2	7.00	8	93.00	4	84.92	10	76.98	2	140.12
McMillen,-Daniel-P.	3	6.83	3	117.50	5	79.46	2	112.36	9	97.76
Alperovich,-Gershon	4	6.50	33	63.00	24	51.48	30	50.79	28	74.76
Braid,-Ralph-M.	5	6.00	4	117.00	6	79.04	3	111.61	10	97.27
Hansen,-Niles	6	6.00	18	73.00	28	49.23	72	35.81	149	38.88
Turnbull,-Geoffrey-K.	7	5.83	12	84.17	16	56.88	11	69.70	47	63.13
Pasha,-Hafiz-A.	8	5.50	29	64.00	27	49.78	21	57.67	25	76.64
Voith,-Richard	9	5.33	9	89.67	12	62.56	7	82.82	27	75.42
Congdon,-Peter	10	5.00	7	107.00	1	106.41	5	90.74	1	161.21
Parr,-John-B.	11	5.00	13	84.00	9	72.40	15	66.02	16	87.78
Yinger,-John	12	4.50	6	112.50	10	72.31	4	108.87	8	98.76
Nijkamp,-Peter	13	4.50	19	72.00	20	53.75	53	40.28	98	47.72
Hoyt,-William-H.	14	4.50	14	81.50	22	52.96	13	68.60	43	64.28
Miceli,-Thomas-J.	15	4.50	26	65.00	43	44.94	26	54.11	63	58.29
Fujita,-Masahisa	16	4.17	5	115.50	8	77.92	6	82.99	18	83.27
Lever,-William-F.	17	4.00	32	63.00	14	57.96	35	49.24	12	93.95
Strange,-William-C.	18	4.00	10	85.50	17	55.16	8	79.10	32	72.48
Badcock,-Blair-A.	19	4.00	52	51.00	32	47.87	42	43.67	17	86.21
Zhang,-Wei-Bin	20	4.00	34	63.00	42	45.17	158	24.81	223	33.93
Isserman,-Andrew-M.	24	3.50	2	143.50	3	99.25	9	78.06	5	115.92
Harris,-Richard-I.-D.	25	3.50	51	51.00	15	56.96	24	55.08	13	92.63
Anas,-Alex	26	3.50	20	71.00	23	51.84	17	61.02	53	61.82
Ihlanfeldt,-Keith-Pos..	27	3.33	27	64.67	48	43.14	19	60.72	61	59.55
Bovaird,-Tony	30	3.00	11	85.00	7	78.20	14	66.44	3	126.75
Gilbert,-Alan	31	3.00	17	75.00	11	69.00	20	58.62	6	111.84
Hart,-Tom	32	3.00	28	64.00	13	58.88	32	50.02	11	95.44
Viton,-Philip-A.	33	3.00	15	79.00	19	53.94	12	68.65	59	60.70
Wildasin,-David-E.	34	3.00	16	75.50	26	49.83	33	49.83	90	49.83
Jones,-Lawrence-D.	39	3.00	23	69.00	45	44.68	18	60.89	67	56.41
Wheaton,-William-C.	40	3.00	35	62.50	57	40.00	16	63.56	64	57.05
Healey,-Patsy	58	2.50	57	48.00	30	49.20	43	42.83	19	83.27
O'Farrell,-P.-N.	59	2.50	86	41.33	37	46.61	49	41.36	20	81.54
Frey,-William-H.	88	2.00	36	59.00	18	54.28	37	46.12	15	87.98
Chen,-Xiangming	89	2.00	41	56.00	21	52.97	34	49.58	7	99.01
Clark,-Gordon-L.	90	2.00	100	39.00	25	49.92	39	45.29	14	90.72

**TABLE 9. Ranking of authors who published regional or urban articles (1996-2000)**

Full data set 1996-2000 Author	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
Nijkamp,-Peter	1	7.83	1	167.33	2	129.09	3	101.04	3	139.89
Wu,-Fulong	2	7.00	2	166.50	1	150.78	1	127.49	1	246.60
Arnott,-Richard-J.	3	5.58	3	123.50	4	85.67	4	98.96	9	103.74
Braid,-Ralph-M.	4	5.50	4	123.00	5	84.46	2	107.75	13	94.52
Henderson,-J.-Vernon	5	5.50	5	102.50	10	66.80	7	82.14	26	79.36
Brueckner,-Jan-K.	6	5.00	6	102.00	8	69.22	8	80.90	30	76.29
Parr,-John-B.	7	4.50	8	93.00	6	83.68	13	70.82	6	112.98
McMillen,-Daniel-P.	8	4.50	9	93.00	13	62.69	6	88.86	20	83.87
Rietveld,-Piet	9	4.42	17	78.58	18	58.27	16	63.75	37	70.93
Sasaki,-Komei	10	4.33	14	82.83	20	56.03	26	55.92	76	57.13
Gordon,-Ian-Pos..	11	4.00	21	72.00	11	66.77	28	54.72	8	105.22
Kahn,-Matthew-E.	12	4.00	18	78.50	23	52.49	15	65.87	71	59.38
Turnbull,-Geoffrey-K.	13	4.00	16	79.17	26	51.46	11	77.16	40	69.19
Batabyal,-Amitrajeet-A.	14	4.00	33	60.00	47	44.86	131	30.32	274	34.22
Rey,-Sergio-J.	15	3.83	15	81.17	14	61.75	46	46.53	67	60.43
Ross,-Stephen-L.	16	3.83	10	92.83	15	61.51	5	92.64	18	89.07
Skaburskis,-Andrejs	17	3.50	7	101.00	3	92.92	9	78.94	2	150.61
Turok,-Ivan	18	3.50	28	63.00	12	64.61	23	56.31	7	109.55
Capello,-Roberta	19	3.50	30	61.50	16	61.20	35	49.84	12	96.03
Glaeser,-Edward-L.	20	3.50	13	83.50	21	53.84	10	77.78	35	71.16
Graham,-Stephen	25	3.33	54	53.67	28	50.57	45	46.75	15	92.86
Pugh,-Cedric	29	3.00	11	85.00	7	78.65	14	68.24	4	131.56
O-hUallachain,-Breandan	30	3.00	12	84.50	9	67.33	19	58.95	96	52.62
Verhoef,-Erik-T.	38	2.92	19	77.25	22	53.53	29	54.10	122	47.61
Raphael,-Steven	39	2.83	20	73.00	32	48.76	12	72.28	59	63.03
Bennett,-Robert-J.	40	2.83	92	43.33	27	50.99	49	45.62	16	90.49
Ihlanfeldt,-Keith-Pos..	41	2.83	23	68.33	31	48.78	20	57.26	89	54.23
Guy,-Simon	42	2.83	62	51.67	34	48.48	54	44.19	19	87.20
Yeung,-Henry-Wai-chung	45	2.50	43	56.00	17	59.97	22	56.37	5	113.57
Jensen-Butler,-Chris	46	2.50	39	57.00	19	57.68	37	49.48	17	89.45
Bromley,-Rosemary-D.-F.	47	2.50	45	55.50	24	52.01	43	47.19	14	92.92
Kan,-Kamhon	56	2.50	27	63.50	56	42.38	17	62.90	87	54.88
Riddiough,-Timothy-J.	68	2.33	36	58.33	82	37.33	18	59.32	93	53.24
Jessop,-Bob	183	1.50	63	51.50	30	49.28	41	47.87	11	97.11
Boyer,-Robert	304	1.00	69	49.00	36	47.53	40	48.11	10	99.26

**TABLE 10. Ranking of authors who published regional articles (1991-1995)**

Regional 1991-1995 Author	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
Hansen,-Niles	1	5.00	4	66.00	11	44.82	21	32.60	87	34.46
Nijkamp,-Peter	2	4.50	2	72.00	5	53.75	9	40.28	26	47.72
Parr,-John-B.	3	4.00	3	71.00	2	60.44	2	55.86	14	68.39
McCann,-Philip	4	4.00	24	41.00	26	34.32	22	32.43	28	46.63
Harris,-Richard-I.-D.	5	3.50	10	51.00	4	56.96	3	55.08	3	92.63
Isserman,-Andrew-M.	6	3.00	1	129.00	1	89.68	1	68.49	1	106.35
Hart,-Tom	7	3.00	5	64.00	3	58.88	4	50.02	2	95.44
Johansson,-Borje	8	3.00	7	56.50	9	46.34	44	25.24	35	44.14
Zhang,-Wei-Bin	9	3.00	11	49.00	22	35.93	170	15.57	176	24.69
Fingleton,-Bernard	10	3.00	20	42.00	24	35.41	31	28.34	44	41.23
Beckmann,-Martin-J.	11	3.00	107	24.00	158	17.73	483	7.69	446	12.18
Rickman,-Dan-S.	12	2.83	8	53.83	21	36.82	38	27.02	132	29.46
O'Farrell,-P.-N.	13	2.50	22	41.33	8	46.61	6	41.36	5	81.54
Begg,-Iain	14	2.50	13	47.00	10	45.78	7	41.10	9	73.47
ten-Raa,-Thijs	15	2.50	6	58.00	19	38.28	10	38.28	63	38.28
Button,-Kenneth-J.	16	2.50	51	32.00	28	33.12	43	25.27	25	48.80
West,-Carol-Taylor	17	2.50	9	52.00	30	32.76	50	23.83	100	32.81
Griffith,-Daniel-A.	18	2.50	18	45.50	31	32.06	36	27.45	191	23.39
Duffy-Deno,-Kevin-T.	19	2.50	39	37.50	40	29.52	20	33.24	64	37.35
Warf,-Barney	20	2.50	34	38.50	41	29.48	52	23.46	47	39.78
Fischer,-Manfred-M.	27	2.17	28	40.33	18	39.01	18	34.72	22	51.53
Clark,-Gordon-L.	28	2.00	30	39.00	6	49.92	5	45.29	4	90.72
Pompili,-Tomaso	29	2.00	19	45.00	7	46.80	8	40.87	6	79.63
Suarez-Villa,-Luis	30	2.00	12	48.00	12	44.71	13	37.24	16	62.51
Champion,-A.-G.	31	2.00	14	47.00	13	43.24	15	36.74	12	70.09
Fielding,-A.-J.	32	2.00	23	41.00	14	43.12	11	37.74	8	73.66
Glasson,-John	33	2.00	15	46.00	15	42.32	17	35.95	13	68.60
Turok,-Ivan	34	2.00	31	39.00	16	42.00	14	36.94	10	72.35
Borello,-José-Antonio	35	2.00	36	38.00	20	36.86	12	37.31	7	76.98
Barlow,-James	37	2.00	40	37.00	25	34.84	23	32.12	15	63.73
Buhr,-Walter	39	2.00	16	46.00	29	33.12	201	14.36	201	22.76
Sheehan,-Maura	41	2.00	104	24.00	34	30.72	34	27.87	20	55.83
Wolff,-Edward-N.	42	2.00	17	46.00	35	30.36	25	30.36	118	30.36
Keeble,-David	54	1.83	45	34.83	17	40.45	16	36.09	11	71.43
Jensen-Butler,-Chris	61	1.50	46	34.00	32	31.78	29	28.58	19	56.05
Smith,-Tony-E.	63	1.50	27	40.50	38	29.93	19	34.46	143	28.04
Mingione,-Enzo	65	1.50	63	30.00	44	29.10	26	29.46	17	60.77
Chen,-Xiangming	112	1.00	66	29.00	48	28.13	30	28.48	18	58.74

**TABLE 11. Ranking of authors who published regional articles (1996-2000)**

Regional 1996-2000 Author	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
Nijkamp,-Peter	1	5.33	1	114.00	1	87.95	1	52.69	8	76.75
Batabyal,-Amitrajeet -A.	2	4.00	5	60.00	8	44.86	31	30.32	84	34.22
Rey,-Sergio-J.	3	3.83	2	81.17	2	61.75	4	46.53	18	60.43
Tan,-Lin-Ti	4	3.50	25	43.50	34	33.04	142	17.34	204	23.65
Anselin,-Luc	5	3.25	3	61.67	11	43.00	9	41.51	44	43.63
Thisse,-Jacques-Francois	6	2.67	19	45.83	42	31.59	7	42.62	70	36.15
Parr,-John-B.	7	2.50	12	52.50	3	51.72	5	44.64	3	86.22
Mur,-Jesus	8	2.50	14	49.50	7	45.79	21	34.79	28	52.90
Green,-A.-E.	9	2.50	47	34.00	9	43.49	12	39.46	6	79.03
Stenberg,-Rolf	10	2.50	30	38.50	12	42.77	10	40.95	4	83.25
Kelejian,-Harry-H.	11	2.50	7	55.50	21	39.74	40	28.42	85	33.19
Brocker,-Johannes	12	2.50	8	54.00	22	39.15	108	18.95	184	25.55
Hsu,-Song-ken	13	2.50	51	33.50	70	25.22	76	23.11	243	21.13
Henderson,-J.-Vernon	14	2.50	45	35.00	89	22.75	25	33.09	115	30.94
Roy,-John-Pos..	15	2.33	28	41.00	44	30.57	119	18.00	312	17.76
Bennett,-Robert-J.	16	2.33	64	31.33	19	39.95	19	36.25	9	72.59
Haynes,-Kingsley-E.	17	2.33	17	47.17	32	33.96	218	14.72	206	23.34
Rietveld,-Piet	18	2.25	44	35.25	49	28.58	84	21.33	162	27.33
Partridge,-Mark-D.	19	2.17	13	50.67	10	43.02	11	40.80	19	58.94
Martin,-Ron	20	2.17	43	35.33	20	39.85	15	38.06	12	66.33
Yeung,-Henry-Wai-chung	21	2.00	21	45.00	4	49.85	3	47.78	2	97.16
O-hUallachain,-Breandan	22	2.00	4	60.50	5	49.09	16	37.31	71	35.80
Westlund,-Hans	23	2.00	6	57.00	14	41.88	66	24.32	196	24.56
de-Mesnard,-Louis	24	2.00	10	53.00	15	41.73	29	31.82	86	32.96
Yiftachel,-Oren	25	2.00	36	37.00	16	40.85	13	39.20	5	79.76
Congdon,-Peter	26	2.00	22	44.00	17	40.48	22	34.39	13	65.61
Rickman,-Dan-S.	27	2.00	9	53.33	18	40.24	8	42.50	30	51.48
Tewdwr-Jones,-Mark	28	2.00	29	40.00	23	38.78	24	33.38	15	64.33
Lin,-George-C.-S.	29	2.00	27	43.00	24	38.19	20	35.24	17	60.53
Frenkel,-Amnon	30	2.00	18	47.00	26	36.27	176	15.72	191	24.92
Fingleton,-Bernard	31	2.00	16	49.00	27	35.74	26	32.63	79	34.65
Rutherford,-Tod-D.	32	2.00	85	28.00	29	35.45	27	32.17	14	64.42
Hanson,-Gordon-H.	34	2.00	11	53.00	31	34.44	6	44.62	48	41.80
Swyngedouw,-Erik	54	1.83	40	36.50	28	35.50	28	31.95	16	62.85
Dietzenbacher,-Erik	55	1.83	24	43.83	35	33.03	14	39.19	116	30.46
Markusen,-Ann-Pos..	56	1.83	20	45.33	37	32.91	56	25.17	57	38.53
Edgington,-David-W.	61	1.50	26	43.00	13	42.44	18	36.65	10	70.80
Wallace,-Claire	64	1.50	77	29.00	52	28.13	38	28.48	20	58.74
Boyer,-Robert	111	1.00	15	49.00	6	47.53	2	48.11	1	99.26
Jessop,-Bob	112	1.00	31	38.00	25	36.86	17	37.31	7	76.98
Theret,-Bruno	113	1.00	48	34.00	36	32.98	23	33.39	11	68.87

**TABLE 12. Ranking of authors who published urban articles (1991-1995)**

Urban 1991-1995 Author	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
Henderson,-J.-Vernon	1	7.00	1	160.00	2	104.05	1	133.26	3	125.19
McMillen,-Daniel-P.	2	6.83	2	117.50	3	79.46	2	112.36	8	97.76
Alperovich,-Gershon	3	6.50	18	63.00	15	51.48	23	50.79	14	74.76
Braid,-Ralph-M.	4	6.00	3	117.00	4	79.04	3	111.61	9	97.27
Turnbull,-Geoffrey-K.	5	5.83	9	84.17	10	56.88	8	69.70	25	63.13
Congdon,-Peter	6	5.00	5	107.00	1	106.41	5	90.74	1	161.21
Evans,-Alan-W.	7	5.00	14	66.00	9	61.52	18	54.79	5	106.97
Yinger,-John	8	4.50	4	112.50	6	72.31	4	108.87	7	98.76
Hoyt,-William-H.	9	4.50	10	81.50	14	52.96	10	68.60	20	64.28
Miceli,-Thomas-J.	10	4.50	15	65.00	20	44.94	19	54.11	38	58.29
Pasha,-Hafiz-A.	11	4.50	25	55.00	29	41.50	24	50.64	23	63.22
Strange,-William-C.	12	4.00	7	85.50	11	55.16	6	79.10	17	72.48
Voith,-Richard	13	4.00	19	63.00	25	42.60	13	61.88	47	53.47
Fujita,-Masahisa	14	3.67	6	102.50	8	67.91	7	78.65	12	76.39
Sirmans,-C.-F.	15	3.67	21	60.17	26	41.74	20	53.02	52	51.21
Ihlanfeldt,-Keith-Pos..	16	3.33	16	64.67	22	43.14	15	60.72	36	59.55
Rosenthal,-Stuart-S.	17	3.33	23	58.83	35	37.87	17	55.90	53	50.92
Bovaird,-Tony	18	3.00	8	85.00	5	78.20	11	66.44	2	126.75
Gilbert,-Alan	19	3.00	12	75.00	7	69.00	16	58.62	4	111.84
Viton,-Philip-A.	20	3.00	11	79.00	12	53.94	9	68.65	34	60.70
Dowall,-David-E.	21	3.00	27	53.00	18	45.64	34	39.97	18	69.06
Lever,-William-F.	22	3.00	36	49.00	19	45.08	38	38.30	16	73.07
Jones,-Lawrence-D.	23	3.00	13	69.00	21	44.68	14	60.89	41	56.41
Wheaton,-William-C.	26	3.00	20	62.50	30	40.00	12	63.56	39	57.05
Healey,-Patsy	34	2.50	37	48.00	16	49.20	30	42.83	10	83.27
Abdel-Rahman,-Hesham-M.	35	2.50	17	63.50	28	41.57	26	47.98	71	46.21
Chen,-Xiangming	47	2.00	24	56.00	13	52.97	25	49.58	6	99.01
Lawless,-Paul	48	2.00	31	51.00	17	46.92	35	39.86	13	76.05
Fielding,-A.-J.	49	2.00	50	41.00	23	43.12	40	37.74	15	73.66
Syrett,-Stephen	50	2.00	68	36.00	31	39.57	39	38.04	11	77.43
Paris,-Chris	53	2.00	56	39.00	38	36.78	46	34.09	19	67.78

**TABLE 13. Ranking of authors who published urban articles (1996-2000)**

Urban 1996-2000 Author	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
Wu,-Fulong	1	6.00	1	145.50	1	135.66	1	120.94	1	236.21
Arnott,-Richard-J.	2	5.58	2	123.50	3	85.67	3	98.96	4	103.74
Braid,-Ralph-M.	3	5.50	3	123.00	4	84.46	2	107.75	7	94.52
Brueckner,-Jan-K.	4	5.00	4	102.00	6	69.22	6	80.90	15	76.29
McMillen,-Daniel-P.	5	4.50	6	93.00	7	62.69	5	88.86	12	83.87
Turnbull,-Geoffrey-K.	6	4.00	9	79.17	14	51.46	9	77.16	21	69.19
Sasaki,-Komei	7	4.00	12	75.50	16	50.75	19	53.63	51	53.50
Ross,-Stephen-L.	8	3.83	7	92.83	8	61.51	4	92.64	11	89.07
Skaburskis,-Andrejs	9	3.50	5	101.00	2	92.92	7	78.94	2	150.61
Glaeser,-Edward-L.	10	3.50	8	83.50	10	53.84	8	77.78	19	71.16
Abdel-Rahman,-Hesham-M.	11	3.50	17	66.00	23	46.19	17	54.93	74	47.27
Crampton,-Graham-Pos..	12	3.50	38	49.50	27	43.76	55	36.21	37	61.99
Evans,-Alan-W.	13	3.50	81	36.50	70	31.80	114	26.05	96	42.60
Graham,-Stephen	14	3.33	30	53.67	17	50.57	30	46.75	9	92.86
Nijkamp,-Peter	15	3.17	16	66.33	15	51.35	15	56.41	18	71.29
Green,-Richard-K.	16	3.00	14	70.50	21	48.14	20	51.13	48	55.00
Henderson,-J.-Vernon	17	3.00	15	67.50	26	44.05	24	49.05	68	48.42
Kanemoto,-Yoshitsugu	18	3.00	18	64.00	29	41.98	29	46.88	79	45.53
Voith,-Richard	19	3.00	21	58.00	39	39.52	14	56.68	65	48.70
Hall,-Peter	20	3.00	69	39.00	40	39.48	65	34.28	26	66.51
Verhoef,-Erik-T.	21	2.92	10	77.25	11	53.53	18	54.10	73	47.61
Raphael,-Steven	22	2.83	13	73.00	20	48.76	10	72.28	35	63.03
Pugh,-Cedric	26	2.50	11	76.00	5	69.92	12	59.40	3	113.33
Bromley,-Rosemary-D.-F.	27	2.50	24	55.50	12	52.01	27	47.19	8	92.92
Kan,-Kamhon	29	2.50	19	63.50	28	42.38	11	62.90	49	54.88
Mun,-Se-il	33	2.50	27	55.00	53	35.20	16	55.93	60	50.20
Congdon,-Peter	37	2.33	28	54.00	18	49.68	38	42.21	14	80.53
Riddiough,-Timothy-J.	39	2.33	20	58.33	47	37.33	13	59.32	52	53.24
Murie,-Alan	40	2.33	49	45.00	30	41.93	50	37.28	17	72.72
Ihlanfeldt,-Keith-Pos..	41	2.33	25	55.33	33	40.46	35	44.04	103	42.37
Turok,-Ivan	44	2.00	26	55.00	9	54.40	28	47.04	10	90.99
Drakakis-Smith,-David	45	2.00	23	56.00	13	51.52	36	43.77	13	83.51
Arimah,-Ben-C.	46	2.00	42	49.00	24	45.08	48	38.30	16	73.07
Kumar,-Sunil	49	2.00	56	43.00	34	40.21	54	36.21	20	71.07
Jessop,-Bob	98	1.50	34	51.50	19	49.28	26	47.87	6	97.11
Boyer,-Robert	168	1.00	41	49.00	22	47.53	25	48.11	5	99.26



**TABLE 14. Ranking of institutions whose members published regional or urban articles (1991-2000)**

Full dataset 1991-2000 Institution	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
University of Glasgow	1	52.67	2	928.50	1	861.38	2	740.79	1	1359.07
University Illinois	2	50.87	1	971.43	2	707.40	1	745.43	3	821.61
Free University of Amsterdam	3	36.33	3	689.67	4	527.11	8	441.96	15	556.17
University Wales	4	34.17	4	614.33	3	616.71	3	546.26	2	1065.99
University of Texas	5	32.17	7	538.67	9	437.42	10	415.26	11	617.48
Ohio State University	6	30.67	6	545.67	13	391.26	13	386.81	34	371.91
University Newcastle Upon Tyne	7	29.83	11	490.33	5	501.73	6	446.50	4	816.13
University Reading	8	29.25	21	416.50	14	384.68	21	328.27	13	601.88
University Cambridge	9	28.63	12	476.38	6	485.84	7	442.27	6	778.26
University Pennsylvania	10	28.23	8	529.77	12	392.07	11	410.66	21	479.34
London School of Econ & Political Science	11	27.67	9	525.33	7	484.14	9	437.42	7	766.34
University of Connecticut	12	27.50	10	519.00	16	363.97	5	450.97	23	452.77
University of British Columbia	13	27.33	5	594.33	10	436.65	4	522.82	10	627.05
National University Singapore	14	25.33	13	459.33	8	442.85	12	397.75	5	781.16
University of Sheffield	15	23.67	16	443.33	11	408.29	15	364.57	8	654.54
University of California, Irvine	16	23.67	15	443.67	18	343.37	16	364.57	22	457.03
University of California, Berkeley	17	22.37	20	419.27	19	342.83	20	333.84	18	521.17
State University of New York at Buffalo	18	22.17	19	419.83	21	334.24	19	354.63	25	441.63
University of California, Los Angeles	19	22.08	22	385.00	15	372.74	18	360.92	9	653.65
University Minnesota	20	21.50	18	425.83	24	325.64	17	360.96	24	444.04
University Strathclyde	21	20.50	32	327.33	20	339.26	24	312.80	16	549.51
West Virginia University	22	20.40	14	449.80	23	332.40	28	293.64	31	385.37
Syracuse University	23	20.17	17	439.17	27	301.95	14	365.56	36	363.61
University Bristol	25	19.42	24	358.42	17	359.09	23	315.72	12	604.79
University Newcastle	29	18.17	37	302.17	28	287.41	33	260.56	20	481.66
University College of London	30	17.67	29	331.50	25	319.31	29	284.20	19	518.64
Heriot-Watt University	31	17.42	33	320.92	22	333.31	27	293.84	14	574.94
Sheffield Hallam University	37	16.67	31	330.33	26	317.15	32	271.24	17	523.52

**TABLE 15. Ranking of institutions whose members published regional articles (1991-2000)**

Regional 1991-2000 Institution	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
University Cambridge	<b>1</b>	27.63	<b>1</b>	458.88	<b>1</b>	469.74	<b>1</b>	428.59	<b>1</b>	752.16
Free University of Amsterdam	<b>2</b>	25.67	<b>2</b>	455.17	<b>4</b>	354.23	<b>7</b>	242.00	<b>11</b>	317.30
University Newcastle Upon Tyne	<b>3</b>	23.33	<b>5</b>	370.83	<b>2</b>	391.23	<b>2</b>	344.42	<b>2</b>	648.37
University of Glasgow	<b>4</b>	22.67	<b>4</b>	386.00	<b>3</b>	359.99	<b>3</b>	314.13	<b>3</b>	565.77
University of Texas	<b>5</b>	20.83	<b>7</b>	341.83	<b>7</b>	281.24	<b>6</b>	244.98	<b>6</b>	369.18
University Illinois	<b>6</b>	20.00	<b>6</b>	351.67	<b>8</b>	264.51	<b>8</b>	225.09	<b>14</b>	259.10
University Wales	<b>7</b>	19.00	<b>8</b>	293.50	<b>5</b>	318.57	<b>4</b>	283.57	<b>4</b>	555.76
West Virginia University	<b>8</b>	17.90	<b>3</b>	401.30	<b>6</b>	298.80	<b>5</b>	263.14	<b>8</b>	347.48
Ohio State University	<b>9</b>	14.67	<b>9</b>	254.67	<b>13</b>	188.28	<b>14</b>	158.47	<b>40</b>	163.82
University Strathclyde	<b>10</b>	13.67	<b>12</b>	215.50	<b>9</b>	233.48	<b>9</b>	218.08	<b>5</b>	370.79
University Pennsylvania	<b>11</b>	13.33	<b>13</b>	211.50	<b>18</b>	163.62	<b>15</b>	148.30	<b>35</b>	176.44
University Groningen	<b>12</b>	13.00	<b>10</b>	243.50	<b>11</b>	189.76	<b>11</b>	186.68	<b>41</b>	161.72
London School of Econ & Political Science	<b>13</b>	12.33	<b>11</b>	232.00	<b>10</b>	218.19	<b>10</b>	202.18	<b>7</b>	358.41
University of Arizona	<b>14</b>	12.33	<b>14</b>	201.17	<b>17</b>	164.97	<b>17</b>	138.13	<b>36</b>	167.78
University Lancaster	<b>15</b>	12.00	<b>17</b>	171.50	<b>16</b>	166.51	<b>16</b>	142.83	<b>13</b>	267.23
University Reading	<b>16</b>	11.08	<b>25</b>	151.83	<b>21</b>	143.96	<b>24</b>	123.16	<b>20</b>	222.30
Vienna University Econ & Business Admin.	<b>17</b>	11.00	<b>15</b>	191.50	<b>15</b>	172.24	<b>19</b>	130.18	<b>31</b>	189.89
University Sussex	<b>18</b>	9.67	<b>18</b>	164.33	<b>12</b>	189.67	<b>12</b>	169.06	<b>9</b>	334.38
Queen's University Belfast	<b>19</b>	9.67	<b>36</b>	123.33	<b>22</b>	140.88	<b>23</b>	125.18	<b>15</b>	248.59
Heriot-Watt University	<b>20</b>	9.42	<b>20</b>	160.42	<b>14</b>	181.64	<b>13</b>	161.36	<b>10</b>	318.35
University of California, Los Angeles	<b>21</b>	9.33	<b>26</b>	151.00	<b>19</b>	152.97	<b>18</b>	136.06	<b>12</b>	268.90
University Newcastle	<b>25</b>	9.17	<b>32</b>	134.33	<b>25</b>	136.81	<b>26</b>	121.47	<b>17</b>	242.69
University of Sheffield	<b>27</b>	8.67	<b>22</b>	157.00	<b>20</b>	148.76	<b>20</b>	129.65	<b>18</b>	233.99
University Warwick	<b>39</b>	7.33	<b>50</b>	113.00	<b>27</b>	133.05	<b>25</b>	122.34	<b>19</b>	231.16
University of Florida	<b>42</b>	7.17	<b>16</b>	172.17	<b>39</b>	113.32	<b>48</b>	90.58	<b>59</b>	112.36
University of British Columbia	<b>43</b>	7.00	<b>19</b>	160.50	<b>23</b>	137.53	<b>21</b>	128.75	<b>27</b>	200.40
National University Singapore	<b>49</b>	6.83	<b>37</b>	122.83	<b>30</b>	129.87	<b>27</b>	121.11	<b>16</b>	243.02

**TABLE 16. Ranking of institutions whose members published urban articles (1991-2000)**

Urban 1991-2000 Institution	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
University of Glasgow	1	38.17	2	674.00	1	628.11	2	540.41	1	995.58
University Illinois	2	37.37	1	736.60	2	536.23	1	601.99	2	670.15
University of Connecticut	3	24.00	4	465.00	6	323.05	4	406.53	12	401.30
University of British Columbia	4	23.33	3	503.83	4	347.51	3	447.56	6	487.89
University Reading	5	21.17	18	292.67	11	266.48	23	227.00	11	421.33
University Pennsylvania	6	20.73	5	413.77	8	304.40	5	334.14	13	392.26
London School of Econ & Political Science	7	19.83	6	375.83	3	350.52	7	314.96	4	551.85
Ohio State University	8	19.50	9	359.50	16	251.06	12	279.85	36	249.52
University of California, Irvine	9	18.83	14	324.83	19	236.70	14	269.57	23	304.70
University of California, Berkeley	10	18.53	10	349.10	9	288.85	11	281.08	8	447.38
National University Singapore	11	18.50	11	336.50	7	312.98	13	276.64	5	538.14
University Wales	12	17.67	8	366.33	5	345.99	8	307.38	3	599.93
Syracuse University	13	17.17	7	371.50	15	254.54	6	323.40	20	326.08
University Wisconsin	14	16.67	16	301.33	22	222.25	25	222.10	32	267.22
University Minnesota	15	16.67	12	336.50	14	257.41	10	294.40	15	363.33
Wayne State University	16	16.50	13	336.00	18	242.26	9	299.05	22	307.56
University of California, Los Angeles	17	15.75	22	281.00	12	263.61	15	264.00	7	461.24
University of Sheffield	18	15.50	17	298.33	10	268.53	21	241.47	10	424.93
Free University of Amsterdam	19	15.00	15	323.50	17	242.60	17	254.49	24	301.24
University of Southern California	20	14.67	23	279.33	29	198.14	20	242.69	37	247.78
Columbia University	21	14.33	19	292.00	25	205.72	18	251.16	29	273.91
State University of New York at Buffalo	22	13.83	20	291.17	23	219.03	19	248.10	27	290.57
University Bristol	23	13.67	24	278.50	13	262.66	22	229.07	9	432.43
University Newcastle Upon Tyne	25	13.50	26	246.50	20	232.38	27	206.66	14	368.83
University of Colorado	27	13.33	21	283.17	26	205.31	16	256.14	25	296.61
Michigan State University	28	13.33	33	225.17	28	200.36	29	196.49	17	348.03
University Newcastle	29	13.00	31	225.83	27	203.46	36	185.02	19	331.02
Sheffield Hallam University	32	11.67	28	241.83	21	225.29	34	188.40	16	359.80
University College of London	33	11.33	29	240.17	24	216.11	32	190.51	18	332.10

**TABLE 17. Ranking of institutions whose members published regional or urban articles (1991-1995)**

Full data set 1991-1995 Institution	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
University of Glasgow	1	24.67	2	404.00	1	367.40	2	318.55	2	571.38
University Illinois	2	22.67	1	418.92	3	313.83	1	339.10	3	403.73
University Newcastle Upon Tyne	3	20.50	4	326.50	2	346.22	3	310.49	1	583.13
University of Texas	4	18.67	9	278.67	6	226.18	10	199.90	9	303.20
Ohio State University	5	18.50	6	302.00	7	217.18	7	204.80	34	179.57
University Pennsylvania	6	17.90	5	319.60	5	229.89	6	236.44	15	264.69
University of British Columbia	7	16.83	3	335.83	4	246.13	4	301.94	5	357.87
Syracuse University	8	14.17	7	295.33	11	202.53	5	242.74	18	242.35
University of Connecticut	9	14.17	13	235.00	19	165.48	11	195.53	32	192.79
University of California, Berkeley	10	13.83	12	242.00	12	195.81	9	200.58	8	306.95
University of California, Irvine	11	13.67	11	246.33	15	181.45	8	203.43	25	224.12
West Virginia University	12	13.50	8	288.50	8	216.58	16	173.02	14	277.08
Brown University	13	13.33	10	247.00	17	172.59	12	190.38	29	206.26
University York	14	12.83	16	208.83	18	171.09	23	148.83	20	236.91
University Wales	15	12.33	20	188.17	10	203.23	13	186.05	4	364.58
University Cambridge	16	12.33	18	205.00	9	207.87	14	185.21	6	328.10
State University of New York at Buffalo	17	11.83	17	207.33	23	155.32	20	169.62	35	173.15
Free University of Amsterdam	18	11.83	21	188.00	27	143.30	44	108.78	47	138.90
University of Southern California	19	11.17	26	181.00	34	126.87	22	152.29	46	139.74
University Reading	20	11.00	31	160.00	24	144.95	32	127.10	23	229.33
University of Sheffield	22	10.83	15	211.00	13	192.19	17	172.92	11	290.33
University of California, Los Angeles	23	10.58	22	185.00	14	186.70	19	171.35	7	325.66
University Minnesota	25	10.17	14	212.50	22	160.60	15	184.02	21	231.04
University Strathclyde	27	9.67	35	142.00	21	161.70	24	146.50	13	279.80
Wayne State University	28	9.67	19	192.17	28	142.36	18	172.03	31	194.52
University Sussex	29	9.33	33	151.00	20	163.94	25	144.42	12	283.20
Queen's University Belfast	32	9.08	52	116.08	30	131.21	34	123.39	17	249.30
London School of Econ & Political Science	33	8.83	30	172.17	16	175.86	21	158.69	10	301.01
University Toronto	41	8.00	34	148.00	26	143.72	30	128.97	16	253.30
University Amsterdam	45	7.83	32	152.50	25	144.62	33	123.75	19	237.43

**TABLE 18. Ranking of institutions whose members published regional or urban articles (1996-2000)**

Full data set 1996-2000 Institution	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
University Illinois	1	28.20	1	552.52	3	393.57	2	406.33	6	417.89
University of Glasgow	2	28.00	2	524.50	1	493.98	1	422.25	1	787.69
Free University of Amsterdam	3	24.50	3	501.67	4	383.81	5	333.18	7	417.27
University Wales	4	21.83	4	426.17	2	413.48	3	360.21	2	701.41
National University Singapore	5	21.33	5	392.33	5	380.31	4	341.77	3	671.63
London School of Econ & Political Science	6	18.83	6	353.17	6	308.28	6	278.73	4	465.32
University Reading	7	18.25	12	256.50	9	239.74	14	201.17	11	372.54
University Cambridge	8	16.29	9	271.38	7	277.97	7	257.06	5	450.16
University Wisconsin	9	14.17	8	278.83	15	209.15	13	204.19	28	252.59
University of Texas	10	13.50	10	260.00	13	211.23	10	215.36	16	314.27
University College of London	11	13.33	16	243.17	10	235.07	12	209.95	10	374.15
University of Connecticut	12	13.33	7	284.00	17	198.49	8	255.44	26	259.98
University Newcastle	13	13.00	21	213.00	14	209.53	17	191.21	12	365.65
University Bristol	14	12.92	13	250.42	8	244.01	11	213.46	8	403.71
University of Sheffield	15	12.83	18	232.33	12	216.10	16	191.66	13	364.21
University Groningen	16	12.17	14	247.50	18	195.25	19	188.44	46	176.65
Sheffield Hallam University	17	12.17	17	233.83	11	228.83	15	199.92	9	388.14
Ohio State University	18	12.17	15	243.67	24	174.08	21	182.01	39	192.34
University of California, Los Angeles	19	11.50	26	200.00	20	186.04	18	189.57	15	327.99
Academia Sinica	20	11.42	28	193.25	40	139.10	47	121.72	72	127.69
University Minnesota	21	11.33	20	213.33	29	165.04	24	176.94	36	213.00
University of British Columbia	24	10.50	11	258.50	19	190.53	9	220.88	22	269.18
State University of New York at Buffalo	25	10.33	22	212.50	22	178.92	20	185.01	23	268.49
University Aberdeen	27	10.00	42	160.00	30	164.59	37	143.57	20	279.49
Heriot-Watt University	29	9.92	25	201.75	16	201.48	23	177.28	14	345.75
University Manchester	30	9.81	31	182.69	21	179.36	29	164.54	18	287.54
Harvard University	31	9.70	19	231.43	33	158.33	25	176.49	40	186.61
University Lancaster	33	9.58	38	165.67	28	165.71	34	147.33	17	290.41
Cardiff University	42	8.50	36	171.50	26	168.21	33	147.51	19	286.94

**TABLE 19. Ranking of institutions whose members published regional articles (1991-1995)**

Regional 1991-1995 Institution	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
University Newcastle Upon Tyne	1	17.00	1	274.00	1	292.88	1	264.14	1	493.15
University of Glasgow	2	12.67	3	211.00	4	189.84	3	167.69	3	283.57
University of Texas	3	12.50	5	187.50	5	156.12	7	128.33	8	201.60
University Cambridge	4	12.33	4	205.00	2	207.87	2	185.21	2	328.10
West Virginia University	5	12.00	2	252.00	3	190.54	4	148.01	5	246.75
Free University of Amsterdam	6	10.83	7	172.00	10	128.58	10	96.27	20	115.04
University Illinois	7	9.92	6	177.67	7	135.35	6	133.19	14	150.63
Ohio State University	8	9.67	8	152.17	11	109.81	11	94.29	42	74.85
University Wales	9	9.50	12	134.50	6	152.51	5	138.69	4	270.12
University Pennsylvania	10	9.33	11	135.50	13	103.57	17	85.28	21	107.86
University of California, Santa Barbara	11	8.00	10	139.50	16	95.73	13	91.47	32	85.01
University Strathclyde	12	7.67	15	114.00	8	133.06	8	121.58	6	231.37
University York	13	7.00	13	124.50	17	94.46	22	73.31	23	104.78
Vienna University Econ & Business Admin.	14	6.83	16	112.67	14	103.08	18	82.30	19	115.52
University Sussex	15	6.83	14	118.50	9	131.16	9	115.98	7	228.06
University Ulster	16	6.50	27	82.50	18	94.44	15	89.35	10	181.09
University North Carolina	17	6.50	26	83.50	27	71.38	28	64.73	25	98.20
University of California, Los Angeles	18	6.33	17	109.00	12	105.71	14	91.14	11	177.76
University of Arizona	19	6.00	18	100.50	23	83.39	24	70.13	26	96.65
University of Florida	20	5.83	9	140.17	20	91.02	23	71.05	28	88.39
Queen's University Belfast	21	5.83	35	72.33	22	85.37	20	78.46	13	157.37
Heriot-Watt University	22	5.50	23	87.17	15	102.39	12	91.55	9	181.47
University Western Australia	23	5.50	20	92.50	26	74.27	38	50.87	40	78.46
Erasmus University	26	5.33	24	86.17	21	90.42	19	78.65	16	138.26
University New York	30	4.67	19	96.00	31	65.06	26	67.47	52	64.05
London School of Econ & Political Science	31	4.50	22	89.33	19	93.54	16	87.49	12	163.30
University Toronto	37	4.00	29	78.00	24	79.32	21	74.25	15	148.91
University Bristol	38	4.00	49	58.50	28	69.12	29	61.87	18	122.72
Monash University	53	3.00	40	68.00	25	76.60	25	67.96	17	133.96

**TABLE 20. Ranking of institutions whose members published regional articles (1996-2000)**

Regional 1996-2000 Institution	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
University Cambridge	1	15.29	2	253.88	1	261.87	1	243.38	1	424.06
Free University of Amsterdam	2	14.83	1	283.17	2	225.66	4	145.72	5	202.25
University Groningen	3	10.50	3	208.00	5	162.78	2	154.67	21	136.84
University Illinois	4	10.08	5	174.00	6	129.16	14	91.90	30	108.47
University of Glasgow	5	10.00	4	175.00	3	170.15	3	146.44	3	282.20
University Wales	6	9.50	6	159.00	4	166.06	5	144.88	2	285.64
University of Texas	7	8.33	7	154.33	7	125.13	6	116.64	9	167.58
London School of Econ & Political Science	8	7.83	9	142.67	8	124.65	8	114.69	6	195.11
University Reading	9	7.08	22	94.83	18	94.57	20	79.77	12	155.12
University Newcastle	10	6.83	24	92.67	13	100.18	12	93.11	7	187.82
University Lancaster	11	6.50	13	104.50	11	107.03	11	93.27	8	185.74
University Newcastle Upon Tyne	12	6.33	21	96.83	14	98.35	19	80.28	11	155.22
Cornell University	13	6.33	14	102.83	24	81.30	36	61.00	65	63.96
University of Arizona	14	6.33	19	100.67	23	81.58	28	68.00	54	71.13
University Strathclyde	15	6.00	18	101.50	12	100.42	10	96.50	18	139.42
San Diego State University	16	6.00	12	107.50	21	84.63	37	60.69	44	86.28
West Virginia University	17	5.90	8	149.30	10	108.26	7	115.13	32	100.73
National University Singapore	18	5.83	11	109.83	9	117.91	9	110.95	4	223.64
University of Sheffield	19	5.83	17	101.83	19	94.54	17	83.65	13	153.57
Academia Sinica	20	5.83	36	78.17	47	59.80	69	38.69	92	44.49
University Aberdeen	21	5.50	26	91.50	15	96.89	16	85.09	10	166.49
University London	22	5.50	20	100.00	16	95.12	18	80.36	15	148.84
University Dundee	23	5.50	42	70.00	31	73.35	26	69.32	17	139.79
University Manchester	26	5.14	23	92.86	17	94.79	13	92.30	14	149.13
University Portsmouth	27	5.00	52	62.00	26	79.03	24	71.71	16	143.62
Ohio State University	28	5.00	15	102.50	27	78.47	32	64.18	41	88.98
University of British Columbia	30	4.50	10	114.00	20	89.62	15	87.19	25	121.33
University Warwick	31	4.50	40	72.00	22	82.01	21	76.24	19	139.13
Harvard University	33	4.50	16	102.00	34	71.27	38	60.65	55	70.34
Heriot-Watt University	44	3.92	39	73.25	25	79.25	25	69.81	20	136.88

**TABLE 21. Ranking of institutions whose members published urban articles (1991-1995)**

Urban 1991-1995 Institution	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
University of Glasgow	<b>1</b>	17.67	<b>3</b>	280.00	<b>1</b>	259.92	<b>3</b>	226.21	<b>1</b>	415.79
University Illinois	<b>2</b>	16.75	<b>1</b>	324.25	<b>2</b>	247.47	<b>1</b>	276.67	<b>2</b>	343.64
University of British Columbia	<b>3</b>	15.33	<b>2</b>	312.33	<b>3</b>	216.05	<b>2</b>	274.64	<b>3</b>	303.20
Syracuse University	<b>4</b>	12.83	<b>4</b>	265.33	<b>4</b>	182.73	<b>4</b>	222.94	<b>7</b>	222.55
University Pennsylvania	<b>5</b>	12.40	<b>5</b>	244.60	<b>5</b>	176.58	<b>5</b>	194.48	<b>8</b>	222.15
Ohio State University	<b>6</b>	12.33	<b>6</b>	218.33	<b>7</b>	155.45	<b>11</b>	162.02	23	146.15
University of Connecticut	<b>7</b>	12.17	<b>8</b>	204.00	<b>9</b>	139.68	<b>8</b>	169.26	<b>19</b>	160.00
University of California, Irvine	<b>8</b>	11.67	<b>10</b>	198.33	<b>12</b>	136.74	<b>9</b>	166.19	<b>17</b>	161.61
University of California, Berkeley	<b>9</b>	11.50	<b>7</b>	211.00	<b>6</b>	168.98	<b>6</b>	177.17	<b>4</b>	261.50
University Karachi	<b>10</b>	10.00	<b>17</b>	130.00	<b>19</b>	107.84	<b>19</b>	111.49	<b>16</b>	169.56
Brown University	<b>11</b>	9.50	<b>9</b>	200.00	<b>11</b>	137.67	<b>7</b>	170.61	<b>13</b>	185.43
University Newcastle Upon Tyne	<b>12</b>	9.00	<b>14</b>	155.50	<b>8</b>	153.14	<b>13</b>	132.18	<b>5</b>	255.26
Wayne State University	<b>13</b>	8.67	<b>12</b>	177.17	<b>14</b>	128.56	<b>12</b>	160.31	<b>15</b>	172.15
Bar Ilan University	<b>14</b>	8.50	45	82.50	46	67.22	47	67.81	45	96.99
University of Southern California	<b>15</b>	8.33	<b>15</b>	150.83	21	106.01	<b>14</b>	131.38	32	119.61
Los Angeles State University	<b>16</b>	8.17	25	119.50	31	82.49	23	101.57	49	94.58
University Minnesota	<b>17</b>	8.17	<b>11</b>	181.50	<b>13</b>	132.98	<b>10</b>	162.48	<b>12</b>	190.59
University of Sheffield	<b>18</b>	8.00	<b>13</b>	155.83	<b>10</b>	137.97	<b>15</b>	126.91	<b>10</b>	209.91
University Reading	<b>19</b>	8.00	27	116.00	<b>20</b>	107.52	26	93.87	<b>14</b>	181.53
Michigan State University	<b>20</b>	7.83	22	122.17	<b>17</b>	113.02	21	109.75	<b>11</b>	209.77
University York	21	7.83	<b>18</b>	129.83	<b>18</b>	109.27	25	99.04	21	158.29
State University of New York at Buffalo	22	7.50	<b>16</b>	143.67	22	102.91	<b>16</b>	121.01	35	115.22
University of California, Los Angeles	23	7.25	21	123.00	<b>16</b>	124.83	<b>17</b>	119.34	<b>6</b>	224.40
Columbia University	25	7.00	23	121.00	30	84.66	<b>20</b>	111.29	29	124.86
London School of Econ & Political Science	27	6.33	<b>20</b>	123.83	<b>15</b>	127.97	<b>18</b>	111.60	<b>9</b>	217.22
University of Colorado	30	6.17	<b>19</b>	126.50	25	90.50	22	109.16	27	127.26
University Utrecht	31	6.00	31	107.00	24	98.44	31	83.63	<b>20</b>	159.56
Hebrew University, Jerusalem	35	5.50	36	104.50	23	100.79	30	85.40	<b>18</b>	160.40



**TABLE 22. Ranking of institutions whose members published urban articles (1996-2000)**

Urban 1996-2000 Institution	Articles		Pages		Std. Pages		Cit. Std. P.		Imp. Std. P.	
	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N	Pos.	N
University Illinois	1	20.62	1	412.35	3	288.76	1	325.32	6	326.52
University of Glasgow	2	20.50	2	394.00	1	368.19	2	314.20	1	579.79
National University Singapore	3	15.50	4	282.50	4	262.40	5	230.82	3	447.99
University Wales	4	14.83	3	312.67	2	295.27	3	260.02	2	505.47
London School of Econ & Political Science	5	13.50	7	252.00	5	222.55	7	203.36	5	334.63
University Reading	6	13.17	14	176.67	12	158.96	19	133.13	12	239.79
University Wisconsin	7	12.67	8	246.33	9	181.09	9	177.40	19	213.22
Free University of Amsterdam	8	12.50	5	279.50	7	206.88	6	225.16	8	254.47
University of Connecticut	9	11.83	6	261.00	8	183.37	4	237.28	11	241.31
University Bristol	10	11.17	9	229.00	6	216.69	8	188.68	4	354.07
University College of London	11	9.33	11	185.17	11	165.51	11	147.53	9	250.09
Sheffield Hallam University	12	8.67	13	176.83	10	168.29	15	144.17	7	276.82
University of California, Los Angeles	13	8.50	18	158.00	14	138.78	14	144.66	13	236.84
South Bank University	14	8.50	23	146.00	15	134.97	27	116.72	15	224.67
University Minnesota	15	8.50	20	155.00	22	124.43	21	131.93	25	172.74
University Pennsylvania	16	8.33	16	169.17	21	127.82	17	139.66	27	170.11
University Newcastle	17	8.17	24	144.33	16	132.63	24	121.67	14	226.44
University of British Columbia	18	8.00	10	191.50	19	131.47	10	172.91	21	184.69
Wayne State University	19	7.83	17	158.83	28	113.69	18	138.74	42	135.41
University of Sheffield	20	7.50	27	142.50	20	130.56	31	114.56	17	215.02
Tulane University	21	7.50	29	140.50	33	101.10	20	133.07	40	141.75
Boston College	23	7.33	12	178.00	23	121.08	13	144.92	35	146.78
Columbia University	24	7.33	15	171.00	24	121.06	16	139.87	34	149.04
University of Colorado	25	7.17	19	156.67	27	114.81	12	146.99	29	169.35
University of California, Berkeley	28	7.03	31	138.10	25	119.87	35	103.91	20	185.88
Heriot-Watt University	29	7.00	21	153.50	13	145.23	23	127.01	10	246.15
Cardiff University	31	6.50	25	143.00	17	132.36	30	114.98	16	221.80
Queen's University Kingston	36	6.00	26	143.00	18	131.56	33	111.77	18	213.24

**TABLE 23. Number of standardized pages by country**

Full dataset: Std. Pages			TOTAL		1991-1995		1996-2000	
<b>USA</b>			19039.56	38.83%	9520.77	43.89%	9518.79	34.82%
<b>UK</b>			12699.53	25.90%	5049.26	23.28%	7650.27	27.99%
<b>Continental Europe</b>			9337.58	19.05%	3636.08	16.76%	5701.50	20.86%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>91-95</b>	<b>96-00</b>						
Netherlands	Netherlands	Netherlands	1888.66	3.85%	784.01	3.61%	1104.65	4.04%
Germany	Germany	Germany	1407.77	2.87%	603.68	2.78%	804.09	2.94%
France	Sweden	France	1048.74	2.14%	384.54	1.77%	751.79	2.75%
Sweden	France	Spain	752.64	1.54%	296.95	1.37%	513.96	1.88%
Other (26)*			4239.76	8.65%	1566.90	7.22%	2527.01	9.24%
<b>OTHER (38)*</b>			7950.39	16.22%	3485.89	16.07%	4464.50	16.33%
<b>TOTAL</b>			49027.06	100.00%	21691.99	100.00%	27335.07	100.00%
<b>Et-al</b>			566.28		157.53		408.75	
<b>TOTAL</b>			49593.34		21849.52		27743.82	

Regional: Std. Pages			TOTAL		1991-1995		1996-2000	
<b>USA</b>			8064.80	34.52%	4331.01	39.03%	3733.79	30.44%
<b>UK</b>			6662.95	28.52%	3111.52	28.04%	3551.43	28.95%
<b>Continental Europe</b>			5439.40	23.28%	2170.43	19.56%	3268.97	26.65%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>91-95</b>	<b>96-00</b>						
Netherlands	Netherlands	Netherlands	1112.96	4.76%	513.38	4.63%	599.58	4.89%
Germany	Germany	Germany	867.99	3.72%	342.80	3.09%	525.19	4.28%
France	Sweden	France	604.31	2.59%	248.80	2.24%	451.57	3.68%
Sweden	Italy	Spain	458.98	1.96%	244.69	2.20%	326.68	2.66%
Other (22)*			2395.16	10.25%	820.77	7.40%	1365.95	11.14%
<b>OTHER (27)*</b>			3196.99	13.68%	1484.46	13.38%	1712.53	13.96%
<b>TOTAL</b>			23364.14	100.00%	11097.42	100.00%	12266.73	100.00%
<b>Et-al</b>			353.50		106.55		246.95	
<b>TOTAL</b>			23717.64		11203.97		12513.67	

Urban: Std. Pages			TOTAL		1991-1995		1996-2000	
<b>USA</b>			12902.15	42.03%	6378.30	48.12%	6523.84	37.41%
<b>UK</b>			7383.72	24.06%	2561.47	19.32%	4822.26	27.65%
<b>Continental Europe</b>			4958.69	16.15%	2003.49	15.11%	2955.20	16.95%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>91-95</b>	<b>96-00</b>						
Netherlands	Netherlands	Netherlands	960.30	3.13%	356.74	2.69%	603.56	3.46%
Germany	Germany	France	669.32	2.18%	303.01	2.29%	430.50	2.47%
France	Israel	Germany	624.75	2.04%	229.39	1.73%	366.31	2.10%
Israel	Sweden	Israel	478.80	1.56%	219.22	1.65%	249.41	1.43%
Other (22)*			2225.53	7.25%	895.14	6.75%	1305.42	7.49%
<b>OTHER (34)*</b>			5450.03	17.76%	2312.37	17.44%	3137.66	17.99%
<b>TOTAL</b>			30694.59	100.00%	13255.63	100.00%	17438.96	100.00%
<b>Et-al</b>			285.05		93.62		191.43	
<b>TOTAL</b>			30979.63		13349.24		17630.39	

\* The number in brackets is the number of countries that have been grouped in that category.

**TABLE 24. Country where the institution is located vs. country where the journal is published (number of standardized pages)**

Full Dataset	Country of publication				1991-1995				1996-2000				
	TOTAL				TOTAL				TOTAL				
	USA	UK	C. EUROPE	TOTAL	USA	UK	C. EUROPE	TOTAL	USA	UK	C. EUROPE	TOTAL	
<b>Author Country</b>	USA	5388.87	8378.13	5272.56	19039.56	2662.06	4143.94	2714.78	9520.77	2726.82	4234.19	2557.78	9518.79
	UK	195.74	11815.13	688.66	12699.53	22.83	4653.76	372.67	5049.26	172.91	7161.38	315.99	7650.27
	C. EUROPE	714.11	5651.98	2971.49	9337.58	188.58	2255.58	1191.92	3636.08	525.53	3396.40	1779.57	5701.50
	OTHERS	918.65	5157.11	1874.62	7950.39	446.76	2182.79	856.34	3485.89	471.90	2974.32	1018.29	4464.50
	TOTAL	7217.38	31002.35	10807.33	49027.06	3320.22	13236.07	5135.70	21691.99	3897.16	17766.29	5671.63	27335.07
	Et-al	15.78	335.80	214.71	566.28	8.32	97.39	51.82	157.53	7.46	238.41	162.89	408.75
	TOTAL	7233.15	31338.15	11022.04	49593.34	3328.54	13333.46	5187.52	21849.52	3904.61	18004.69	5834.52	27743.82
<b>Regional articles</b>	Country of publication				1991-1995				1996-2000				
	TOTAL				TOTAL				TOTAL				
	USA	UK	C. EUROPE	TOTAL	USA	UK	C. EUROPE	TOTAL	USA	UK	C. EUROPE	TOTAL	
<b>Author Country</b>	USA	1594.57	3834.46	2635.78	8064.80	765.03	2221.38	1344.60	4331.01	829.54	1613.08	1291.18	3733.79
	UK	107.15	6059.53	496.28	6662.95	0.00	2798.61	312.91	3111.52	107.15	3260.92	183.37	3551.43
	C. EUROPE	342.01	2919.54	2177.85	5439.40	73.71	1204.92	891.80	2170.43	268.30	1714.62	1286.05	3268.97
	OTHERS	200.21	1900.55	1096.23	3196.99	89.05	923.80	471.61	1484.46	111.16	976.75	624.62	1712.53
	TOTAL	2243.94	14714.07	6406.14	23364.14	927.79	7148.71	3020.92	11097.42	1316.15	7565.36	3385.22	12266.73
	Et-al	0.00	215.83	137.67	353.50	0.00	80.35	26.20	106.55	0.00	135.48	111.47	246.95
	TOTAL	2243.94	14929.90	6543.80	23717.64	927.79	7229.06	3047.12	11203.97	1316.15	7700.84	3496.68	12513.67
<b>Urban articles</b>	Country of publication				1991-1995				1996-2000				
	TOTAL				TOTAL				TOTAL				
	USA	UK	C. EUROPE	TOTAL	USA	UK	C. EUROPE	TOTAL	USA	UK	C. EUROPE	TOTAL	
<b>Author Country</b>	USA	4102.57	5478.63	3320.95	12902.15	2048.86	2522.01	1807.44	6378.30	2053.71	2956.62	1513.51	6523.84
	UK	95.95	7006.88	280.89	7383.72	22.83	2404.77	133.87	2561.47	73.12	4602.11	147.02	4822.26
	C. EUROPE	426.28	3409.27	1123.14	4958.69	114.87	1362.61	526.01	2003.49	311.41	2046.66	597.13	2955.20
	OTHERS	778.49	3650.90	1020.65	5450.03	379.03	1407.30	526.05	2312.37	399.46	2243.60	494.60	3137.66
	TOTAL	5403.30	19545.67	5745.62	30694.59	2565.59	7696.68	2993.36	13255.63	2837.71	11849.00	2752.26	17438.96
	Et-al	15.78	149.51	119.76	285.05	8.32	46.59	38.71	93.62	7.46	102.93	81.05	191.43
	TOTAL	5419.07	19695.18	5865.38	30979.63	2573.91	7743.26	3032.07	13349.24	2845.16	11951.92	2833.31	17630.39

**TABLE A1. Number of articles, pages and standardized pages of the full data set**

<b>Number of articles</b>											
<b>Journal</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1993</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>ARS</b>	18	25	25	22	24	23	24	27	35	34	257
<b>IJURR</b>	41	39	40	40	39	38	44	45	45	52	423
<b>IRSR</b>	8	11	18	18	40	17	11	10	13	18	164
<b>JRS</b>	25	27	27	28	33	30	30	34	31	32	297
<b>JUE</b>	53	50	42	39	37	36	47	46	49	45	444
<b>PRS</b>	27	29	27	28	21	25	26	20	27	22	252
<b>RSUE</b>	46	37	39	39	39	29	36	35	35	30	365
<b>RS</b>	42	56	73	69	67	69	80	74	79	78	687
<b>US</b>	55	73	95	87	84	95	90	111	125	127	942
<b>TOTAL</b>	315	347	386	370	384	362	388	402	439	438	3831

  

<b>Number of pages</b>											
<b>Journal</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1993</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>ARS</b>	263	363	348	386	412	410	481	531	563	599	4356
<b>IJURR</b>	532	560	543	656	608	671	598	597	725	843	6333
<b>IRSR</b>	158	154	226	416	403	243	230	248	262	325	2665
<b>JRS</b>	389	413	447	506	601	583	622	607	666	679	5513
<b>JUE</b>	807	808	803	729	734	735	950	962	1009	1053	8590
<b>PRS</b>	441	419	429	436	386	515	476	417	401	393	4313
<b>RSUE</b>	765	612	753	761	758	664	783	722	687	681	7186
<b>RS</b>	498	610	753	758	718	719	837	807	830	824	7354
<b>US</b>	866	1160	1539	1524	1422	1670	1762	2077	2072	2283	16375
<b>TOTAL</b>	4719	5099	5841	6172	6042	6210	6739	6968	7215	7680	62685

  

<b>Number of standardized pages</b>											
<b>Journal</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>1992</b>	<b>1993</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>ARS</b>	202.51	279.51	250.56	277.92	296.64	295.20	346.32	382.32	405.36	485.19	3221.53
<b>IJURR</b>	516.04	543.20	526.71	636.32	589.76	650.87	580.06	579.09	703.25	817.71	6143.01
<b>IRSR</b>	99.54	97.02	142.38	262.08	253.89	153.09	156.40	168.64	186.02	230.75	1749.81
<b>JRS</b>	295.64	313.88	339.72	384.56	456.76	443.08	472.72	461.32	506.16	495.67	4169.51
<b>JUE</b>	516.48	517.12	513.92	466.56	469.76	470.40	608.00	615.68	645.76	673.92	5497.60
<b>PRS</b>	330.75	314.25	321.75	327.00	289.50	386.25	357.00	312.75	308.77	302.61	3250.63
<b>RSUE</b>	504.90	403.92	496.98	502.26	500.28	438.24	516.78	476.52	453.42	449.46	4742.76
<b>RS</b>	637.44	780.80	963.84	970.24	919.04	920.32	1071.36	1032.96	1062.40	1030.00	9388.40
<b>US</b>	796.72	1067.20	1415.88	1402.08	1308.24	1536.40	1621.04	1910.84	1906.24	2100.36	15065.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	3900.02	4316.90	4971.74	5229.02	5083.87	5293.85	5729.68	5940.12	6177.38	6585.67	53228.25