

A DRAFT! PLEASE, DO NOT QUOTE!

**WHAT MAKES “INTERESTING” BUSINESS HISTORY?
Evaluation of the Most Cited Recent Business History Journal Articles**

*Paper to be presented at the 15th Annual Conference of the European Business
History Association in Athens, Greece, 24-26 August 2011*

by

Heli Valtonen
University of Jyväskylä; Academy of Finland, Finland
heli.valtonen@jyu.fi

Jari Ojala
University of Jyväskylä, Finland
jari.ojala@jyu.fi

Jari Eloranta
Appalachian State University, USA
elorantaj@appstate.edu

Introduction

This paper discusses the impact and context of the most cited articles in two premier journals in the field of business history in the 1990s (*Business History Review*, BHR (USA) and *Business History*, BH (UK)). Why do scholars refer to these articles? The obvious and most simple answer is that the most cited articles are interesting. But what makes a business history article an interesting one? Is it the topic of the paper, the findings, the method applied, the theoretical framework, the scholar him/herself and his or her reputation, the high quality of the article in general, or perhaps the controversial nature of the subject or the argumentative style the scholar has decided to use?

In an earlier paper (Eloranta, Ojala, & Valtonen, 2010), we evaluated how often quantitative tools and methods were utilized in BHR and BH in the 1990s. We found that the use of even simple quantitative tools increased the citation counts in the BHR, with the more quantitatively sophisticated articles receiving more citations, but not in BH. There were also differences in the subject matter between the two journals that might be linked to the divergence of European and American research interests. In particular, it seemed that while both journals became more theoretically-oriented, BHR concentrated more and more on the emerging IT revolution. Overall, the interdisciplinary appeal of articles increased when quantitative methods were used in conjunction with a specific theoretical framework, thus suggesting that this approach was helpful in bridging the gaps between disciplines.

During the past few years a number of bibliometric studies have emerged to discuss the citation impacts in various fields of science. The reason for that includes the growing financial and scholarly impact of databases such as ISI, ERIH (*European Reference Index for Humanities*), and Google Scholar in research evaluations – and also the relatively easy use of these sources. In most cases the bibliometric analyses have mostly concentrated on external, quantitative issues such as the number of citations, article length, and the number of authors (Judge, Cable, Colbert, & Rynes, 2007; Waldenström, Di Vaio, & Weisdorf, 2010). Only rarely have the contents of the articles been analysed at a deeper level to find out what exactly makes the article so appealing that it gets citations in first place. (see also (Stremersch, Verniers, & Verhoef, 2007))

Bibliometric studies can roughly be divided into two categories: 1) those that analyze the contributions in a given field, using various quantitative tools like econometric analyses of the determinants of citations or network models, in order to gauge what has been done in this field in the past and what the dominant research trends are going to be in the future; 2) those that use similar tools, but are aimed at certain normative and policy goals, especially in order to evaluate the effectiveness of research and the appropriate levels/targets of funding. (Abramo, Angelo, & Caprasecca, 2009; Davis & Carden, 1998; Huang & Chang, 2008) In the first group of studies, the analyses usually concentrate on a single field of study—like finance (Chung & Cox, 1990), communication (Feeley, 2008), organizational innovation (Hsing-Chau, Lin-Yuan, & Kuo-Hsun, 2010), strategic management (Peng & Zhou, 2006) etc.—or certain issues, including trust marketing (Arnott, 2007), corporate political action (Skippari, Eloranta, Lamberg, & Parvinen, 2005), web-based citations practices (Cronin, 2001; Dangzhi & Strotmann, 2007) and so forth.

Furthermore, typically the very reason for the citation counts has not been questioned. Citation databases as such do have a lot of source critical challenges for historians to consider (see more in detail below), but still they do help answer

some of the key issues in a given discipline, as scientific knowledge is ultimately created through the critical academic discussion.(Andrew, Hong, Qi, Zhou, & Brenda, 2009) There is also plenty of criticism that maintains that referential chains (or clusters, see e.g. (Franceschet, 2009; Jarwal, Brion, & King, 2009)), which are commonly analyzed on the basis of citation counts, do not fit well with disciplines such as history, in which the knowledge is created through archival sources rather than by referring to previous literature.(Kelly, 2009) Nevertheless, the discussion itself is often important, and bibliometric citation counts might reveal at least something about these discussions. For an academic getting the texts published is an achievement as such. That is, however, not enough; the texts should inspire discussion in order to contribute to the knowledge creation.

There have not been many efforts to do that among business historians, at least in a comprehensive, bibliometric fashion.(Lamoreaux, Raff, & Temin, 2008) Here we are not going to engage in comprehensive bibliometric analysis, but we do wish to chart some important trends in the recent business history scholarship. To understand “the philosophy” (i.e., why other scholars cite above all certain papers) behind the citations at a deeper level, we analyze references to the all-time ten most cited ISI-ranked Business History and Business History Review articles (20 articles altogether). The basic data is compiled by employing the ISI Web database. The ten most cited BH articles have 171 citations in 71 journals and, respectively, the then most cited BHR articles have 570 citations in 189 journals. The analyses consist of the following main factors: who is referring to the article (the field of scholarship); what is the forum where the citation is made, e.g. the type of paper the citation is made in (article, review, proceedings paper) and the field of scholarship of the journal (business history, management, law, geography etc.); what is the subject of the paper where the citation is; what part of the article is referred to (subject, findings, methodology etc.); and the nature of the citation (neutral/declaratory, appreciative, critical). We analyze the data both quantitatively and qualitatively.

The main goal of the paper is to find out who is citing the scholarly contributions made in these two journals and why? Thus, we go beyond the general bibliometric analysis by looking also at the internal, not just external features of the articles. For this purpose, we first selected the ten most cited articles from both journals, based on ISI-data (Appendix 1). Secondly, we analyzed all the articles citing these articles. Based on this analysis, we argue that the majority of the articles citing business history scholarship are focused on their substance and novel findings, and only seldom are the methods or theories represented in business history journals the target of their interest. In most cases the citations were neutral by nature, whereas both critical and supportive ones were rare. It seems to be that the scholars citing business history articles often consider this field as providing complementary information to their own, or at least that they want to provide an acknowledgement of the empirical work done by business historians. In terms of the journals having citations to articles in these two journals, we found that history-related journals seem to dominate the citations for Business History, while in the case of Business History Review the scope is more diverse and interdisciplinary. The average time lag between the published article and the article in which it is cited was the same for both journals: 14 years. The variation, however, is rather significant, 47 years at most, and in some cases, the citations were published at the same year as were the cited articles.

Our research highlights the methodological and analytical trends and differences in the recent business history scholarship, which we see as a valuable exercise in the post-Chandlerian research environment. Business historians have not

engaged in such methodological reviews and debates often enough. Our goal is engage in such debate, and to probe further the possibility of divergent research agendas and foci between the European and North American scholars.

Methodology, Sources, and Data

This article is based on the citation data collected from the Thompson ISI-database, and a careful quantitative and qualitative analysis of the contents of the articles citing BHR and BH. A plethora of the existing literature is quite critical of the ISI database (e.g. (Kelly, 2009)), thus we do not need to go deeper into this general discussion. However, certain observations relevant for this particular paper should be noted. Namely, especially in the field of business history, the Thompson database does not necessarily reveal the “real” importance of the articles as such; e.g. analysis utilizing Google Scholar might produce rather different outcomes, especially as some (business) historians tend to publish their research in monographs and edited volumes rather than in international journals (see e.g. (Eloranta et al., 2010)), on Google scholar and indices, see especially (Harzing & van der Wal, 2009; Rosenstreich & Wooliscroft, 2009)), yet monographs, which undoubtedly constitute a highly influential body of publications in shaping historical disciplines, are not analyzed in this article. However, as this paper is not primarily interested in the question of which articles are the most cited, but rather which articles get citations in the first place and why, the question of the reliability of the ISI-database is not as important for this particular paper.

However, there are some issues that created challenges for this paper. For some of the articles the ISI-data was rather vague. Furthermore, as we selected only exactly ten of the most cited articles, we were forced to leave out the analysis of certain articles that actually had the same number of citations as the very last ones on the lists for BH and BHR. As we decided to include only ten articles in both cases to make this exercise more manageable, we made the selection for the last articles to be included on the basis of the year of publication in order to make the comparisons as useful as possible. Namely, we selected the most recent articles to be included in the sample. In the case of BH, the last noted article received 13 citations (Turrell, 1986), yet the same amount also applied to two other, a bit older articles at the time of our analysis, but they were left out (Kirby, 1974; Shaw, 1983). In the case of BHR, the last one in the analysis was the article by William Lazonick (1983) on Cotton Industry Technology change, leaving out Alfred Chandler’s classic but older analysis on Big Business in United States with the same amount of citations (Chandler, 1959).

Thus, the analysis was based on the citations made to the ten most cited articles in BH and BHR. Table 1 summarizes the main characteristics of the most cited articles in these journals, whilst Tables 2 and 3 describes briefly the main attributes of the analyzed articles. All together 1922 articles (and other published items) were published in BH and BHR in 1956-2009. The top ten most cited articles comprise circa one per cent of the all articles in both cases, 1.5 to 1.6 per cent of the pages, yet between 8.2 to 17.5 per cent shares of all the citations to the journals analysed. The top cited articles were more concentrated in case of BHR, which confirms the results of our earlier analysis.(Eloranta et al., 2010) Moreover, as Waldenström et al. (2010) argue, the length of the article correlates with the number of citations in economic history journals, and our analysis of the business history journals confirm this result: In both cases the most cited articles are longer than the rest of the articles on average.

Table 1. Characteristics of Articles Published in BH and BHR and the Ten Most Cited Articles in the Same Journals

	BH All	BH Top 10	BHR All	BHR Top 10
Number of articles	911	10	1011	10
% share of articles	100	1.1	100	1.0
First publication year	1958	1962	1956	1970
Last publication year	2009	1996	2009	1993
Average publication year	1990	1984	1980	1984
Total number of pages	16796	270	23058	340
Average number of pages	18	27	23	34
Mean number of pages	19	24	23	36
Max number of pages	57	57	81	58
Min number of pages	0	13	0	12
% share from pages	100	1.6	100	1.5
Total number of cites	2081	171	3251	570
Average number of cites	2	17	3	57
Mean number of cites	1	17	1	59
Max number of cites	23	23	85	85
Min number of cites	0	13	0	34
% share of cites	100	8.2	100	17.5

Source: Thompson ISI Web of Science.

As can be detected from Table 2 below, the number of pieces citing the articles (respectively) was considerable higher for BHR than for BH. In both cases we were forced to leave some of the articles out of the analysis simply because we were not able to find copies of them, despite a collective effort by the authors either in Europe or in the United States. The total number of the articles we were not able to find was nine in the case of BH and 32 in the case of BHR. Still, however, the coverage of the sample is about 95 per cent in both cases, thus the results can be considered reliable.

Table 2. Number of Articles Containing Citations to the Top Ten Most Cited Articles in BH and BHR

	BH	BHR	Total
Number of articles containing citations	166	527	693
Number of analysed articles (i.e., article available/found)	157	495	652
% of analysed	95	94	94

Source: Thompson ISI Web of Science.

The main external characteristics of articles containing citations to BH and BHR seem to be rather similar, as presented in Table 3. Some differences, however, can also be discerned. The most notable one is related to the question of referential chains. Obviously the articles containing citations to BHR have gained more citations since there are more than three times more articles containing citations to BHR. However, a more interesting fact is that the articles with citations to BHR have gained almost six times more citations; thus, even the average number of cites per article is double compared to BH. This in turn might be related to different publishing traditions in the US and in Europe, as well as to the fact that ISI covers better the published matter in the US. The high number of citations, of course, does not necessarily have anything to do with the articles originally published in BH and BHR, which can be clearly seen in our qualitative analysis.

Table 3. Main Characteristics of Articles Containing Citations to Top Ten Most Cited Articles in BH and BHR

	Articles Citing BH Top 10	Articles Citing BHR Top 10
First publication year	1963	1973
Last publication year	2009	2009
Average publication year	1997	1996
Total number of pages	4401	13135
Average number of pages	27	25
Mean number of pages	23	22
Max number of pages	236	236
Min number of pages	1	1
Total number of cites	1622	9595
Average number of cites	9.8	18.2
Mean number of cites	5	4
Max number of cites	233	1096
Min number of cites	0	0

Source: Thompson ISI Web of Science.

An interesting fact is that there are several articles citing BHR that have gained hundreds of citations, while in the sample of articles citing BH there are only two articles that have gained more than one hundred citations themselves; both actually citing same article, namely Saul's article on the early development of British motor industry. (Geroski, 1995; Rosenberg, 1963; Saul, 1962) The highest number of citations, over one thousand, was acquired by the Levitt and March article on organizational learning, which in turn cited the Dutton et al. article in BHR on managerial technology.(Dutton, 1984; Levitt, 1988)

Content Analysis

Quantitative Characteristics

In the following we will analyze in more detail the articles containing citations to BH and BHR. We will first start with some general quantitative issues and characterizations, and then move forward to more qualitative content analysis of the most interesting cases.

“History” journals seem to dominate the citations for BH (65 per cent), while in the case of BHR the scope is more diverse, as seen in Table 4. Same can also be seen when analyzing the items published by the most cited authors in different fields; in the case of BH, history dominates, whereas the authors in BHR have a more varied track record (Eloranta et al., 2010). Furthermore, especially scholars that published in business and economic history journals were likely to cite BH (and there are often also citations to the author's own previous BH articles), while in BHR the more “general” history journals are more visible among the sources of citations. The difference lies especially in the field of economic history, which seems to have closer relationship with business history in Europe than in the US. (for further discussion, see (Eloranta et al., 2010))

Table 4. Scope of Journal with Citations to the Top Ten Most Cited Articles in BH and BHR (Per Cent Share)

	BH	BHR	Total
History	9	22	19
Business history	32	10	15
Economic history	23	4	8
History total	65	36	42
Economics	8	13	12
Management, business, organizational	8	21	18
Other (science, tech, research policies)	19	31	28
Together	100	100	100

Source: Thompson ISI Web of Science.

Note: Known (=the scope of the journal known) cases for BH equals 155, for BHR 495, and equalling a total of 650.

This analysis might suggest to us that business history is part of a broader, perhaps more interdisciplinary academic discourse in the US than in Europe. Still, the demarcation between economic and business history is more substantial in the US – here we can actually distinguish a striking difference with the economic history field as a whole, which seems to be dominated by authors from economics rather than historians (Di Vaio, 2010), which has caused even a fear to emerge among the more historically-oriented scholar that economic history will transform it from a distinct academic discipline into a sub-field of economics (Romer, 1994).

Table 5. Focus of Citations in the Known Cases (Per Cent Shares)

	BH	BHR	Total
Method	5	2	3
Theory	3	10	8
Substance/novel finding	52	36	40
Other	40	52	49
Together	100	100	100

Source: Thompson ISI Web of Science.

Notes: 1) one article can have various types of citations; 2) the number of known cases (=individual citations) is 197 in the case of BH, 608 for BHR, and 805 in total. The number of citations for which the type of citation is not known is 69 (47 for BH – that is 19 per cent of the cases - and 22 for BHR)

One possible hypothesis is that a novel methodological contribution or theory should attract more citations; that is, however, not exactly the case according to our analysis. The Table 5 reveals that the substance and/or novel findings induced citations in both cases. Still, in BHR especially theory did play a more important role, perhaps even encouraging the interdisciplinary citations. The category “other” is rather broad (and important), usually containing a “list-type” of citations to previous literature, with no particular focus (which is rather typical in all history journals).

Table 6. Type of Citations in the Known Cases (Per Cent Shares)

	BH	BHR	Total
Supporting	6	8	7
Critical	6	3	4
Neutral	88	90	89
Total	100	100	100

Source: Thompson ISI Web of Science.

Note: The total number of known cases is 675; 160 for BH, and 515 for BHR. The type is not known for almost one fourth of the cases (23 per cent), in about one third for BH (34 per cent) and one fifth for BHR (18 per cent), which makes the case weaker.

A vast majority of the citations were neutral by nature, meaning basically supportive, as can be detected from Table 6. Thus, the argument that highly controversial articles induce citations does not get any support from our analysis. Mostly scholars seem to refer to the work by business historians in order to provide context to their own, perhaps validating their theoretical observations or models.

Table 7. Time Lag between the Publication and the Citation

	BH	BHR	Total
Average	14	14	14
Min	0	2	0
Max	47	39	47

Source: Thompson ISI Web of Science.

Fascinatingly, in both journals the average time lag between the published article and the citing article is the same: 14 years. The variation, however, is rather significant: 47 years at most, and in some cases, the citations were published at the same year as were the cited articles. While these observations are helpful in order to answer the questions posed in this article, especially why business history scholarship is cited, they do not provide enough detail about the context of the articles in question, nor the topics they cover. In order to do that, we also engaged in a qualitative review of the top most cited articles.

Qualitative Analysis of the Most Cited Articles

The most cited articles in BH and BHR have certain differentiating characteristics also when analyzed qualitatively. In BH, the top ten articles concentrate more on subjects dealing with questions mainly related to British business history (Bostock & Jones, 1994; Broadberry & Crafts, 1996; Hannah, 1974; Mass & Lazonick, 1990; Saul, 1962) and exhibit the features of case study articles (Liebenau, 1984; Turrell, 1986). The most cited articles in BHR, for one, discuss subjects such as high tech (and technology in general) (Christensen, 1993; Cusumano, Mylonadis, & Rosenbloom, 1992; Langlois, 1992); (US) economic policies and regulation or economic thought (Hawley, 1978; McCraw, 1975); or theoretical, methodological, and other questions related to business history as a discipline (Galambos, 1970, 1983). In short, in BH there are more papers on subjects often representing themes important for the history of Great Britain, whereas BHR favors subjects which have global interest (types of business, types of industries). This state of affairs may, up to a point, explain why articles published in BHR get more citations in a more varied spectrum of journals and articles.

On the other hand, the strict political division between conservative and liberals in the United States, as well as the US governmental structure and polity in general, may attract citations on articles concerned with economic policies, regulation, or/and economic thought (Hawley, 1978; McCraw, 1975). Besides, it should be noted that certain subjects, like regulation, have been under heated societal and economic debate in the United States since the nineteenth century. This may create interest towards these articles among researchers from other disciplines.

The concentration on case studies or nationally important subjects does not, however, necessarily imply lower citation impact or less interest among scholars from other disciplines. Helper's (1991) case study on the US automobile industry published in BHR is a good example on that. Her study titled 'Strategy and Irreversibility in Supplier Relations: The Case of the United States Automobile Industry' has attracted citations relatively widely also in outlets other than business, history, economics, or management journals. Their field of expertise varies from computer science and engineering to environmental studies and geography as well as from law to political science and social sciences. Many of these publications represent cross-disciplinary, multidisciplinary, or interdisciplinary fields of research.

In contrast, Lazonick's (1983) BHR article 'Industrial Organization and Technological Change: The Decline of the British Cotton Industry' has induced citations mainly among economic and business history journals as well as economics journals. It is also notable that the articles citing Lazonick are more often representing humanities than, for example, the articles citing Helper. In that sense Lazonick's article in BHR resembles articles published in BH, which are often cited in history journals as well as in social science and humanities journals. On the other hand, Mira Wilkins' (1992) article on trademarks and the modern corporation in BH has similarities with the BHR top ten, inasmuch it gets citations also in journals like *Industrial and Corporate Change*, *Information Society* and various law reviews. This may be so due to the subject matter of 'trademarks', which possibly has attracted interest among different disciplines.

Another issue which may attract an increasing number of citations is, in broad terms, comparisons, or methodologies facilitating comparative research. Most of the most cited articles have at least some kind of comparative perspective inherent in them, whether it means comparisons between countries (or economies), industries, firms, or disciplines. Another common feature between most of these twenty articles is that they are written on widely studied subjects. For example, Lazonick's (1983) BHR article as well as Mass and Lazonick's (1990) BH article are both part of the same fairly heated debate on the decline of the British cotton industry—a topic that has been studied widely, with a multitude of contributions, theories, and empirical observations among scholars. It is possible gauge the importance of Lazonick's (1983) article by reading John F. Wilson's comments in his textbook on British business history (Wilson, 1995), in which he cites and comments this particular article several times, along with some other articles written by Lazonick (Elbaum & Lazonick, 1986; Lazonick, 1991). All of these three articles discuss similar themes: British business culture, business organizations, managerial structure and organizational change in Britain and effects they had on British industrial and economic performance.

Other widely studied subjects include innovations and strategies, and many of the top ten articles, at the very least, touch on these themes. The clearest exceptions to that are Hawley's (1978) article on corporate liberalism and McCraw's (1975) review of regulation in the United States, as well as the article 'British Economic Policy and Industrial Performance in the Early Post War Period' by

Broadberry and Crafts (1996). Conversely, articles like Anderson's (1970) study on money and credit in eighteenth century deal with strategies to some extent. What is notable is that even though many of the top ten articles are cited in management journals, only one article is entirely focused on the history of management, namely Dutton, Thomas and Butler's (1984) study on progress functions as a managerial technology, published in BHR. This does not mean, however, that such themes like the history of management or managerial culture are rare among the top ten articles in BH or BHR. On the contrary, almost every article deals with management somehow, even if sometimes only by implication. Given the influence of Chandler and the managerial revolution, this is hardly surprising.

Reviews (Galambos, 1970, 1983; Mass et al., 1990; McCraw, 1975; Turrell, 1986) and articles with the characteristics of a review (Edgerton, 1987; Hawley, 1978) are excessively represented in the top 10 lists, both in BHR and BH. Some of the reviews were written in a relatively provocative style (e.g. (Hawley, 1978)). The multiplicity of reviews and articles resembling reviews indicates that broader reviews may attract more citations because they review and summarize the existing body of literature—and not merely literature in economic and business history but other disciplines as well (e.g. (McCraw, 1975))—and bring forth future challenges on a certain subject matter and thus raise more questions and interesting topics than try to give answers for.

Discussion

This paper focused on analyzing the main characteristics of the most cited articles in two premier journals in the field of business history (*Business History Review*, BHR (USA) and *Business History*, BH (UK)). Why would scholars refer to these particular articles? The obvious and most simple answer is that the most cited articles are interesting. But what makes a business history article an interesting one?

In earlier research we found that the use of even simple quantitative tools increased the citation counts in BHR, with the more quantitatively sophisticated articles receiving more citations, but not in BH. There were certain differences in the subject matter between the two journals that might be linked to the divergence of European and American academic discourses. Overall, the interdisciplinary appeal of articles that used quantitative methods, when used in conjunction with theory, was higher.

Here we analyzed references to the all-time ten most cited ISI ranked BH and BHR articles (20 articles altogether). We analyzed all published articles in both journals, totaling 1922 articles published between 1956 and 2009. The ten most cited BH articles had 166 citations in 71 journals, whereas the ten most cited BHR articles had 527 citations in 189 journals. The analyses consisted of the following main factors: the field of scholarship of the journal containing citations BHR and BH (business history, management, economics, etc.); what part of the article is referred to (subject, findings, methodology, theory etc.); and the nature of the citation (neutral/declaratory, appreciative, critical). We analyzed the data both quantitatively and qualitatively.

We concluded that the majority of the articles citing business history scholarship are focused on their substance and the originality of the findings. The methods or theories represented in the business history journal articles were rarely the primary focus of the outside scholars' interest. In almost 90 per cent of the cases the

citations were neutral by nature, and both critical and supportive ones were rare. The scholars citing business history articles often considered the field of business history as providing complementary information to their own, or at least that they want to provide an acknowledgement of the empirical work done by business historians. In terms of the scope of the journals having citations to articles in these two journals, we found that history-related journals seem to dominate the citations for BH, whilst in the case of BHR the scope is more diverse and interdisciplinary. Fascinatingly, in both journals the average time lag between the published article and the article in which it is cited is the same: 14 years. The variation, however, is rather significant, 47 years at most, and in some cases, the citations were published at the same year as were the cited articles.

The top ten articles published in BH tended to concentrate more on subjects dealing with questions mainly related on British business history and, in particular, the decline of the British industrial status. The most cited articles in BHR, for one, discussed subjects such as high tech (and technology in general), economic policies and regulation in the United States, economic thought, or theoretical, methodological and other questions related to business history as a discipline. This may, up to a point, explain why articles published in BHR have attracted more citations in more varied spectrum of journals and articles. Besides, it should be noted that certain subjects, like regulation, have been under heated debate in the United States at least since the nineteenth century, which may have created interest towards these articles among researchers from other disciplines.

Concentration on case studies or nationally important subjects has not necessarily led to lower citation impact or less interest among scholars from other disciplines. Many of these publications represent cross-disciplinary, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary fields of research. One common feature between most of these twenty articles is that they are written on widely studied subjects, like the decline of the British cotton industry. Other widely studied subjects include innovations and strategies, and many of the top ten articles featured at least some discussion of them. Even though many of the top ten articles were cited in management journals, only one of the top ten articles was primarily focused on the history of management. However, almost every one of these articles dealt with management somehow, either in terms of theory or empirical observations of management, even if sometimes only by implication. Moreover, broad reviews and articles resembling reviews were excessively represented in the top ten lists both in BHR and BH. The abundance of reviews and review articles is indicative that such overviews of scholarship may attract more citations because they review and summarize an existing body of literature and theorize about the future of the field itself.

In terms of further challenges for our research, we, first of all, need to probe the data further to reconcile our earlier findings and the results outlined here; in particular, why the quantitative analysis of the citations seemed to indicate a larger role for (quantitative) methods and theory, and why the broader citation trends seem to suggest that the empirical side of the business historians' work is perhaps more important. It is entirely possible that the broader citation trends could be dissected and analyzed further by utilizing various bibliometric methods. It is also quite plausible that *both* the empirical insights *and* certain methodological bridges, like quantitative methods or the aforementioned reviews of scholarly trends, make business history scholarship more appealing outside the field. Finally, a deeper qualitative review of the scholarship, going beyond the top ten most cited articles, might be necessary to understand further the reasons for the appeal recent business history scholarship.

References:

- Abramo, G., Angelo, C. A., & Caprasecca, A. 2009. Allocative efficiency in public research funding: Can bibliometrics help? *Research Policy*, 38(1): 206-215.
- Anderson, B. L. 1970. Money and Structure of Credit in Eighteenth Century. *Business History*, 12(2): 85-101.
- Andrew, L. I. M., Hong, M. A., Qi, W. E. N., Zhou, X. U., & Brenda, C. 2009. Distinguishing Citation Quality for Journal Impact Assessment. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(8): 111-116.
- Arnott, D. C. 2007. Research on trust: a bibliography and brief bibliometric analysis of the special issue submissions. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41(9/10): 1203-1240.
- Bostock, F., & Jones, G. 1994. Foreign Multinationals in British Manufacturing, 1850-1962. *Business History*, 36(1): 89-126.
- Broadberry, S., & Crafts, N. F. R. 1996. British Economic Policy and Industrial Performance in the Early Post-War Period. *Business History*, 38(4): 65-91.
- Chandler, A. 1959. The Beginnings of Big Business in American Industry. *Business History Review*, 33(1): 1-31.
- Christensen, C. M. 1993. The Rigid Disk Drive. *The Business History Review*, 67(4): 531-588.
- Chung, K. H., & Cox, R. A. K. 1990. Patterns of Productivity in the Finance Literature: A Study of the Bibliometric Distributions. *Journal of Finance*, 45(1): 301-309.
- Cronin, B. 2001. Bibliometrics and beyond: some thoughts on web-based citation analysis. *Journal of Information Science*, 27(1): 1-7.
- Cusumano, M. A., Mylonadis, Y., & Rosenbloom, R. S. 1992. Strategic Maneuvering and Mass-Market Dynamics: The Triumph of VHS over Beta. *The Business History Review*, 66(1): 51-94.
- Dangzhi, Z., & Strotmann, A. 2007. Can citation analysis of Web publications better detect research fronts? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 58(9): 1285-1302.
- Davis, C., & Carden, F. 1998. Research Effectiveness and R&D evaluation in developing countries. *Knowledge, Technology & Policy*, 10(4): 7-30.
- Di Vaio, G., Daniel Waldenström, Jacob Wisdorf. 2010. *Citation Success: Evidence from Economic History Journal Publications*. Stockholm: Research Institute of Industrial Economics.
- Dutton, J. M., A. Thomas, J.E. Butler. 1984. This history of Progress Functions as a Managerial Technology. *Business History Review*, 58(2): 204.
- Edgerton, D. E. H. 1987. Science and Technology in British Business History. *Business History*, 29(4): 84-104.
- Elbaum, B., & Lazonick, W. 1986. An institutional perspective on British decline. In B. Elbaum, & W. Lazonick (Eds.), *The Decline of the British Economy*. Oxford.
- Eloranta, J., Ojala, J., & Valtonen, H. 2010. Quantitative methods in business history: An impossible equation? *Management & Organizational History*, 5(1): 79-107.
- Feeley, T. H. 2008. A Bibliometric Analysis of Communication Journals from 2002 to 2005. *Human Communication Research*, 34(3): 505-520.

- Franceschet, M. 2009. A cluster analysis of scholar and journal bibliometric indicators. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 60(10): 1950-1964.
- Galambos, L. 1970. Emerging Organizational Synthesis in Modern American History. *Business History Review*, 44(3): 279-290.
- Galambos, L. 1983. Technology, Political-Economy, and Professionalization - Central Themes of the Organizational Synthesis. *Business History Review*, 57(4): 471-493.
- Geroski, P. A. 1995. What do we know about entry? *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 13(4): 421-440.
- Hannah, L. 1974. Takeover Bids in Britain before 1950 - Exercise in Business pre-History. *Business History*, 16(1): 65-77.
- Harzing, A.-W., & van der Wal, R. 2009. A Google Scholar h-index for journals: An alternative metric to measure journal impact in economics and business. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 60(1): 41-46.
- Hawley, E. W. 1978. Discovery and Study of a Corporate Liberalism. *Business History Review*, 52(3): 309-320.
- Helper, S. 1991. Strategy and Irreversibility in Supplier Relations: The Case of the U.S. Automobile Industry. *The Business History Review*, 65(4): 781-824.
- Hsing-Chau, T., Lin-Yuan, C., & Kuo-Hsun, Y. 2010. CURRENT RESEARCH PARADIGMS IN EXPATRIATE(S) RESEARCH: A BIBLIOMETRIC APPROACH. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, 2(3): 22-39.
- Huang, M.-h., & Chang, Y.-w. 2008. Characteristics of research output in social sciences and humanities: From a research evaluation perspective. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 59(11): 1819-1828.
- Jarwal, S. D., Brion, A. M., & King, M. L. 2009. Measuring research quality using the journal impact factor, citations and 'Ranked Journals': blunt instruments or inspired metrics? *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, 31(4): 289-300.
- Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M., Colbert, A. E., & Rynes, S. L. 2007. WHAT CAUSES A MANAGEMENT ARTICLE TO BE CITED--ARTICLE, AUTHOR, OR JOURNAL? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3): 491-506.
- Kelly, A., Huw Morris, Michael Rowlinson, Charles Harvey (Ed.). 2009. *The Association of business schools academic journal quality guide. Version 3. Introduction: Context, purpose and method. March [Online] http://www.the-abs.org.uk/files//ABS2009web_introduction.pdf (cited Feb 9, 2010).*
- Kirby, M. 1974. Lancashire Cotton Industry in Inter-War Years - Study of Organizational Change. *Business History*, 16(2): 145-159.
- Lamoreaux, N., Raff, D. M. G., & Temin, P. 2008. Economic Theory and Business History. In G. Jones, & J. Zeitlin (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Business History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Langlois, R. N. 1992. External Economies and Economic Progress: The Case of the Microcomputer Industry. *Business History Review*, 66(1): 1-50.
- Lazonick, W. 1983. Industrial Organization and Technological Change. The Decline of the British Cotton Industry. *Business History Review*, 57(2): 195-236.
- Lazonick, W. 1991. *Business Organisation and the Myth of the Market Economy*. Cambridge.

- Levitt, B., J.G. March. 1988. Organizational Learning. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14: 319-340.
- Liebenau, J. 1984. Industrial R&D in Pharmaceutical Firms in the early 20th Century. *Business History*, 26(3): 329-346.
- Mass, W., & Lazonick, W. 1990. The British Cotton Industry and International Competitive Advantage: The State of the Debates. *Business History*, 32(4): 9-65.
- McCraw, T. K. 1975. Regulation in America - Review Article. *Business History Review*, 49(2): 159-183.
- Peng, M. W., & Zhou, J. Q. 2006. Most cited articles and authors in global strategy research. *Journal of International Management*, 12(4): 490-508.
- Romer, C. D. 1994. The End of Economic History? *Journal of Economic Education*, 25(Winter): 49-66.
- Rosenberg, N. 1963. Technological Change in the Machine Tool Industry, 1840 - 1910. *Journal of Economic History*, 23(4): 414-443.
- Rosenstreich, D., & Wooliscroft, B. 2009. Measuring the impact of accounting journals using Google Scholar and the g-index. *British Accounting Review*, 41(4): 227-239.
- Saul, S. B. 1962. The Motor Industry in Britain to 1914. *Business History*, 5(1): 22-44.
- Shaw, C. 1983. The Large Manufacturing Employers of 1907. *Business History*, 25(1): 42-60.
- Skippari, M., Eloranta, J., Lamberg, J.-A., & Parvinen, P. 2005. Conceptual and empirical underpinnings in the research of corporate political activity: A bibliometric analysis. *Finnish Journal of Business Economics*, 2(1): 185-208.
- Stremersch, S., Verniers, I., & Verhoef, P. C. 2007. The Quest for Citations: Drivers of Article Impact. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(3): 171-193.
- Turrell, R. V., J.J. Van Helten. 1986. The Rottschilds. The Exploration Company and Mining Finance. *Business History*, 28(2): 181-205.
- Waldenström, D., Di Vaio, G., & Weisdorf, J. 2010. Citation Success: Evidence from Economic History Journal Publications, *IDEAS Working Paper Series*, Vol. 819: Research Institute of Industrial Economics.
- Wilkins, M. 1992. The Neglected Intangible Asset: The Influence of the Trade Mark on the Rise of the Modern Corporation. *Business History*, 34(1): 66-95.
- Wilson, J. F. 1995. *British business history, 1720–1994*. Manchester and New York.

Appendix 1. Top 10 Most Cited Articles (Only ISI)

Business History

1. **Broadberry, S., & Crafts, N. F. R. 1996.** British Economic Policy and Industrial Performance in the Early Post-War Period. *BH*, 38(4): 65-91.
2. **Mass, W., & Lazonick, W. 1990.** The British Cotton Industry and International Competitive Advantage: The State of the Debates. *BH*, 32(4): 9-65.
3. **Wilkins, M. 1992.** The Neglected Intangible Asset: The Influence of the Trade Mark on the Rise of the Modern Corporation. *BH*, 34(1): 66-95.
4. **Hannah, L. 1974.** Takeover Bids in Britain before 1950 - Exercise in Business pre-History. *BH*, 16(1): 65-77.
5. **Anderson, B. L. 1970.** Money and Structure of Credit in Eighteenth Century. *BH*, 12(2): 85-101.
6. **Bostock, F., & Jones, G. 1994.** Foreign Multinationals in British Manufacturing, 1850-1962. *BH*, 36(1): 89-126.
7. **Liebenau, J. 1984.** Industrial R&D in Pharmaceutical Firms in the early 20th Century. *BH*, 26(3): 329-346.
8. **Saul, S. B. 1962.** The Motor Industry in Britain to 1914. *BH*, 5(1): 22-44.
9. **Edgerton, D. E. H. 1987.** Science and Technology in British Business History. *BH*, 29(4): 84-104.
10. **Turrell, R. V., J.J. Van Helten. 1986.** The Rottschilds. The Exploration Company and Mining Finance. *Business History*, 28(2): 181-205.

Business History Review

1. **Galambos, L. 1970.** Emerging Organizational Synthesis in Modern American History. *BHR*, 44(3): 279-290.
2. **Cusumano, M. A., Mylonadis, Y., & Rosenbloom, R. S. 1992.** Strategic Maneuvering and Mass-Market Dynamics: The Triumph of VHS over Beta. *BHR*, 66(1): 51-94.
3. **Helper, S. 1991.** Strategy and Irreversibility in Supplier Relations: The Case of the U.S. Automobile Industry. *BHR*, 65(4): 781-824.
4. **Langlois, R. N. 1992.** External Economies and Economic Progress: The Case of the Microcomputer Industry. *BHR*, 66(1): 1-50.
5. **Galambos, L. 1983.** Technology, Political-Economy, and Professionalization - Central Themes of the Organizational Synthesis. *BHR*, 57(4): 471-493.
6. **Christensen, C. M. 1993.** The Rigid Disk Drive Industry: A History of Commercial and Technological Turbulence. *BHR*, 67(4): 531-588.
7. **Hawley, E. W. 1978.** Discovery and Study of a Corporate Liberalism. *BHR*, 52(3): 309-320.
8. **McCraw, T. K. 1975.** Regulation in America - Review Article. *BHR*, 49(2): 159-183.
9. **Dutton, J. M., A. Thomas, J.E. Butler. 1984.** This history of Progress Functions as a Managerial Technology. *BHR*, 58(2): 204.
10. **Lazonick, W. 1983.** Industrial Organization and Technological Change. The Decline of the British Cotton Industry. *BHR*, 57(2): 195-236.