



*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

# A Content Analysis of the *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*

Conrado M. Gempesaw II and Fe Zinnia Albay

A content analysis is conducted on the *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* the official publication of the Northeastern Agricultural and Resource Economics Association, to determine whether the journal has maintained a strong regional focus and whether there has been a narrow concentration of published articles in subject area and methodology. The results show that in the 1990s (1) the share of articles that do not focus on the Northeast has increased tremendously and (2) more articles used quantitative techniques than nonquantitative methods.

The purpose of the *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* (ARER) as the official publication of the Northeastern Agricultural and Resource Economics Association (NAREA) is to foster and disseminate professional thought and literature relating to the economics of agriculture, natural resources, and community development. Since the first issue of the official publication of NAREA in 1972, it has undergone several changes in its name, content, focus, and audience as well as in physical appearance. This study analyzes the changes the journal has gone through during the period from 1978 to 1995.

In the 1986 issue of the NAREA publication that was at that time called the *Northeastern Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* (NJARE), two studies focused on evaluations of the journal based on the perspective of agricultural economics faculty and professionals. Using 1982 survey data, Broder (1986) found that faculty employed in the Northeast gave a high ranking to the NAREA publication in terms of professional quality and personal usefulness. Similar results were found by Lindsay (1986), who concluded that almost two-thirds of the NAREA membership rated the journal highly. Sixteen percent of the NAREA respondents rated the journal as an excellent outlet of publication, while 49% rated it as a good outlet. However, faculty from other regions did not hold similar views. Based on a survey of agricultural

economics faculty at major land grant universities, Broader and Ziemer (1984) found that faculty from other regions gave the journal a low ranking relative to other agricultural economics and related journals. Furthermore, these faculty members also observed that the NAREA publication maintained a strong regional character.

During the last eighteen years, the journal has undergone several important changes. Since 1978, there have been six editors, each holding a three-year term. The journal had two issues every year, with the spring issue publishing externally reviewed papers and, until 1983, the fall issue publishing selected papers presented during the NAREA annual meetings. However, in 1983 the membership voted to discontinue the practice of publishing most, if not all, of the selected papers presented at the NAREA annual meetings. In the 1983 NAREA annual business meeting, Goode (1983) noted that the impact of the decision not to publish selected papers presented was that the journal editor now explicitly controlled the contents of both issues of the journal. He further noted that the journal could become an irrelevant outlet for publication by the membership if controlled by an editor who had a narrow view in terms of subject matter and methodology.

In 1984, the journal's name was changed from the *Journal of the Northeastern Agricultural Economic Council* (JNAEC) to the *Northeastern Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*. This change was made because the association's name was changed from the Northeastern Agricultural Economic Council to its present name, the Northeastern Agricultural and Resource Economics Association. The size of the journal was also reduced, and the design and font size were changed in 1984.

---

Conrado M. Gempesaw II is professor and chair of the Department of Food and Resource Economics, University of Delaware. Fe Zinnia Albay is graduate research assistant in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Penn State University. The authors gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments of two anonymous reviewers. Published as Paper No. 1589 in the Journal Series of the Delaware Agricultural Experiment Station.

The journal name was changed again in 1992 to its present name, the *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*. The latest name change, effective with the April 1993 issue, was undertaken to broaden the scope of the journal and to communicate theoretical, applied, and empirical findings in agricultural and resource economics to regional as well as national and international audiences. In addition to the new name, the journal acquired a new cover design.

Because of the larger scope and audience, there was a marked increase in the number of articles submitted for possible publication in the *ARER*. From 1984 to 1986, 121 articles, including invited presentations, were submitted. This number dropped to 100 articles during the period from 1987 to 1989, and 108 articles during the period from 1990 to 1992. A substantial increase came in 1993 to 1995 when the total number of submissions went up to 179 articles, including invited articles.

In view of these past events affecting the *ARER*, this paper has several objectives. The first objective is to determine whether the journal still maintains a strong regional focus. The second objective is to ascertain whether there has been a narrow concentration of published articles in terms of subject area and methodology. The third objective is to report the institutional affiliations and ranks of authors and the number of authors per article published. This analysis is useful to potential authors interested in submitting manuscripts to the journal as it provides information on the scope and interest of the journal. In addition, the information presented in this study can be used by current and future editors, editorial board members, and NAREA executive board members in assessing the scope, coverage, and relevance of the journal. Finally, this study provides some evidence of the success of the journal from 1992, when the association membership decided on its latest name change with the purpose of expanding the journal's scope.

## Methodology

The analysis of the *ARER* will be conducted using a technique known as content analysis. Several other journals have been the focus of content analysis, such as the *Journal of Consumer Affairs* (Geistfeld and Key 1986), the *Harvard Business Review* and the *Journal of Marketing Research* (Helgeson, Mager, and Taylor 1984), and the *Home Economics Research Journal* (Goldsmith 1983). The general objectives of journal content analysis are to determine the types of professionals

who publish in that journal and the institutions to which they belong, to indicate trends in subject areas and methodologies used in published articles, and to provide some indication of the regional or national character of the journal. In particular, a content analysis of the *ARER* is important in evaluating the future direction of the journal.

A similar approach will be used on the *ARER*. This study will conduct a content analysis of the *ARER* for the period 1978 to 1995. (For the purpose of this study, the *ARER* name will be used as the journal title throughout this period.) During these years, there were six journal editors, each of whom may have had some impact on the type of papers published in the *ARER*. The editors were Dale Colyer (West Virginia University) from 1978 to 1980, Filmore Bender (University of Maryland) from 1981 to 1983, Cleve Willis (University of Massachusetts) from 1984 to 1986, James Dunn (Pennsylvania State University) from 1987 to 1989, Loren Tauer (Cornell University) from 1990 to 1992, and Conrado Gempesaw (University of Delaware) from 1993 to 1995. This paper will refer to each three-year term as a period; i.e., the duration from 1978 to 1980 is the first period under consideration.

Following Abdel-Ghany and Nichols (1984), the following data were collected for each of the 496 articles published in the 1978 to 1995 issues: volume and year of publication, rank/position of author(s), institutional affiliation, subject matter, region of focus, and number of authors. The rank/position of the author(s) was classified into six categories, i.e., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, research associate/assistant, USDA economist, and others. The category "others" included authors not associated with a university or with USDA and authors in other positions in a university such as extension specialists.

Institutional affiliation was divided into fifteen categories. The first twelve were land grant institutions located in the Northeast: Cornell University, Pennsylvania State University, University of Delaware, University of Maine, West Virginia University, University of New Hampshire, University of Vermont, University of Connecticut, University of Maryland, University of Massachusetts, University of Rhode Island, and Rutgers University. The last three categories were the USDA, Canada, and others. The Canada category included Canadian universities, government offices, and private institutions. The other institutions included universities outside of the Northeast region and other nonuniversity institutions. Ten classifications were used for subject area: production, marketing, resource and environment, international trade, rural and community development,

agricultural policy, methodology, agricultural finance, agricultural labor and inputs, and others. The category "others" included articles dealing with teaching programs, research expenditures, journal assessment, agricultural extension programs, land grant university systems, and agricultural economics department assessment.

A basic difficulty in the subject area classification was that an article sometimes fit into two or three categories. In this case, that article was placed in the category that was the dominant focus of the study. The same approach was followed when classifying articles based on methodology. The dominant methodology used in the article became the basis for classification. For example, one article used regression techniques in a dynamic mathematical programming model. In this instance, the article was classified under the mathematical programming classification since it was the dominant methodology utilized in the paper. Five different methodology classifications were used: econometrics/regression, mathematical programming, statistical procedures, nonquantitative, and others. The statistical procedures included analysis of variance, discriminant analysis, logit and probit analysis, and simulation models. The nonquantitative methods included descriptive statistics and graphical illustrations. The category "others" included articles that were theoretical in nature (i.e., with no empirical content) and also articles using the following procedures: input-output, partial budgeting, shift-share analysis, benefit-cost analysis, simulation models, gini ratios, GIS, and microparameter distribution models.

The region of focus criterion was divided into two categories: the Northeast and regions outside of the Northeast. The number of authors was based on the listed authors per article. In case of joint authorship, each author was given credit in terms of institutional affiliation and rank/position. This means that an article with dual authorship was counted twice when the unit of measurement was the number of authors. Finally, all classifications were based on what was available in the published articles. After all the articles were classified, sev-

eral articles were randomly selected and pretested to verify whether they were appropriately categorized. The results were then tabulated and reported, based on the three-year term of each journal editor since 1978.

## Results

During the last eighteen years, the *ARER* published a total of 496 articles representing 932 authors from more than 80 institutions. As previously mentioned, the number of authors included all the authors for all the articles. Therefore, an individual who submitted and published two articles, as either a single and/or a coauthor, was counted twice in the number of authors.

### *Region of Focus*

The distribution of the published *ARER* articles according to region of focus and period of publication is presented in table 1. There were considerably more articles published in the 1978 to 1980 period. This may be due to an earlier practice of publishing most, if not all, of the papers presented during the NAREEA annual meetings in the fall issue. In terms of regional focus, there has been a movement from a Northeast-oriented focus to a broader area of focus. In the first two periods, from 1978 to 1983, almost two-thirds of the articles published were focused on the Northeast. This proportion went down to approximately one-half during the two periods from 1984 to 1989. Finally, in the last two periods, from 1990 to 1995, the proportion of articles focused on the Northeast has gone down to less than one-third of the total number of articles published.

These results confirm Broder and Ziemer's findings (1984), based on 1982 survey data, that the *ARER* had a strong regional character. However, in the last six years the *ARER* has increased its publication of articles not focused on the Northeast. This result is reinforced when the institutional affiliations of authors by period of publication are

**Table 1. Region of Focus of Published *ARER* Articles**

Region	1978-80	1981-83	1984-86	1987-89	1990-92	1993-95	Total
Northeast	75 (63.56) <sup>1</sup>	55 (62.50)	44 (48.35)	34 (52.31)	19 (31.67)	22 (29.73)	249 (50.20)
Others	43 (36.44)	33 (37.50)	47 (51.65)	31 (47.69)	41 (68.33)	52 (70.27)	247 (49.80)
Total number of articles	118	88	91	65	60	74	496

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in parentheses are column percentages.

analyzed, as shown in table 2. During the first period of the study, almost 78% of the authors belonged to Northeast universities (not including USDA). Recently, this percentage has decreased, with only 54% of the authors from the Northeast for the 1990 to 1992 period, and only 45% for 1993 to 1995. The percentage of authors from universities outside of the Northeast and other non-university institutions increased from 22% for the 1978 to 1980 period to 55% for 1993 to 1995. If USDA was included in the Northeast classification, more than 53% of the 1993 to 1995 authors came from the Northeast region.

### Leading Universities

Overall, Cornell and Penn State had the largest number of authors for the eighteen-year period (Table 2). On the average, almost half (46%) of the authors with articles published in the journal from 1978 to 1995 belonged to only five Northeast institutions, i.e., Cornell, Penn State, Massachusetts, Maryland, and Rutgers. Furthermore, among the Northeast universities alone, these five schools contributed an average of 71% of the published authors. This is not totally unexpected considering that these universities also have a bigger pool of agricultural economics faculty, particularly in the case of Cornell and Penn State. However, the share of these five universities from the total number of authors has dropped from a high of 55% in the 1981 to 1983 period to 40% in the 1990 to 1992 period, and finally to 31% in the 1993 to 1995 period. This drop in the share is a result of the increase in the number of authors from other uni-

versities outside the Northeast region and other institutions aside from USDA.

Since articles that are jointly written by two or more authors are counted several times, there is a bias in counting the number of authors toward the articles that have more authors. Some multiauthor articles are written by persons from the same institution, while other articles are a result of a collaboration of authors from two or three institutions. Table 3 shows the affiliation of the first author only, i.e., the sole writer for single-author articles and the first writer for the multiauthor articles. Again, Penn State and Cornell are the dominant sources of first authors of published *ARER* articles.

### Subject Area

An analysis of published articles by subject area is presented in table 4. Overall, almost half (47%) of the articles were classified as belonging to the traditional production, marketing, and resource economics areas. However, there has been a decrease in the share of articles on production economics. On the one hand, production articles went down from 23% (1981 to 1983) to only 8% (1993 to 1995). On the other hand, articles dealing with resource economics increased from 22% (1978 to 1980) to 28% (1990 to 1992) but declined to 18% in the latest period (1993 to 1995). The share of marketing-related articles has fluctuated but is still higher at 16% during the 1993 to 1995 period compared with the earlier years. The number of trade articles has increased from less than 1% during the 1978 to 1980 period to almost 11% during the 1993 to 1995 period. Agricultural policy articles

**Table 2. Affiliation of Authors of Published *ARER* Articles**

Institution	1978-80	1981-83	1984-86	1987-89	1990-92	1993-95	Total
Cornell	29	21	25	23	13	10	121
Penn State	16	30	21	34	15	28	144
Delaware	7	6	2	11	3	4	33
Maine	6	0	4	7	3	2	22
West Virginia	8	2	14	3	4	5	36
New Hampshire	17	1	1	0	2	0	21
Vermont	3	2	2	0	0	0	7
Connecticut	13	9	2	3	2	3	32
Maryland	11	15	15	1	5	3	50
Massachusetts	28	8	9	11	11	9	76
Rhode Island	4	4	6	3	1	8	26
Rutgers	13	13	7	3	2	2	40
USDA	13	13	9	7	8	13	63
Canada	1	0	6	4	5	3	19
Others	30	33	43	23	40	73	242
Total number of authors	199	157	166	133	114	163	932

**Table 3. Affiliation of First Authors of Published *ARER* Articles**

Institution	1978-80	1981-83	1984-86	1987-89	1990-92	1993-95	Total
Cornell	15	13	14	10	5	6	63
Penn State	8	15	9	16	7	12	67
Delaware	5	3	2	5	2	3	20
Maine	4	0	2	2	2	1	11
West Virginia	6	1	6	1	2	2	18
New Hampshire	9	1	1	0	2	0	13
Vermont	3	1	1	0	0	0	5
Connecticut	7	5	1	2	1	2	18
Maryland	7	10	6	1	3	1	28
Massachusetts	17	4	5	4	5	3	38
Rhode Island	1	2	4	1	1	3	12
Rutgers	8	8	3	2	2	2	25
USDA	7	9	5	3	7	7	38
Canada	1	0	3	3	4	1	12
Others	19	16	29	15	17	31	129
Total number of articles	118	88	91	65	60	74	496

were very few between 1981 and 1989. However, the proportion of policy articles increased in the last two periods (1990 to 1995) to level higher than that of the 1978 to 1980 period, whereas rural development articles, went down from a high of 19% (1981 to 1983) to 8% (1993 to 1995). Both the methodology and agricultural finance articles reached their peaks during the period from 1984 to 1986 at 19% and 10%, respectively. During the 1993 to 1995 period, the methodology-oriented articles accounted for 12%, while agricultural finance-oriented articles claimed 7%, both of which were close to their average shares for the whole

period. The share of articles on agricultural inputs and labor was highest in the period from 1990 to 1992 but has decreased substantially in the latest period.

One factor that may have influenced the choice of topics published in the *ARER* is the call for papers that was made for the April issues from 1991 to 1994. In the April 1991 issue, the topic was the effects of agricultural production on environmental quality, and almost half of the articles were on resource and environmental economics. The April 1992 issue called for papers on the changing composition of the agricultural industry,

**Table 4. Subject Areas of Published *ARER* Articles**

Topic	1978-80	1981-83	1984-86	1987-89	1990-92	1993-95	Total
Production	17 (14.41) <sup>1</sup>	20 (22.73)	18 (19.78)	12 (18.46)	6 (10.00)	6 (8.11)	79 (15.93)
Marketing	9 (7.63)	7 (7.95)	15 (16.48)	7 (10.77)	7 (11.67)	12 (16.22)	57 (11.49)
Resources	26 (22.03)	9 (10.23)	14 (15.38)	16 (24.62)	17 (28.33)	13 (17.57)	95 (19.15)
Trade	1 (0.85)	5 (5.68)	2 (2.20)	5 (7.69)	3 (5.00)	8 (10.81)	24 (4.84)
Rural development	13 (11.02)	17 (19.32)	8 (8.79)	5 (7.69)	2 (3.33)	6 (8.11)	51 (10.28)
Agricultural policy	11 (9.32)	3 (3.41)	4 (4.40)	3 (4.62)	7 (11.67)	8 (10.81)	36 (7.26)
Methodology	14 (11.86)	7 (7.95)	15 (16.48)	9 (13.85)	9 (15.00)	9 (12.16)	63 (12.70)
Agricultural finance	3 (2.54)	8 (9.09)	9 (9.89)	4 (6.15)	2 (3.33)	5 (6.76)	31 (6.25)
Agricultural labor	5 (4.24)	2 (2.27)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.54)	4 (6.67)	2 (2.70)	14 (2.82)
Others	19 (16.10)	10 (11.36)	6 (6.59)	3 (4.62)	3 (5.00)	5 (6.76)	46 (9.27)
Total number of articles	118	88	91	65	60	74	496

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in parentheses are column percentages.

while the April 1993 issue dealt with trade liberalization and international agricultural development. Lastly, the April 1994 issue published articles on agricultural, resource, and environmental policies in the 1990s.

In general, the dominant subject areas published in the *ARER* during the last eighteen years have been in production and resource economics, which comprised 35% of all articles published. This finding is consistent with the results of a survey of Ph.D. graduates in agricultural economics conducted by the AAEA Employment Services Committee in 1993 (Marchant and Kinyanjui 1994). The survey shows that for the academic year 1992 to 1993, 21% of the Ph.D. graduates specialized in natural resources and environment economics, while 11% specialized in production economics.

### Methodology

Table 5 shows the classification of methodology used in each article. The econometric (29%) and nonquantitative methodologies (37%) together make up two-thirds of the articles published. The econometric methodology was most popular in the mid-1980s, when its share was highest at 46%. While its share dropped in the late 1980s, it has picked up during the last two periods (1990 to 1995) to a level equal to its overall average share. Nonquantitative articles, in contrast, were abundant, especially during the first two periods (1978 to 1983), with a share of almost half of the articles published. Most of the selected papers presented at in the annual meetings and published in the journal used nonquantitative methodologies, which may account for the high number of articles using this method. Both mathematical programming and statistical methods show increasing trends when the 1978 to 1980 period is compared with the 1993 to 1995 period. The mathematical programming

share increased from 9% to 20%, while the share of statistical methods went up from 4% to more than 17%.

### Academic Rank and Number of Authors

The distribution of ranks/positions of author(s) is shown in table 6. Given the publication requirements to attain tenure, assistant professors (26%) published the most articles in the *ARER*, followed by associate professors (21%). However, the percentage of articles authored by assistant professors has declined slightly during the last eighteen years, from a high of 31% in the 1978 to 1980 period to 18% in 1993 to 1995. Perhaps this decrease reflects the decline in the hiring of new assistant professors due to budgetary pressures in the late 1980s and early 1990s. In contrast, the share of articles authored by full professors has increased, from 17% in the first period to 25% in the latest period of analysis. It is interesting to note that a significant number of journal articles were authored or coauthored by research assistants/associates. In fact, over the eighteen-year period, research assistants/associates have published as many articles in the *ARER* as have full professors.

The distribution of the number of authors per article is shown in table 7. The numbers of single and dual authorship were almost the same, with a combined total of 77%. However, it should be noted that most of the invited presentations and papers were submitted by single authors. This finding shows that most of the refereed articles have dual authorship rather than single authorship.

### Implications of the Study

This study was undertaken to determine whether the *ARER* has maintained a strong regional char-

**Table 5. Procedures Used in Published *ARER* Articles**

Methodology	1978-80	1981-83	1984-86	1987-89	1990-92	1993-95	Total
Econometrics	30 (25.42) <sup>1</sup>	23 (26.14)	42 (46.15)	13 (20.00)	15 (25.00)	22 (29.73)	145 (29.23)
Mathematical programming	10 (8.47)	6 (6.82)	12 (13.19)	12 (18.46)	3 (5.00)	15 (20.27)	58 (11.69)
Statistical methods	5 (4.24)	1 (1.14)	6 (6.59)	13 (20.00)	10 (16.67)	13 (17.57)	48 (9.68)
Nonquantitative methods	62 (52.54)	42 (47.73)	29 (31.87)	12 (18.46)	25 (41.67)	15 (20.27)	185 (37.30)
Others	11 (9.32)	16 (18.18)	2 (2.20)	15 (23.08)	7 (11.67)	9 (12.16)	60 (12.10)
Total number of articles	118	88	91	65	60	74	496

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in parentheses are column percentages.

**Table 6. Rank or Position of Authors of Published *ARER* Articles**

Rank or Position	1978-80	1981-83	1984-86	1987-89	1990-92	1993-95	Total
Professor	35 (17.59) <sup>1</sup>	28 (17.83)	26 (15.66)	22 (16.54)	17 (14.91)	41 (25.15)	169 (18.13)
Associate professor	38 (19.10)	27 (17.20)	41 (24.70)	33 (24.81)	29 (25.44)	30 (18.40)	198 (21.24)
Assistant professor	62 (31.16)	47 (29.94)	37 (22.29)	39 (29.32)	31 (27.19)	30 (18.40)	246 (26.39)
Research assistant/associate	35 (17.59)	28 (17.83)	38 (22.89)	26 (19.55)	10 (8.77)	33 (20.25)	170 (18.24)
USDA economist	13 (6.53)	13 (8.28)	10 (6.02)	6 (4.51)	8 (7.02)	12 (7.36)	62 (6.65)
Others	16 (8.04)	14 (8.92)	14 (8.43)	7 (5.26)	19 (16.67)	17 (10.43)	87 (9.33)
Total number of authors	199	157	166	133	114	163	932

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in parentheses are column percentages.

acter over the past eighteen years and whether there has been a narrow concentration of articles in terms of subject area and methodology. A content analysis of the *ARER* was conducted and several significant trends were found.

First, during the last six years, the *ARER* has increased the publication of articles with a non-Northeastern orientation. The validity of the argument that the *ARER* has a strong regional focus has been diminished with this trend. Results indicate that Northeast agricultural economists have increased research activities that are not specific to the Northeast region. Second, the share and number of authors from outside the Northeast region have increased. This finding is in line with the objective of increasing the scope and audience of the *ARER*, which was initiated by the name change of the journal as voted upon by the NAREA membership in 1992.

Third, almost half of the articles published in the *ARER* during the last eighteen years came from just five land grant universities in the Northeast, with Cornell and Penn State having the largest con-

tributions. Fourth, the dominant subject areas of *ARER* articles were production and resource economics. During the last period, there was a significant increase in marketing- and trade-oriented articles and a decline in rural development articles. Fifth, the popular methodologies, econometrics and nonquantitative methods, showed increasing and decreasing trends, respectively. Sixth, assistant professors contributed the most in published articles, with research assistants/associates publishing as much as full professors. Finally, most of the articles were written by either single or dual authors. However, more of the refereed articles published were submitted by dual authors than by single authors.

Has the *ARER* maintained a strong regional focus? Because it is a regional journal, it is expected that most of the articles published would be Northeast-specific. However, in the 1990s, the share of articles that do not focus mainly on the Northeast has increased tremendously. Whether or not this is good for the image of the *ARER* is an issue that the leadership and members of the association must

**Table 7. Number of Authors of Published *ARER* Articles**

Number of Authors	1978-80	1981-83	1984-86	1987-89	1990-92	1993-95	Total
One	54 (45.76) <sup>1</sup>	37 (42.05)	34 (37.36)	22 (33.85)	29 (48.33)	18 (24.32)	194 (39.11)
Two	47 (39.83)	34 (38.64)	42 (46.15)	22 (33.85)	15 (25.00)	30 (40.54)	190 (38.31)
Three	17 (14.41)	16 (18.18)	12 (13.19)	17 (26.15)	10 (16.67)	19 (25.68)	91 (18.35)
Four	0 (0.00)	1 (1.14)	3 (3.30)	4 (6.15)	5 (8.33)	7 (9.46)	20 (4.03)
Five	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.67)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.20)
Total number of articles	118	88	91	65	60	74	496

<sup>1</sup>Numbers in parentheses are column percentages.



discuss and decide. If the objective is to increase the number of submissions, then the trend toward having a national scope is advantageous to the journal.

Has there been a narrow concentration in subject matter and methodology? This study's results show that, in terms of subject matter, the dominant focus has been production and resource economics, with an increase in marketing-oriented articles. Considering that the *ARER* has published articles predominantly dealing with the three traditional areas of agricultural economics, it seems that there is no clear trend toward a narrow concentration in subject matter. In contrast, there is a clear trend in terms of methodology. During the last period, more articles used quantitative techniques than nonquantitative methods. Whether or not this can be construed as a narrow concentration in methodology would require a comparative analysis of other agricultural economics and related journals in order to derive definite conclusions. However, in general, agricultural and resource economists have published more articles using quantitative techniques than nonquantitative methods. Similar findings were reported by Robison and Colyer (1994) for other agricultural economics journals. Questions on the relevance of too much emphasis on quantitative approaches in published economics articles are being raised in the profession. It is definitely an issue that the NAREA leadership, members, and future *ARER* editors must face.

## References

- Abdel-Ghany, M., and S.Y. Nichols. 1984. "Consumer Consumption and Family Economics/Household Management Research 1972-82: Survey of the Past and Outlook for the Future." *Home Economics Research Journal* 1(3):265-78.
- Broder, J.M. 1986. "An Assessment of the NJARE." *Northeastern Journal of Agricultural Economics* 15(1):28-31.
- Broder, J.M., and R.F. Ziemer. 1984. "Assessment of Journals Used by Agricultural Economists at Land Grant Universities." *Southern Journal of Agricultural Economics* 16(1):167-72.
- Geistfeld, L.V., and R. Key. 1986. "Decade in Perspective 1975-84: Focus and Trends in the Journal of Consumer Affairs." *Journal of Consumer Affairs* 20(1):65-76.
- Goldsmith, E.B. 1983. "An Empirical Analysis of the Home Economics Research Journal." *Home Economics Research Journal* 11(3):207-14.
- Goode, F. 1983. Remarks at the Annual Business Meeting; Northeastern Agricultural Economics Council, June 21, 1983. *Journal of the Northwestern Agricultural Economics Council* 12(2):125-26.
- Helgeson, J.G., E.S. Mager, and C. Taylor. 1984. "Trends in Consumer Behavior Literature: A Content Analysis." *Journal of Consumer Research* 10(4):449-54.
- Lindsay, B.E. 1986. "An Empirical Overview of the NAREA Membership Survey." *Northeastern Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 15(2):117-22.
- Marchant, M. and W. Kinyanjui. 1994. *AAEA Employment Services Committee 1993 Survey Results*. Lexington: University of Kentucky.
- Robinson, L., and D. Colyer. 1994. "Reflections on Relevance of Professional Journals." *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 26(1):19-34.