Discussion Paper No. 12-029

Investigating JEEM Empirically: A Story of Co-Authorship and Collaboration

Michael Schymura and Andreas Löschel

ZEW
Zentrum für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung GmbH
Centre for European Economic Research

Discussion Paper No. 12-029

Investigating JEEM Empirically: A Story of Co-Authorship and Collaboration

Michael Schymura and Andreas Löschel

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since the first decades of the 20^{th} century scholarly activity in economics has expanded rapidly. Indeed, the cumulative stock of journal articles in economics has doubled every fourteen years. A century ago, co-authored scientific articles in general and economic papers in particular were, in sharp contrast to the present, more the exception than the rule. A representative example of this, as we will show in this paper, is the evolution in articles published by the *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, which is the leading journal in the field of environmental and resource economics.

Numerous empirical studies have examined the production of scientific knowledge in economics, patterns of co-authorship for individual economists, the development of co-authorship in certain economic subfields or, like for most of the studies, the focus was set on the major economic journals. All such studies have found a rising incidence and extent of co-authorship in economic publications. The reasons for this are explored in this paper. However, surprisingly few studies to date have dealt specifically with environmental and resource economics, a subfield which has become ever more important in the economics profession. We hope to close this gap in the research, particularly because of the finding that intellectual collaboration is most important in environmental and resource economics. In this paper, we empirically investigate the first 36 years of the *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*. Specifically, we analyze all articles published in this journal with respect to potentially relevant characteristics that could explain an author's decision to cooperate with another peer. We focus in this regard on the development of structural patterns of co-authorship, the increasing complexity of the discussed subject matter, publications by female economists in *JEEM*, and the incremental growth in international collaboration.

Analyses of the structure of co-authorship are normally based on four hypotheses: The *division of labor hypothesis*, the *opportunity cost of time hypothesis*, the *quality hypothesis*, and the *diversification hypothesis*. We use our dataset to test these hypotheses, also add a fifth hypothesis that is new to the literature: the *competition for external funding hypothesis*. This hypothesis hinges on the following observation: As research has become more demanding in terms of both skill and financial expense, a critical mass of expertise and reputation is now necessary in order to obtain external funding.

We find support for the division of labor hypothesis, the opportunity cost of time hypothesis, and the external funding hypothesis. We find weak support for the quality hypothesis, and were only able to test the diversification hypothesis in a limited sample. In contrast to previous studies, we find substantial differences in the pattern of external funding for single-authored, co-authored, and multi-authored articles. We surmise that these differences in external funding could be attributable to the interdisciplinary nature of environmental and resource economics. Future research efforts could build on this finding with an investigation that uses a different approach.

DAS WICHTIGSTE IN KÜRZE

Seit den ersten Jahrzehnten des 20. Jahrhunderts hat sich das ökonomische Wissen sehr schnell und um ein Vielfaches vermehrt. Der kumulative Bestand der veröffentlichten Fachartikel verdoppelt sich dabei alle 14 Jahre. Von mehreren Autoren gemeinsam verfasste Fachartikel waren in den Wirtschaftswissenschaften, im Gegensatz zur heutigen Zeit, eher die Ausnahme. Wie wir in dieser Arbeit zeigen werden, ist die Entwicklung des *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* als führendem Fachjournal im Bereich der Umwelt- und Ressourcenökonomie ein stellvertretendes Beispiel für diese Beobachtung.

Bisherige empirische Studien haben die Produktion ökonomischen Wissens analysiert, die Beteiligung einzelner Autoren bei gemeinsamen Publikationen, die Entwicklung der Ko-Autorenschaft in gesonderten Teildisziplinen der Volkswirtschaftslehre oder, wie in den meisten Studien, die zentralen ökonomischen Fachzeitschriften untersucht. Alle Studien haben sowohl ein zunehmendes Auftreten als auch ein ansteigendes Ausmaß von Ko-Autorenschaften bei ökonomischen Publikationen gefunden. Die möglichen Ursachen für diese Entwicklung werden in dieser Arbeit untersucht. Überraschenderweise existieren nur wenige Studien, welche die Umwelt- und Ressourcenökonomie genauer betrachten, einem Teilbereich der Volkswirtschaftslehre, der zunehmend an Bedeutung gewinnt. Wir wollen diese Wissenslücke schließen, da allgemeinere Studien offenbart haben, dass die intellektuelle Zusammenarbeit am stärksten im Bereich der Umwelt- und Ressourcenökonomie ausgeprägt ist. In unserem Artikel untersuchen wir empirisch die ersten 36 Jahre des *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*. Zu diesem Zweck haben wir alle veröffentlichten Artikel hinsichtlich potentieller Einflussgrößen analysiert, die die Entscheidung eines Autors beeinflussen, mit einem anderen Autor zusammen zu arbeiten. Im Besonderen interessieren uns die Entwicklung der Ko-Autorenschaften, die zunehmende Komplexität des Fachbereichs, Veröffentlichungen von weiblichen Forschern und die zunehmende internationale Zusammenarbeit.

Üblicherweise wird die Struktur von Ko-Autorenschaften durch das Testen von vier Hypothesen untersucht: der Hypothese der Arbeitsteilung, der Hypothese von Zeit-Opportunitätskosten, der Qualitätshypothese und der Diversifikationshypothese. Mit Hilfe unseres Datensatzes können wir diese Hypothesen überprüfen und eine zusätzliche Fünfte testen, die den Einfluss externer Finanzierung auf die Autorenstruktur untersucht. Forschung wird, bewertet anhand von Fachwissen und benötigtem Geld, zunehmend anspruchsvoller und eine kritische Masse an Expertise und Reputation ist heutzutage notwendig, um externe finanzielle Zuwendungen zu erhalten.

In unserer Arbeit können wir die Arbeitsteilungshypothese, die Hypothese der Zeit-Opportunitätskosten und den Einfluss der externen Finanzierung auf den Status der Ko-Autorenschaft bestätigen. Die Qualitätshypothese können wir zurückweisen und die Diversifikationshypothese nur in einer eingeschränkten Stichprobe überprüfen. Im Gegensatz zu bisherigen Studien können wir substantielle Unterschiede in der Struktur der externen Finanzierung bei Arbeiten von einem, zwei oder mehreren Autoren festellen. Wir vermuten, dass die Unterschiede bei der externen Finanzierung teilweise durch die starke Interdiszplinarität der Umwelt- und Ressourcenökonomik erklärt werden können.

INVESTIGATING *JEEM* EMPIRICALLY: A STORY OF CO-AUTHORSHIP AND COLLABORATION*

MICHAEL SCHYMURA† AND ANDREAS LÖSCHEL‡

ABSTRACT - We examine the incidence and extent of co-authorship and intellectual collaboration in the leading journal of environmental and resource economics: the *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*. Previous studies of general economic journals have offered empirical evidence for the fact that intellectual collaboration is most prevalent in the field of environmental and resource economics. However, no previous study has examined this finding more carefully. This is a gap in the literature we hope to fill. Accordingly, we investigate all 1436 papers published in *JEEM* from 1974 until 2010 with respect to potential drivers of co-authorship. We start with a simple descriptive analysis in order to depict the most important trends in the past 36 years. We then employ empirical methods to test several hypotheses that are commonly used to analyze the structure of co-authorship. However, we do not stick to the commonly used hypotheses but investigate also other potentially relevant drivers of co-authorship as e.g. the acknowledgment of external funding, the gender of the authors or the geographical location. We find empirical support for the rising incidence of co-authorship with increasing complexity of the field of economics and the competition for external funding. As research has become more demanding in terms of both disciplinary and - especially in the field of environmental and resource economics - interdisciplinary skills, the likelihood of collaborative research and jointly written publications increased.

Keywords: Environmental and resource economics, co-authorship, production of knowledge
JEL Classification: Q0, Q50

*Thanks to Wolfgang Buchholz, Sascha Rexhäuser, and Lucais Sewell for helpful comments and suggestions. We are also very thankful to the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research. The usual caveats apply.

†Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW), L 7, 1, D-68161 Mannheim, Germany; E-mail: schymura@zew.de.

‡Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW) , L 7, 1, D-68161 Mannheim, Germany and the University of Heidelberg; E-mail: loeschel@zew.de

I. INTRODUCTION

SINCE THE FIRST DECADES of the 20th century scholarly activity in economics has expanded rapidly.[1] A century ago, co-authored scientific articles in general and economic papers in particular were, in stark contrast to today, more the exception than the rule. A representative example of this, as we will show in this paper, is the development of publication trends in the *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, which is the leading journal in the field of environmental and resource economics.[2] In this paper, we empirically investigate the first 36 years of the *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* by analyzing all articles published in the journal up to 2010. We focus especially on the development of structural patterns of co-authorship, the increasing complexity of the discussed subject matter, publications by female economists in *JEEM*, and the incremental growth in international collaboration.

Analyses of the structure of co-authorship are commonly based on four hypotheses: First, the *division of labor hypothesis*, which states that specialization occurs in line with the growth of a market, an argument dating back to Adam Smith. The second hypothesis is the *opportunity cost of time hypothesis*, which posits that there are increasing pressures to publish in the field of economics. The third hypothesis is the the *quality hypothesis*, which is a synthesis of the first and second hypotheses. This hypothesis states that due to increasing complexity and specialization, researchers are pushed to collaborate in order to maximize the quality of an article. Finally, the *diversification hypothesis* takes the uncertainties of the editorial and reviewing process into account. This hypothesis states that an increased tendency toward intellectual collaboration can be expected in order to maximize research output under the constraints of limited time and especially journal space (Piette and Ross, 1992). However, we do not stick to the commonly used hypotheses but that we investigate also other potentially relevant drivers of co-authorship. We use the four hypotheses as a starting ground for further analysis. Previous studies have focused in particular on either a relatively rough measure of the quantitative content of each article (McDowell and Melvin, 1983; Barnett et al., 1988) or have examined a very short timeframe (1984 to 1986 in Piette and Ross (1992)). We investigate every article in *JEEM* from Volume 1 in 1974 to Volume 60 in 2010 in terms of their quantitative content (equations, figures, tables, appendix), acknowledgment of individuals and financial support, the gender structure of the authors, and the geographical distribution of co-authors if the article was written by more than one person.

This paper is organized as follows: Part one charts notable developments in the publication of articles in *JEEM* in a descriptive fashion. Our disaggregated data set describes a variety of article characteristics. We show that the incident and extent of co-authorship have increased significantly, that empirical research has gained more attention over time, that the number of acknowledged persons has increased and that the fraction of arti-

[1] Lovell (1973) notes that the cumulative stock of journal articles in economics doubles every fourteen years.

[2] According to the ISI Web of Knowledge, *JEEM* was ranked number 17 of all economic journals and number 1 among environmental economics journals with an impact factor of 2.989 in 2010. Rousseau et al. (2009) offer evidence that *JEEM* "is the leading publication in the field" (Rousseau et al., 2009, p. 283).

cles in which a woman has participated has risen from just over 0 % to more than 30 %. Furthermore, we show that only 16 % of co-authored articles in 1975 were written by authors in different geographical locations, while this number increased to more than 75 % in 2010. In the second part of the paper we investigate empirically how the evolution of these characteristics over time has impacted the status of co-authorship. We find empirical support for the rising incidence of co-authorship with the growth of the field of environmental and resource economics and the increasing complexity in economics. Beside the four main hypotheses, we test an additional fifth hypothesis: the *competition for external funding hypothesis*. As research has become more demanding in terms of both skill and financial expense, a critical mass of expertise and reputation is now necessary in order to obtain external funding. Furthermore, "it is also conceivable that the possible tendency of some grant-giving agencies to favor collaborative research may also have been a significant factor in explaining the growth of multi-authored papers" (Hudson, 1996, p. 157). Environmental and resource economics is characterized by a high degree of interdiscplinarity (see e.g. Bjurström and Polk, 2011). As a consequence, there is an increased likelihood of collaborative research and jointly written publications. Our empirical model finds strong support for this external funding hypothesis; the presence of external funding thus seems to be an important driver of intellectual collaboration in environmental and resource economics.

Following this introduction, we briefly summarize the relevant literature in section II. We then start our analysis by describing our data and variables in section III. Next, we present a descriptive analysis. Our empirical models are subsequently introduced in section IV. Lastly, we draw some tentative conclusions.

II. RELEVANT LITERATURE

In 1991 Shogren and Durden conducted a review of the first 15 years of the *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* (*JEEM*). They identified the 25 institutions that had contributed most to the research output of *JEEM*, investigated which countries alongside the United States had contributed the most, examined how articles from *JEEM* had been recognized by other economic journals, and determined which 10 articles were the most cited.[3] In 2000 the *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* celebrated its 25^{th} birthday. Fisher and Ward (2000) and Smith (2000) investigated these 25 years empirically. Fisher and Ward (2000) focused their analysis on natural resource economics and research trends in this subfield. They found that about half of the articles published in the first 35 volumes dealt with natural resources. Smith (2000) investigated the development of non-market valuation in the first 25 years of *JEEM*. However, none of these articles has focused on intellectual collaboration and co-authorship in *JEEM*. This is an noticeable gap in the literature that we seek to address. An example of a theoretical treatment of co-authorship issues can be found in Engers et al. (1999). The authors derive

[3] Resources for the Future, the University of British Columbia, the University of Maryland, the University of California, Berkeley, and the University of Wyoming all had more than 10 papers published in *JEEM*. Canada, the United Kingdom, Israel, Norway, and Australia were the top foreign contributing countries.

the result that "an alphabetical name ordering will exist as a norm in a noncooperative game with self-interested agents" (Engers et al., 1999, p. 881). Past empirical studies have examined the production of scientific knowledge in economics (Lovell, 1973), patterns of co-authorship for individual economists (McDowell and Melvin (1983); Hollis (2001), and Hilmer and Hilmer (2005)), the development of co-authorship in certain economic subfields,[4] or, like most of the studies, the focus was set on the major economic journals (McDowell and Melvin (1983); Barnett et al. (1988); Piette and Ross (1992); Hudson (1996), and Medoff (2007)). McDowell and Melvin (1983) develop a utility-based microeconomic model for an individual researcher and tested various hypotheses regarding the co-authorship of articles. Barnett et al. (1988) extend this framework and explore the incidence of co-authorship for *The American Economic Review* between 1960 and 1985. Piette and Ross (1992) show that the frequency of co-authorship differs for different economic specialties. Hudson (1996) identifies potential reasons for co-authorship and compares eight leading journals and Medoff (2007) employs a production function approach to show that co-authors in economics are equivalent substitutes in production. All of these studies find a rising incidence and extent of co-authorship in economic publications, the reasons for which are explored below. Notably, Laband and Tollison (2000) compare the social science of economics with the natural science of biology, concluding that the "social sciences may indeed be more 'social´ than the natural sciences" (Laband and Tollison, 2000, p. 661) in terms of the frequency of co-authorship. Nevertheless, surprisingly few articles deal with environmental and resource economics, a subfield which has become more and more important in the economics profession. Costanza et al. (2004) investigate the subtopic of ecological economics and which ecological economics publications have had the biggest impact. Ma and Stern (2006) focus particularly on the two leading field journals (*JEEM* and *Ecological Economics*). Auffhammer (2009) broadens the scope of the analysis but he focuses on *Google Scholar* as a source of information on citations and article impact. As Auffhammer (2009) pessimistically notes in his first sentence, one could "conclude that nothing published in environmental and resource economics has mattered to the general economics profession" (Auffhammer, 2009, p. 251). This is a somewhat glaring gap in the literature, for Piette and Ross (1992) and Laband and Tollison (2000) have both offered empirical evidence for the fact that intellectual collaboration is most important in the field of the environmental and resource economics.[5] In this study, we build on the work of McDowell and Melvin (1983); Barnett et al. (1988); Piette and Ross (1992), and especially Laband and Tollison (2000) to assess empirically the structural pattern of co-authorship and its impact on the relevance of an article published in *JEEM*.

[4]See Acedo et al. (2006) for management and organizational studies and Hilmer and Hilmer (2005) for agricultural economics. Hollis (2001) uses a panel of 339 economists in order to evaluate the relationship between co-authorship and output, and Acedo et al. (2006) investigate co-authorship in management and organizational studies using network analysis.

[5]Piette and Ross (1992) investigate the 15 leading economic journals between 1984 and 1986 and find general evidence that co-authorship in economics depends on the field of specialization. In their probit estimation, the effect for "natural resources" was the most influential. Laband and Tollison (2000) have also estimated a probit model for the timespan from 1885 to 1995 using the old *Journal of Economic Literature* (JEL) classification. The marginal effect for the "JEL 700 - Agriculture and natural resources" variable was both statistically highly significant and most influential (with a marginal effect of .0885).

III. DATA AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Before turning to the empirical analysis, we first describe the data used and how we have constructed the variables we control for. Subsequently we present some interesting descriptive facts about how *JEEM* has evolved over the past 36 years. First, we illuminate how the incidence and extent of co-authorship have developed in *JEEM*. We then discuss trends in articles' quantitative content in relation to the status of co-authorship. Finally, stylized facts about acknowledgements, geographically distant collaboration, author gender, and external funding are addressed before we turn to our empirical analysis.

A. DATA AND VARIABLES

Our sample is a set of 1436 articles, published in the *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* between 1974 and 2010. The source is the *Social Science Citations Index* (SSCI), provided by Thomson Reuthers. The SSCI offers a range of information about each article, including the number of authors, the number of pages, and how many times the article has been cited. For some characteristics, however, we had to collect data by hand. We gathered data on a number of content-related characteristics, including the number of equations, tables, figures, and appendices contained in each article. We then used this information to classify each article as purely qualitative, theoretical, quantitative, or both theoretical and empirical. We also gathered information on author gender and his or her institutional location. We counted the number of acknowledged colleagues and checked whether an article had acknowledged external funding or not. This information allowed us to set up an empirical model in order to identify potential drivers of the decision to collaborate with another author.

B. SOME DESCRIPTIVE EVIDENCE

Incidence and Extent of Co-Authorship

When investigating the pattern of co-authorship, we specifically examine two different characteristics. First, changes in the *incidence* of co-authorship, which designates the fraction of articles with more than one author, and second, the *extent* of co-authorship, that is, the average number of authors in co-authored papers (Laband and Tollison (2000)). The evolution of the incidence and extent of co-authorship is depicted in figures 1a and 1b, where we compare trends at *JEEM* to six major economic journals ("core journals").[6]

A few interesting facts emerge from this comparison: In the initial two volumes of *JEEM*, the fraction of sole-author papers was remarkably low compared to our reference group of the core journals ($\approx 38\,\%$ in 1974). After the first two volumes, this fraction subsequently increased, fluctuating between $50 - 70\,\%$ until the end of the 1980s. The fraction of single-authored articles reached a peak of $\approx 72\,\%$ in 1988, before dropping rapidly and continuously to only 15 % in 2008.[7] With regard to the core journals, we find

[6] According to Kalaitzidakis et al. (2003), p. 1349): *The American Economic Review, Econometrica, The Journal of Political Economy, Journal of Economic Theory, and The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. To keep a balance between U.S. and European journals we have also included the British *Economic Journal*.

[7] Similar to Hudson (1996) we conduct a linear spline analysis for the average fraction of single-authored papers for each year in order to figure out whether trends were more or less steady or spasmodic. We

no sideways trend between 1974 and 1988. The fraction of single-author papers decreased constantly, dropping from 75% in 1974 to 25% in 2010. In this way, the incidence of co-authorship for articles published in *JEEM* and the core journals increased significantly during the period under examination.

An average article in *JEEM* was written by 1.71 authors in 1974. Logically, the same trend that applies to the fraction of single-authored papers is also observable for the growth in total number of authors between 1974 and 1988. After 1988, the average number of authors increased steadily, reaching approximately 2.5 in 2009. The trend at the core journals was very similar, although the overall number of authors was lower. The average number of authors in the core journals rose from 1.28 in 1974 to 2.17 in 2010. We thus find that the extent of co-authorship has increased for both *JEEM* and the core journals.[8]



(a) Single Authors (b) Number of Authors

Figure 1: Incidence and Extent of Co-Authorship in *JEEM* and Other Top Journals

Quantitative Content

Hudson (1996) and Laband and Tollison (2000) have argued that the rising quantitative content and associated increasing complexity of the field of economics could be an important explanatory factor for the rising incidence of co-authorship. Hudson (1996) compares general economic journals (such as *The Economic Journal* or *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*) with quantitatively oriented journals (such as *The Review of Economics and Statistics*). He finds evidence that the probability of co-authorship is higher in quantitatively oriented journals. In order to determine whether the quantitative content has an influence on the pattern of co-authorship in *JEEM* we have counted the equations, figures, tables, and appendices in each of the 1436 published articles between 1974 and 2010. Table 1 provides a statistical overview of the different forms of authorship. We then studied whether the means differed significantly. While the two-group mean com-

find that the slope of the timeseries changes significantly at the 5 percent level in 1977, 1989, and 1999 (see Appendix B for the estimation and a graphic representation).

[8]However, the magnitude for articles published in *JEEM* was significantly higher. A standard mean-comparison test over the whole sample period revealed a t-value of -9.96. In this way, the mean number of authors was statistically significantly higher for *JEEM* than for the core journals.

parison tests for appendices are inconclusive, the tests for the number of equations and number of tables indicate strong support for structural differences, rejecting the null of equal means at the 1 % significance level and for figures at the 10 % significance level. The logical consequence is thus to investigate how quantitative content influences the incidence and extent of co-authorship. We do this in our empirical model later in the paper.

	Observations	Equations	Tables	Figures	Appendix
Single-Authored Articles	589	8743	894	1078	.33
Multi-Authored Articles	847	10626	2274	1704	.37

Table 1: Quantitative Content in Single- and Multi-Authored Articles in *JEEM*

Type of Articles

We used the information about quantitative content to categorize the articles as qualitative, theoretical, quantitative, or both theoretical and quantitative in nature. Of course, how an article should be categorized is often a subjective matter. We follow Figlio (1994) in our categorization approach. A paper is considered "qualitative" if it is a survey, a case study without empirical analysis, or a commentary piece. An article is defined as "quantitative" if it is purely empirical and when almost no theoretical models serve as a basis for estimation. We also classify articles as empirical if real, as opposed to artificial, data are used. Theoretical articles are purely theoretical discussions or papers that utilize techniques for simulation with artificial data. And, finally, we have classified articles as "theoretical and empirical" when they include substantial theoretical and empirical components (e.g. the derivation of reduced form estimation equations from a theoretical model and their testing in an econometric framework). Figure 2 summarizes the evolution of the different types of article categories in *JEEM*. We find that articles in the journal have become substantially more empirical in the last few decades. While purely qualitative articles have vanished after 2000 and the share of purely theoretical articles has declined in the past three decades, empirical work has gained more and more importance. As we will show in the empirical part of the paper, this has impacted patterns of co-authorship in the journal.

Acknowledgments, Geographically Distant Collaboration, Females, and External Funding

What are possible additional motive factors behind collaboration? To answer this question, we not only investigated forms of formal co-authorship but also informal intellectual collaboration. To this end, we counted the acknowledgments mentioned in each article. As an author usually benefits from the comments of a colleague, the least he or she can do to thank is to offer a "thank you" in the acknowledgments. Such acknowledgment may represent an incentive for the collaborating individual to provide input when time constraints would otherwise limit more extensive collaboration and elevation to co-author status. Hence there could exist a trade-off between acknowledgments and co-authorship status. We also investigated whether patterns of collaboration between



Figure 2: Distribution of Article Categories Over Time in *JEEM*

geographically distant individuals have changed over the past 36 years. In light of the decreasing cost of transportation and the advent of internet and e-mail, one could speculate that the spatially separated collaboration has intensified. While only 16 % of the multi-authored articles written in 1975 were written by geographically distant authors, this share increased to 77 % by 2006. Another interesting aspect previously investigated by Laband and Tollison (2000) is whether the probability of an article being co-authored changes when one of the authors is female. They find that an author being female has the largest positive marginal effect on the probability of co-authorship. Surprisingly, female gender reduces the chances of co-authorship when the authors are geographically distant (Laband and Tollison, 2000, p. 644). We analyzed all *JEEM* articles written under participation of a female researcher (whether as a single-author or co-author).[9] Finally, we investigated each article with regard to whether external funding was acknowledged or not. There is a significant difference between single- and multi-authored articles in terms of the frequency with which external funding is acknowledged. While approximatively 34 % of single-authored papers contained thanks for external funding, the corresponding share among multi-authored articles was roughly 55 %. The average number of authors was 2.09 for articles that mentioned external funding and 1.66 for those that didn't. A mean-comparison test indicates a strong difference between single-authored papers and multi-authored articles. Furthermore, in contrast to the findings of Laband and Tollison

[9]Unfortunately, 31 articles could not be analyzed, since we could not determine the gender of the author(s) because only the surname and the first initial were given.

(2000), we also discovered variation in the pattern of external funding for multi-authored papers. Looking only at multi-authored articles (848 papers), the average number of authors who did not mention financial support was about 2.32, while the number of article authors that mentioned financial support was around 2.56. A mean comparison test once again provided statistical evidence for a significant difference. Later in this paper, we examine the impact of external funding on the number of article authors.



(a) Acknowledgments

(b) Geographically Distant

(c) Female Authors

(d) External Funding

Figure 3: Acknowledgments, Geographically Distant Authors, Females, and Acknowledgment of External Funding in *JEEM*

Summary

To summarize, we have identified a number of interesting trends. We have shown that the incident and extent of co-authorship increased significantly between 1974 and 2010. Furthermore, empirical research has gained increasing prevalence over time, and the number of acknowledged persons has increased. The fraction of articles in which a woman participated has risen from almost 0 % to more than 30 %. In addition, while only 16 % of co-authored articles were written by geographically distant authors in 1975, this share increased to 75 by 2010. In the following second part of this paper, we employ various empirical models to identify the most important drivers of collaboration.

IV. SEARCHING FOR EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

A. CO-AUTHORSHIP

What are the motive forces behind these trends? To explain the findings described in the previous section, we need to test for several hypotheses with regard to the co-authorship structure of papers (Barnett et al., 1988). Can these trends perhaps be explained by Adam Smith's observation that an increasing market size leads to more specialization (*the division of labor hypothesis*, McDowell and Melvin (1983))? Barnett et al. (1988) were the first to highlight and explain the carrot-and-stick argument (*the opportunity cost of time hypothesis*): They claim that the opportunity cost of time in the profession has increased and that this increase has affected the market for the production of publishable articles. Yet alongside the increase in the volume of publications that has been witnessed in recent decades, there also appears to have been an increase in research complexity and specialization. This, in turn, has fostered a need for increased collaboration, as has been noted by Barnett et al. (1988) for other fields of economic research (i.e. *the quality hypothesis*). We investigate whether this finding holds true for environmental and resource economics, a field that also deals with climate change. "Given that the problem scope of climate change is broader than any single discipline, the scientific community must draw on extensive knowledge from various scientific disciplines" (Bjurström and Polk, 2011, pp. 1-2). Finally, we draw on a hypothesis that has been adapted from portfolio theory (*the diversification hypothesis*). It states that the authors of economic papers try to spread their risk in light of uncertainties involved in the process of getting published (e.g. the referee process, the time delay between submission and publication), and that "(T)his uncertainty, of course, can be particularly disquieting to those facing the tenure clock" (Barnett et al., 1988, p. 540). Furthermore, research has become more demanding in terms of both skill and financial expense, a critical mass of expertise and reputation is now necessary in order to obtain external funding. We therefore use our data to test a fifth hypothesis which states that the acknowledgment of external funding has a positive influence on the number of authors (*the competition for external funding hypothesis*). Again, we want to emphasize, that theses five hypotheses are only the starting ground for further estimations we employ later in the paper. To test which hypotheses are valid in the case of environmental and resource economics, we employ the following empirical model with our dataset:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{NO}_i \;=\; & \beta_0 + \underbrace{\beta_1 \cdot \mathrm{PAGES}_i + \beta_2 \cdot \mathrm{THEOR}_i + \beta_3 \cdot \mathrm{QUANTI}_i + \beta_4 \cdot \mathrm{QUANTITHEOR}_i}_{\text{Division of Labor Hypothesis}} + \\
& + \underbrace{\beta_5 \cdot \mathrm{ACKNOWLEDGE}_i}_{\text{Opportunity Cost Hypothesis}} + \underbrace{\beta_6 \cdot \mathrm{TOP10CITED}_i + \beta_7 \cdot \mathrm{TOPINSTITUTION}}_{\text{Quality Hypothesis}} + \\
& + \underbrace{\beta_8 \cdot \mathrm{SUBMISSIONS}_i}_{\text{Diversification Hypothesis}} + \underbrace{\beta_9 \cdot \mathrm{EXTERNALFUND}_i}_{\text{External Funding Hypothesis}} + \\
& + \beta_{10} \cdot \mathrm{TREND}_i + \varepsilon_i
\end{aligned}
\tag{1}
$$

The variables are:

- NO = Number of authors
- PAGES = Number of adjusted pages
- [QUALI] = Dummy variable for a qualitative article (= reference category)
- THEOR = Dummy variable for a theoretical article
- QUANTI = Dummy variable for a quantitative article
- QUANTITHEOR = Dummy variable equal to one for papers that are both quantitative as well as theoretical
- ACKNOWLEDGE = Number of researchers in the acknowledgements
- TOP10CITED = Leading articles
- TOPINSTITUTION = Dummy variable if one of the authors is located at a top institution
- SUBMISSIONS = Number of total submissions to the journal
- EXTERNALFUND = Dummy variable for the acknowledgment of external funding
- TREND = Control variable for time trend

A few words on the variables. NR is self-explanatory. We had to employ a page-adjustment procedure in order to take into account several layout changes over the 36 years. In this regard, we randomly picked 3 articles for each year and counted the words on a page solely filled with text (no graphs, tables, etc.). Then we took the mean and indexed the value to construct 1974-page equivalents.[10] PAGES therefore represents the adjusted page numbers. As mentioned in the previous section, we classified the articles by type. QUALI is a dummy variable indicating purely qualitative articles (e.g. surveys or case studies without empirical work). QUALI serves as our reference category for the type of article and the three other categories are to be interpreted as relative to QUALI. THEOR is the dummy for purely theoretical work or papers that utilize techniques such as simulation to artificial data.[11] QUANTI is a dummy variable for purely empirical papers in which almost no theoretical models serve as a basis for estimation. Another condition for classifying an article as empirical is the use of real data. QUANTITHEOR designates articles that include both substantial theoretical and empirical components (e.g. the derivation of reduced form estimation equations from a theoretical model and their testing in an econometric framework). As mentioned, we also counted the number

[10] While the mean for 1974 was $\approx$ 570 words per page, this number has risen to $\approx$ 1050 words per page in 2010. If we did not take into account these layout changes the coefficient for pages would be significantly biased downwards.

[11] Due to the fact that programming of bootstrapping routines or simulation studies require demanding computer skills and hence fosters potential collaboration, the coefficient on THEORY would be even higher if we were to treat artificial data and simulation methods as quantitative work.

of people that were acknowledged at the outset of each article (excluding the thanks to the two or three anonymous referees).This number is reflected by the ACKNOWLEDGE variable. We also constructed a TOP10CITED variable, which indicates the leading 10% of the articles in terms of citations.[12] We are aware that such an approach favors older articles and thus articles with fewer authors. However, when running our regressions with alternative measures of lead articles, the results change neither qualitatively nor quantitatively.[13] The variable TOPINSTITUTION is a dummy and equals one if an author is located at a top institution (according to the top ten institutions in Shogren and Durden (1991)). SUB is the number of submissions to *JEEM* each year. EXTERNALFUNDING is a dummy variable that equals one if external funding was acknowledged in the article. TREND is a control variable for an existing time trend in the number of authors. In terms of our regression equation, the five hypotheses can be interpreted as follows.

The *division of labor hypothesis* posits that the division of labor is bounded by the size of a market, and that increased specialization is necessary. This arguments holds not only for efficient pin production but also for the scientific profession. As we have descriptively shown above, the number of articles and pages written in the field of environmental and resource economics has considerably grown over the past two decades. With the growth of the field, pressures have arisen for researchers to specialize in niche areas, not least to improve chances of publication. This pressure to specialize, while impacting all fields of economics, has been particularly acute in environmental and resource economics, due to its interdisciplinary nature. Moreover, we expect that this specialization process has become more intense as a result of increasing computational resources, the availability of powerful software applications, and the expansion of the internet. The attendant decrease in transaction costs for knowledge generation and its worldwide exchange could be one of the reasons for the observed increase in co-authored articles. For example, if one researcher is a predominantly theoretical economist trying to investigate empirically the effects of, say, the implementation of a carbon tax and its impacts on an industrial sector, he will try to collaborate with another researcher who is skilled in econometric modeling and simulation analysis. Such a combination of two or more authors may help or even be necessary to make a valuable scientific contribution. We thus hypothesize an increasing incidence of co-authorship over time:

Hypothesis 1 The *division of labor hypothesis* implies $\frac{\delta NO}{\delta PAGES} > 0$, $\frac{\delta NO}{\delta THEOR} = 0$, $\frac{\delta NO}{\delta QUANTI}$ and $\frac{\delta NO}{\delta QUANTITHEORY} > 0$

We therefore argue that the number of authors increases in tandem with number of pages, that purely qualitative articles and theoretical papers are written more often by a single author, that quantitative articles increase the need for additional authors, and that articles that are both theoretical as well as empirical also increase the number of authors.

[12] Of course citations are only one possible alternative for measuring impact or influence. But as Medoff (2007) aptly writes about the findings of Leibowitz and Palmer (1983), "if an article (or an economist) with few citations is considered to be a significant scientific contribution, then why has it not generated more citations?" (Medoff, 2007, p. 305).

[13] Alternative measures include the ordinal inclusion of citations or interpreting the articles as "TOP" that were cited by a core journal at least once ($\approx 10\,\%$).

The *opportunity cost of time hypothesis* attempts to capture the increasing pressures on economists to publish. The decreasing costs of transportation and the eased communication offered by the internet have made knowledge exchange very easy. Nevertheless, science has become more complicated and a single economist may have to discuss his or her topic of interest with other colleagues. Furthermore, the "opportunity cost of time of the typical member of the profession has increased" (Barnett et al., 1988, p. 540). Accordingly, we posit that these time pressures have led acknowledgement to become increasingly common, as contributors lack the time to provide the substantial feedback that would merit co-author status. There is thus of trade-off of sorts for contributors between providing some input (to receive acknowledgement) or extensive input (to receive co-author status). We test this trade-off between the number of articles and the number of acknowledged people:

Hypothesis 2 The *opportunity cost of time hypothesis* implies $\frac{\delta NO}{\delta ACKNOWLEDGE} < 0$

The *quality hypothesis* is a mixture of the *division of labor* and *opportunity cost of time hypotheses*. Economic research has become increasingly complex over the past century indicated by the rise in quantitative content and empirical approaches. Even the bias of leading economic journals against empirical analysis in the 1960s has disappeared. A combination of skills thus tends to be necessary nowadays to maintain a certain quality level (Figlio, 1994). Additionally, the number of economists over time has grown faster than journal space, so that the competition for journal space has intensified. In this way, if the quality of an article as measured by citations is improved by additional collaborators and if the competition for journal space has intensified, we expect leading articles to have been written by more than one author:

Hypothesis 3 The *quality hypothesis* implies $\frac{\delta NO}{\delta TOP10CITED} > 0$ and $\frac{\delta NO}{\delta TOPINSTITUTION} > 0$

The *diversification hypothesis* attempts to capture a risk-bearing behavior of academic scholars, who are exposed to uncertainties with respect to publication. As survival in academia is strongly dependent on publication in refereed journals, the author of an article is regularly exposed to the opinions of two or more anonymous referees. Not every researcher is such an inspired writer like e.g. Robert Solow, who, when asked if one of his articles was rejected, answered: "The fact is that I have never had paper rejected by a journal. Probably this is because I hate writing articles" (Gans and Shepherd, 1994, p. 165). Whether "academics sell their soul to conform to the will of others, the referees and editors, in order to gain one advantage, namely publication" (Frey, 2003, p. 206) or whether they simply have to collaborate due to market saturation and to increase the probability of publication can be tested with the diversification hypothesis. As the field has become more complex and the workload of referees and editors has increased, there could be a tendency toward more collaboration to minimize the random variance effect of the publication process. We investigate the number of submission to *JEEM* each year

and compare it to the papers accepted.[14] If more articles were submitted to the journal, then each editor and referee had less time to investigate the paper for potential publication. Changing submission volumes are likely to increase the uncertainty in the referee process. We expect that this would intensify the incentive toward collaboration:

Hypothesis 4 The *diversification hypothesis* implies $\frac{\delta NO}{\delta SUBMISSIONS} > 0$

The *competition for external funding hypothesis* stems from the *division of labor*, the *opportunity cost of time* and *quality hypotheses* and has been previously examined only rudimentarily.[15] As research has become more demanding in terms of both skill and financial expense, a critical mass of expertise and reputation is now necessary in order to obtain external funding. Bjurström and Polk (2011), for example, argue that environmental and resource economics are characterized by a high degree of interdisciplinary research. Thus, two effects are likely: First, a funding institution will give money only to a group of people. This can have potentially an effect on the number of authors. Second, research is conducted in teams, which results in a higher number of authors. This leads us to our last hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5 The *Competition for External Funding Hypothesis* implies $\frac{\delta NO}{\delta EXTERNALFUND} > 0$

Estimation and Results

We excluded 2 outliers ($< 0.01\%$) from our sample. These were the articles by Howe et al. (1994), written by 9 authors and Loehman et al. (1979), written by 12 authors. We then started our estimation with an ordinary least squares estimation, being aware of the discrete nature of the dependent variable. Hence we expect heteroscedastic disturbance and unbiased but inefficient estimators. Subsequently, we employed an ordinal probit model for the number of authors, in line with Barnett et al. (1988), to ensure consistent and asymptotically efficient estimates. As all tests for heteroscedasticity suggest evidence for heteroscedasticity in the framework of non-robust OLS estimation.[16], we also used a feasible generalized least squares estimation procedure (Wooldridge, 2002). Finally, we estimated a probit model to determine which factors affect the probability of an article being co-authored or not.

The estimation results for the ordinary least squares, the ordered probit, and the FGLS estimates are summarized in table 2. The obtained results for all of the models are qualitatively similar. While the overall explanatory power in terms of the R^2 is sufficiently satisfactory, the individual coefficient estimates are all statistically significant at the 1 %

[14]We thank the editor of *JEEM* for the delivered data on paper submissions for the period from 2000 to 2010. Unfortunately, this results in a restricted sample of 517 articles and the empirical analysis loses some meaning and explanatory power. However, the results are available upon request.

[15]Laband and Tollison (2000) investigate a sub-sample of 439 articles published in *The American Economic Review, the Journal of Political Economy*, and *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* and compare it to articles in three biology journals. They find that "in both disciplines, the presence of funding increases the average number of coauthors by 0.3, which implies that there is *some* relationship between funding and co-authorship" (Laband and Tollison, 2000, p. 637).

[16]We obtain a χ^2 of 123.98 in a Breusch-Pagan test (p = 0.00).

level with the exception of the TOP10CITED variable (insignificant in all models). We find strong support for three of our five hypotheses (the *Diversification Hypothesis* remains untested) and mixed evidence for the *Quality Hypothesis*. The *Division of Labor Hypothesis* is founded by the coefficient estimates for PAGES, THEOR, QUANTI, and QUANTITHEOR. While rather qualitative or theoretical papers are mainly written by a single author (the hypothesis that the coefficient on THEOR equals zero results in a p-value of 0.94), there is statistical evidence that the number of authors increases with the amount of pages, if an article is empirical in nature, or if a paper contains both theoretical as well as quantitative analysis. The coefficient that tests the *opportunity cost of time hypothesis*, ACKNOWLEDGE, also has the expected sign and is statistically significant. The *competition for external funding hypothesis* is supported by the positive coefficient estimate for EXTERNALFUNDING. However, there is only mixed evidence for the *quality hypothesis*. While the estimate for the TOP10CITED variable is not significant, the TOPINSTITUTION variable adds a lot of explanatory power. Nevertheless, we cannot confirm nor reject the *Quality Hypothesis*. To provide an example: Our ordinary least square model predicts that a paper consisting of 20 pages, carrying out empirical and theoretical analysis, and acknowledging financial support will be, ceteris paribus, written by 2.5 authors.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE:	OLS		ORD. PROBIT		FGLS	
NUMBER OF AUTHORS	Coef.	t	Coef.	z	Coef.	t
PAGES	.0116617***	2.93	.0152782***	2.63	.0129417***	3.61
	(.0039852)		(.0058037)		(.0036963)	
THEOR	-.0063306	-0.08	.0730161	0.43	-.0419065	-0.53
	(.0807966)		(.1706725)		(.0797684)	
QUANTI	.5338828***	5.67	.8178335***	4.59	.5096397***	5.43
	(.0942218)		(.1782063)		(.0939165)	
QUANTITHEOR	.3971565***	4.15	.6622948***	3.68	.3669255***	3.88
	(.095769)		(.1799461)		(.094479)	
ACKNOWLEDGE	-.0375067***	-5.11	-.0557503***	-5.49	-.0397634***	-6.00
	(.0073352)		(.0101531)		(.0066221)	
TOP10CITED	.1054989	1.26	.1203763	1.21	.070373	0.93
	(.0834169)		(.0997285)		(.0760747)	
TOPINSTITUTION	.3568859***	5.86	.4827811***	6.83	.3637292***	6.67
	(.0609485)		(.0707336)		(.0545227)	
SUBMISSIONS						
EXTERNALFUND	.2661661***	5.99	.3816222***	6.15	.2624749***	6.18
	(.0444624)		(.0620419)		(.0424695)	
TREND	.0144895***	6.19	.0229318***	6.60	.0137878***	6.28
	(.0023406)		(.0034725)		(.0021939)	
MODEL SUMMARY AND TESTS:						
Observations	1434		1434		1434	
F-Statistic	41.20				47.67	
R^2	0.2112				0.2292	
Root MSE	.80562				.75314	
Wald-χ^2			379.90			
Pseudo-R^2			0.1048			
Log-Pseudolikelihood			-1528.9996			
RESET Test p-Value	0.6816				0.5305	

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01; robust standard errors appear in parentheses; a constant is included in all regressions

Table 2: OLS, Ordered Probit, and FGLS Estimates for Number of Authors

We also employed a probit estimation model in order to determine the marginal effects of the explanatory variables. The dependent variable in this case equals one if an article was co-authored, and zero otherwise.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CO}_i \;=\; & \beta_0 + \\ & + \beta_1 \cdot \text{PAGES}_i + \beta_2 \cdot \text{THEOR}_i + \beta_3 \cdot \text{QUANTI}_i + \beta_4 \cdot \text{QUANTITHEOR}_i + \\ & + \beta_5 \cdot \text{ACKNOWLEDGE}_i + \beta_6 \cdot \text{TOP10CITED}_i + \beta_7 \cdot \text{TOPINSTITUTION}_i + \\ & + \beta_8 \cdot \text{SUBMISSIONS}_i + \beta_9 \cdot \text{EXTERNALFUND}_i + \beta_{10} \cdot \text{TREND} + \\ & + \varepsilon_i \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

DEPENDENT VARIABLE:	PROBIT		
ARTICLE IS COAUTHORED	**Coefficients**	**z-Statistic**	**Marginal Effects**
PAGES	.0141039**	1.95	.004548**
	(.007233)		(.002321)
THEOR	.1106202	0.60	.035671
	(.1857591)		(.0598676)
QUANTI	.8005972***	4.07	.2581632***
	(.1969479)		(.0624091)
QUANTITHEOR	.6725883***	3.36	.216885***
	(.2001211)		(.0637336)
ACKNOWLEDGE	-.0751057***	-6.42	-.02421883***
	(.0116976)		(.003645)
TOP10CITED	.1189834	0.956	.0383678
	(.1243615)		(.0400795)
TOPINSTITUTION	.7886332***	7.35	.2543053***
	(.1073089)		(.0329506)
SUBMISSIONS			
EXTERNALFUND	.421208***	5.64	.1358241***
	(.0746723)		(.0233683)
TREND	.0278447***	6.70	.0089789***
	(.0041551)		(.00127861)
MODEL SUMMARY:			
Observations	1434		
Wald-χ^2	267.44		
Pseudo-R^2	0.1605		
Log-Pseudolikelihood	-814.80903		

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01; robust standard errors appear in parentheses; a constant is included in all regressions

Table 3: Probit Regression Estimates for Co-Authorship in *JEEM*

Again, all variables aside from the TOP10 variable are statistically significant at the 1 % level. We will now focus on the most important marginal effects (evaluated at the sample mean using the standard delta method). Ceteris paribus, if an article is quantitative or contains quantitative and theoretical work, the probability that it was written by more than one author is higher by approximatively 26 % and 22 %, respectively. The effects of a top institution and the acknowledgement of external funding have the largest impact on the probability with $\approx +25\%$ and $\approx +14\%$, respectively. Hence, the probit model also supports 3 out of the 5 stated hypotheses.

B. IMPACT OF QUANTITATIVE CONTENT ON CO-AUTHORSHIP

Our strong support for the *division of labor hypothesis* and the *opportunity cost of time hypothesis* could indicate, on the one hand, that the economics profession has become more technical, or, on the other hand, that collaboration between different types of economists has become more necessary as the market has grown. However, we want to extend our analysis beyond the five hypotheses from the previous section. We now investigate the impact of quantitative content on co-authorship. We analyzed all 1436 articles for various measures of quantitative content. Due to the results obtained above, we expect the probability of co-authorship to be an increasing function of its quantitative content (Laband and Tollison, 2000).

Our estimation strategy consists of three steps: First, we estimate a simple probit model, with co-authorship status as the dependent variable and several control variables as explanatory factors. Subsequently, we employ a two-stage instrumental-variable approach to circumvent arising endogeneity issues, where we control for article type before evaluating the impact of quantitative content. Finally, we restrict our sample to the 825 co-authored articles to check the robustness of our results and to include the information, if two authors were geographically distant. Our first model is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CO}_i \;=\; & \beta_0 + \\ & + \beta_1 \cdot \text{PAGES}_i + \\ & + \beta_2 \cdot \text{FEMALE}_i + \\ & + \beta_3 \cdot \text{EQUAT}_i + \\ & + \beta_4 \cdot \text{TABLES}_i + \\ & + \beta_5 \cdot \text{FIGURES}_i + \\ & + \beta_6 \cdot \text{APPENDIX}_i + \\ & + \gamma_i \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The variables are used in this subsection are:

- CO = Dummy equal to one if article is co-authored, otherwise 0
- PAGES = Number of adjusted pages
- FEMALE = Dummy equal to one if a woman is involved in writing the article, otherwise 0
- EQUAT = Number of equations in the article
- TABLES = Number of tables in the article
- FIGURES = Number of figures in the article
- APPENDIX = Dummy equal to one if article has an appendix, otherwise 0

Again, some words on the variables. The dependent variable is the status of co-authorship and equals one if an article was co-authored and zero if not. PAGES is similar to the models before and indicates the number of adjusted pages. FEMALE is a control variable for the gender of an author (Laband and Tollison, 2000). EQUAT is the number of (numbered) equations in an article.[17] TABLES and FIGURES are the number of tables and figures in the article, and APPENDIX a dummy variable for whether a paper had an appendix or not. Since we know whether each of these articles was written by more than one author and we have collected information about the quantitative content of each article published in *JEEM*, we were able to investigate the statistical significance of the relationship between the quantitative content of a paper and the probability of co-authorship. Table 4 summarizes the estimation results for five different alternatives of model 3. We have included a "female author involved dummy" as well as the number of adjusted pages in every model, following Laband and Tollison (2000).

Our models A to D estimate the separate effect of equations, tables, figures, and appendices on the probability that an article is co-authored or not. While equations and appendices have a negative influence on the probability of co-authorship - both are significant at the 1 % (equations) and 10 % (appendix) level- the impact of tables is positive and significant (1 % level). Model E evaluates the joint impact of quantitative content on the relevant probability. The coefficients and marginal effects remain almost unaltered and hence robust across all model specifications with the exception, that the coefficient on appendix loses its significance. One surprising fact that is shown by these models is that the marginal effect of a female involved in authorship increases the probability that the article was co-authored by 13.4 to 16.1 % (significant at the 1 % level in all models).

[17] We have chosen to use only the numbered equations in order to ensure comparability between articles.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE:	PROBIT MODELS									
ARTICLE IS COAUTHORED	**Model A**	**M. E.**	**Model B**	**M. E.**	**Model C**	**M. E.**	**Model D**	**M E.**	**Model E**	**M E.**
INTERCEPT	-.447***		-.510 ***		-.540***		-.545***		-.461***	
	(.103)***		(.102)		(.101)		(.101)		(.104)	
PAGES	.047***	.0182	.0301***	.0117	.043***	.0168	.0442***	.0172	.042***	.0164
	(.006)***		(.006)		(.006)		(.006)		(.008)	
FEMALE	.373***	.1448	.356***	.1380	.405***	.1572	.4138***	.1606	.346***	.1342
	(.093)***		(.094)		(.092)		(.092)		(.094)	
EQUAT	-.014***	-.005							-.010***	-.0039
	(.003)***								(.003)	
TABLES			.0758***	.0294					.048***	.01864
			(.016)						(.018)	
FIGURES					-.0220	-.0095			-.0137	-.0053
					(.016)				(.016)	
APPENDIX							-.143*	-.0555	-.083	-.0325
							(.077)		(.079)	
MODEL SUMMARY:										
Observations	1405		1405		1405		1405		1405	
Wald-χ^2	90.72		91.30		78.51		80.53		95.99	
Pseudo-R^2	0.061		0.061		0.050		0.050		0.068	
Log-Pseudolikelihood	-894.10		-893.59		-905.14		-904.45		-887.69	

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01; robust standard errors appear in parentheses; M. E. = Marginal Effects

Table 4: Estimation results for the impact of quantitative content on co-authorship

However, there are two fundamental problems with model 3. First, it might be not correctly specified, i.e. by ignoring important variables or unobserved heterogeneity. And second, endogeneity issues could potentially arise with our measures of quantitative content and the decision to co-author. We thus employ an instrumental variable approach by using a two-stage estimation procedure, as suggested by Wooldridge (2002, p. 623). In the first stage, we estimate three similar probit models j with the type of article as the dependent variables ($j \in (THEOR, QUALI, QUANTI)$) and our variables for quantitative content and other potentially relevant characteristics as regressors.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Probit}_{ji} \quad = \quad & \beta_0 + \\ & + \beta_1 \cdot \text{PAGES}_i + \beta_2 \cdot \text{FEMALE}_i + \beta_3 \cdot \text{EXTERNALFUND}_i + \\ & + \beta_4 \cdot \text{EQUAT}_i + \beta_5 \cdot \text{TABLES}_i + \beta_6 \cdot \text{FIGURES}_i + \beta_7 \cdot \text{APPENDIX}_i + \\ & + \gamma_i \\ & \text{with } j \in (THEOR, QUALI, QUANTI) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

DEPENDENT VARIABLE:	THEOR		QUALI		QUANTI	
TYPE OF ARTICLE	Coef.	z	Coef.	z	Coef.	z
PAGES	-.015	-1.46	-.000	-0.02	.009	0.82
FEMALE	-.080	-0.65	-.940***	-2.91	.346***	2.91
EXTERNALFUND	-.112	-1.18	-.564***	-2.94	.383***	3.52
EQUAT	.048***	8.34	-.363***	-3.12	-.177***	-11.60
TABLES	-.564***	-10.57	-.281***	-1.02	.270***	8.14
FIGURES	-.026	-1.22	-.431***	-5.53	.060**	2.72
APPENDIX	.317***	2.99	-.321	-0.93	.042	0.34
Intercept	.412***	3.38	.723***	3.39	-.585***	-4.54
MODEL SUMMARY:						
Observations	1405		1405		1405	
Wald-χ^2	212.28		74.77		174.62	
Pseudo-R^2	0.4904		0.6425		0.5356	
Log-Pseudolikelihood	-493.404		-93.013		-373.247	

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Table 5: Probit Estimates for the First Stage

This results in an exogenous control for article type and the other drivers of the decision to co-author. We have chosen QUANTITHEOR as the reference category for arbitrary reasons; the results do not change with another reference category. As three of our regressors in our second stage would be binary response variables in the case of a single stage estimation, we can apply the methodology suggested by Wooldridge (2002). Therefore, we save the obtained predicted probabilities with robust standard errors and use them as regressors in the second stage. This approach has the advantage of avoiding potential endogeneity issues due to simultaneity bias. Moreover, the first stage regression model does not need to be correctly specified. We use the robust standard errors due to the presence of heteroscedasticity. We thus obtain unbiased but less efficient in-

strumental variable estimators. The results for the first stage are summarized in table 5. Our models for article type as a function of quantitative content and the other characteristics perform very well in terms of goodness-of-fit. Moreover, it is a very good indicator that our by-hand classification of article-types was appropriate. If, say, the coefficient for tables would have been positive for theoretical articles, our classification system would have also been erroneous, as one expects tables to appear in rather quantitative articles (as it is the case in our probit model for QUANTI). The second stage regression is also a probit model and takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CO}_i &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \widehat{\text{THEOR}}_i + \beta_2 \cdot \widehat{\text{QUALI}}_i + \beta_3 \cdot \widehat{\text{QUANTI}}_i + \\ &+ \beta_4 \cdot \text{PAGES}_i + \beta_5 \cdot \text{FEMALE}_i + \beta_6 \cdot \text{EXTERNALFUND} + \\ &+ \beta_7 \cdot \text{EQUAT}_i + \beta_8 \cdot \text{TABLES}_i + \beta_9 \cdot \text{FIGURES}_i + \\ &+ \beta_{10} \cdot \text{APPENDIX}_i + \nu_i \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

DEPENDENT VARIABLE:	IV PROBIT		PROBIT	
ARTICLE IS COAUTHORED	Coefficients	z-Statistic	Coefficients	z-Statistic
THEOR			-.4793***	-4.41
			(.1086)	
QUALI			-.8024***	-3.87
			(.2075)	
QUANTI			-.0348***	-0.31
			(.1129)	
$\widehat{THEOR}$	-.6673***	-3.08		
	(.2167)			
$\widehat{QUALI}$	-.9144***	-3.17		
	(.2884)			
$\widehat{QUANTI}$	.1486	0.88		
	(.1697)			
PAGES	.0347***	4.56	.0352***	4.33
	(.0076)		(.0081)	
FEMALE	.3168***	3.31	.3388***	3.55
	(.0956)		(.0953)	
EXTERNALFUND	.3313***	4.46	.3499***	4.83
	(.0743)		(.0725)	
EQUAT	-.0041	-0.99	-.0077**	-2.17
	(.0041)		(.0036)	
TABLES	-.0505*	-1.64	-.0174	-0.81
	(.00308)		(.0216)	
FIGURES	-.0309*	-1.88	-.0258	-1.58
	(.0164)		(.0163)	
APPENDIX	-.0550	-0.67	-.0686	-0.85
	(.0817)		(.0805)	
Intercept	-.0032	-0.02	-.0981	-0.66
	(.2075)		(.1497)	
MODEL SUMMARY AND TESTS:				
Observations	1405		1405	
Wald-χ^2	160.51		156.05	
$Pseudo - R^2$			0.0981	
Log-likelihood			-858.6742	

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01; robust standard errors appear in parentheses

Table 6: Probit Regression Estimates for Co-Authorship in *JEEM*

The final results are summarized in table 6, which also compares the endogenous estimation with the instrumental variable results. Comparison of the endogenous estimates and instrumental variables estimates shows the lower efficiency of the estimators, as the standard errors are slightly larger. The endogenous model emphasizes the impact of the quantitative content of an article on the probability of co-authorship. At least the coefficient for number of equations is statistically significant. Surprisingly, the coefficient is negative. After controlling for potential endogeneity issues and other potentially influential factors, we find the instrumental variables probit model predominantly captures the type of an article rather than the quantitative content. Hence, in the endogenous model, the impact of quantitative content is overestimated and the coefficients are biased upwards. The only measures of quantitative content that are significant are tables and figures. But the coefficients have the opposite sign, as in the estimates by Laband and Tollison (2000).[18] Both models find a stable relationship between gender, the presence of external funding, and the status of co-authorship.

Our final empirical exercise investigates the subsample of the 826 co-authored articles. This allows us to include a new factor to control for: whether two (or more) authors were geographically separated or not (the DIFFERENT_ INSTITUTION variable).[19] Our criterion for declaring two authors to be geographically separated was not institutional affiliation but the geographic distance (> 100 miles). So, if one authors was, say,at Harvard University and the other author at Boston University, the article was not declared as written by geographically distant authors. We extend the first stage probit estimations by including the DIFFERENT_ INSTITUTION variable.[20] Then we employ an instrumental variable approach to obtain the following estimation model:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NO}_i \;=\; & \beta_0 + \\ & + \beta_1 \cdot \widehat{\text{THEOR}}_i + \beta_2 \cdot \widehat{\text{QUALI}}_i + \beta_3 \cdot \widehat{\text{QUANTI}}_i + \\ & + \beta_4 \cdot \text{PAGES}_i + \beta_5 \cdot \text{FEMALE}_i + \\ & + \beta_6 \cdot \text{EXTERNALFUND} + \beta_7 \cdot \text{DIFFERENT\_ INSTITUTION}_i + \\ & + \beta_8 \cdot \text{EQUAT}_i + \beta_9 \cdot \text{TABLES}_i + \\ & + \beta_{10} \cdot \text{EQUAT}_i + \beta_{11} \cdot \text{TABLES}_i + \beta_{12} \cdot \text{FIGURES}_i + \\ & + \beta_{13} \cdot \text{APPENDIX}_i + \chi_i \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Again, it turns out that after controlling for article type, the quantitative content does little to explain the number of authors. Other factors play a much larger role, such as whether a female was involved or external funding was acknowledged. Our estimations also reveal that the geographic separation of authors has a positive and statistically significant influence on the number of authors, much more than the quantitative content.

[18] The estimates are not directly comparable because Laband and Tollison (2000) also control for the JEL classification of each article.

[19] An inclusion of this variable for all 1426 articles would not have made any sense, since this variable can only be 1 if the article is co-authored. An inclusion would have resulted in multicollinearity.

[20] The results remained almost unaltered; the results are available upon request.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE:	IV ESTIMATES	
NUMBER OF AUTHORS	**Coefficients**	**t-Statistic**
$\widehat{THEOR}$	-.1023016	-0.69
	(.1482307)	
$\widehat{QUALI}$	-.1505571	-0.80
	(.1892945)	
$\widehat{QUANTI}$	-.0260249	-0.25
	(.1697)	
PAGES	.0108374**	2.05
	(.0052741)	
FEMALE	.1956179***	3.02
	(.0647063)	
EXTERNALFUND	.1171532**	2.42
	(.0484768)	
DIFFERENT_ INSTITUTION	.1977038***	4.15
	(.0475915)	
EQUAT	-.004691*	-1.91
	(.0024554)	
TABLES	.0246456	1.11
	(.0222236)	
FIGURES	.0096162	0.89
	(.010768)	
APPENDIX	-.0817259	-1.48
	(.0552791)	
Intercept	2.037232	14.46
	(.1409177)	
MODEL SUMMARY AND TESTS:		
Observations	825	
F-Statistic	8.74	
R^2	0.1082	
Root MSE	.693	

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01; robust standard errors appear in parentheses

Table 7: IV Estimates for Number of Authors, spatial separation included

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper we investigated *JEEM*, the leading journal in the field of environmental and resource economics, with respect to the development of intellectual collaboration between the authors of published articles. First, we presented a descriptive analysis of important characteristics. We then investigated empirically the influence of these characteristics on the status of co-authorship. We tested five interesting hypotheses concerning co-authorship using our sample of all 1436 articles published in *JEEM* between 1974 and 2010. We found support for the *division of labor hypothesis*, the *opportunity cost of time hypothesis*, and the *external funding hypothesis*. While we could reject the *quality hypothesis* we were only able to test the *diversification hypothesis* with a restricted sample. In contrast to previous studies (e.g. Laband and Tollison, 2000), we found substantial differences in the

pattern of external funding for single-authored and co-authored articles. We conjecture that these differences in external funding could be due to the interdisciplinary nature of environmental and resource economics (Bjurström and Polk, 2011). Yet a final question remains that was not tested empirically within the scope of this paper: Why all the effort? The answer appears to be simple: scientific curiosity of two collaborating environmental economists.

REFERENCES

ACEDO, F. J., C. **BARROSO**, C. **CASANUEVA** and J. L. **GALAN** (2006): Co-Authorship in Management and Organizational Studies: An Empirical and Network Analysis, in: *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 43, pp. 957-983.

AUFFHAMMER, M. (2009): The State of Environmental and Resource Economics: A Google Scholar Perspective, in: *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, Vol. 3, pp. 251-269.

BARNETT, A. H., R. W. **AULT**, and D. L. **KASERMAN** (1988): The Rising Incidence of Co-authorship in Economcs: Further Evidence, in: *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 70, pp. 539-543.

BJURSTRÖM, A. and M. **POLK** (2011): Climate change and interdisciplinarity: a co-citation analysis of IPCC Third Assessment Report, in: *Scientometrics*, Vol. 87, pp. 525-550.

BURTON, M. P. and E. **PHIMISTER** (1995): Core Journals: A Reappraisal of the Diamond List, in: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 105, pp. 361-373.

COSTANZA, R., D. **STERN**, B. **FISHER**, L. **HE** and C. **MA** (2004): Influential publications in ecological economics: a citation analysis, in: *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 50, pp. 261-292.

COUPÉ, T. (2003): Revealed Performances: Worldwide Rankings of Economists and Economics Departments, in: *Journal of the European Economic Association*, Vol. 1, pp. 1309-1345.

ENGERS, M., J. S. **GANS**, S. **GRANT**, and S. P. **KING** (1999): First-Author Conditions, in: *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 107, pp. 859-883.

FIGLIO, D. (1994): Trends in the Publication of Empirical Economics, in: *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 8, pp. 179-187.

FISHER, A. and M. **WARD** (2000): Trends in Natural Resource Economics in JEEM 1974-1997: Breakpoint and Nonparametric Analysis, in: *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Vol. 39, pp. 264-281.

FREY, B. S. (2003): Publishing as prostitution? – Choosing between one's own ideas and academic success, in: *Public Choice*, Vol. 116, pp. 205-223.

GANS, J. S. and G. B. **SHEPHERD** (1994): How are the Mighty Fallen: Rejected Classic Articles by Leading Economists, in: *Journal of Economic Perpectives*, Vol. 8, pp. 165-179.

HILMER, C. E. and M. J. **HILMER** (2005): How Do Journal Quality, Co-Authorship, and Author Order Affect Agricultural Economists' Salaries?, in: *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 87, pp. 509-523.

HOLLIS, A. (2001): Co-authorship and the output of academic economists, in: *Labour Economics*, Vol. 8, pp. 503-530.

HOWE, C. W., **SMITH**, M. G., **BENNETT**, L., **BRENDECKE**, C. M., **FLACK**, J. E., **HAMM**, R. M., **MANN**, R., **ROZAKLIS**, L., **WUNDERLICH**, K. (1994): The Value of Water Supply Reliability in Urban Water Systems, in: *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Vol. 26, pp. 19-30.

HUDSON, J. (1996): Trends in Multi-Authored Papers in Economics, in: *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 10, pp. 153-158.

KALAITZIDAKIS, P., T. **STENGOS**, and T. P. **MAMUNEAS** (2003): Rankings of Academic Journals and Institutions in Economics, in: *Journal of the European Economic Association*, Vol. 1, pp. 1346-1366.

KIM, H. E., A. **MORSE**, and L. **ZINGALES** (2006): What has Mattered to Economics Since 1970?, in: *The Journal of Economic Persepctives*, Vol. 20, pp. 189-202.

KOLSTAD, C. D. (2000): Energy and Depletable Resources: Economics and Policy, 1973-1998, in: *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Vol. 39, pp. 282-305

LABAND, D. N. and R. D. **TOLLISON** (2000): Intellectual Collaboration, in: *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 108, pp. 632-662.

LEIBOWITZ, S. J. and J. P. **PALMER** (1983): Assessing Assessments of Economics Departments, in: *Mimeo. University of Western Ohio*

LOEHMAN, E. T., **BERG**, S. V., **ARROYO**, A. A., **HEDINGER**, R. A., **SCHWARTZ**, J. M., **SHAW** M. E., **FAHIEN**, R. W., **DE**, V. H., **FISHE**, R. P., **RIO**, D. E. , **ROSSLEY**, W. F., **GREEN**, A. E. S. (1979): Distributional analysis of regional benefits and cost of air quality control, in: *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Vol. 6, pp. 222-243.

LOVELL, M. C. (1973): The Production of Economic Literature: An Interpretation, in: *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 11, pp. 27-55.

MA, C. and D. I. **STERN** (2006): Environmental and ecological economics: A citation analysis, in: *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 58, pp. 491-506.

MCDOWELL, J. M. and M. **MELVIN** (1983): The Determinants of Co-Authorship: An Analysis of the Economics Literature, in: *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 65, pp. 155-160.

MEDOFF, M. H. (2007): The Input Relationship Between Co-Authors in Economics, in: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 66, pp. 289-308.

PIETTE, M. J. and K. L. **ROSS** (1992): An Analysis of the Determinants of Co-Authorship in Economics, in: *The Journal of Economic Education*, Vol. 23, pp. 277-283.

ROUSSEAU, S., T. **VERBEKE**, and R. **ROUSSEAU** (2009): Evaluating Environmental and Resource Economics: A TOP-Curve Approach, in: *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, Vol. 3, pp. 270-287.

SHOGREN, J. F. and G. C. **DURDEN** (1991): The First 15 Years: Contributors and Contributions to the Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 1974-1988, in: *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Vol. 20, pp. 205-209.

SMITH, V. K. (2000): JEEM and Non-market Valuation: 1974-1998, in: *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Vol. 39, pp. 351-374.

WOOLDRIDGE, J. M. (2002): Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data, MIT Press, Cambridge, USA.

A SUMMARY STATISTICS

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Number of Authors	1.857242	.9611748	1	12
Qualitative Articles Dummy (QUALI)	.0445682	.2064258	0	1
Theoretical Articles Dummy (THEOR)	.454039	.4980566	0	1
Empirical Articles Dummy (QUANTI)	.2597493	.4386497	0	1
Empirical & Theoretical Articles Dummy (QUANTITHEOR)	.2416435	.4282284	0	1
Pages	15.83844	5.782017	2	41
Adjusted Pages	16.94372	6.44433	2.006761	41.94704
External Funding Dummy	.4610028	.4986506	0	1
Acknowledgments	3.370474	3.427386	0	22
Spatially Separated Collaboration Dummy	.3938761	.488778	0	1
Woman Participated in Article Dummy	.1992883	.3996074	0	1
Equations	13.48816	12.51928	0	95
Appendix Dummy	.3551532	.4787264	0	1
Tables	2.206128	2.579062	0	14
Figures	1.937326	2.416027	0	23

Unrestricted Sample: As described in the article, two outliers have been excluded from the analysis.

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics of Important Variables

B LINEAR SPLINE ANALYSIS

DEPENDENT VARIABLE:	LINEAR SPLINE ANALYSIS	
AVERAGE FRACTION OF SINGLE-AUTHORED PAPERS	**Coefficients**	**t-Statistic**
Year1974-1977	.0584313**	2.26
	(.0259054)	
Year1978-1988	-.0591268**	-2.05
	(.0288935)	
Year1989-1999	-.0244146**	-2.85
	(.0085566)	
Year2000-2010	.0184761**	2.11
	(.0087409)	
Intercept	-114.9354**	-2.25
	(51.19172)	
MODEL SUMMARY:		
Observations	37	
F-Statistic	29.05	
R^2	0.7841	
Root-MSE	.07609	

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01, robust standard errors appear in parentheses

Table 9: Linear Spline Regression for Single-Authored Papers



Figure 4: Linear Spline Analysis of Single-Authored Papers