



AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF WINE ECONOMISTS

AAWE WORKING PAPER
No. 258
Economics

WHAT ARE THE MAJOR JOURNALS FOR WINE ECONOMISTS?

Jean-François Outreville, Lara Agnoli
and Eric Le Fur

Oct 2020

www.wine-economics.org

AAWE Working Papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been subject to a peer review process. The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the American Association of Wine Economists AAWE.

© 2020 by the author(s). All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

What are the Major Journals for Wine Economists?

Jean-François Outreville ^a, Lara Agnoli ^b and Eric Le Fur ^c

Abstract:

What are the major journals for wine economists? Which ones are the most influential? Journal rankings are intended to reflect the place of a journal within its field, the relative difficulty of being published in that journal, and the prestige associated with it. A survey for a peer evaluation of journals by wine economists was launched on June 19 this year. The information and link to the survey was sent to 440 valid email addresses of academic researchers who participated at recent annual meetings of academic associations active in the field of wine economics. The objective of this survey is to present different approaches to list the best journals that researchers in the field of wine economics care about or value the most for their publications. This is an attempt to offer more than yet another journal ranking. This exercise is of potential merit for the field of wine economics and those active within it, especially young scholars who are facing a competitive environment.

Keywords: Journal lists, journal rankings, citation analysis, peer evaluation.

JEL Classification: A11; C83; L66

^a Burgundy School of Business, Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté, Dijon, France, Jeanfrancois.outreville@bsb-education.com

^b Burgundy School of Business, Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté, Dijon, France, Lara.agnoli@bsb-education.com

^c INSEEC School of Business and Economics, Bordeaux, France, elefur@inseec.com

1. Introduction

With more than 900 academic journals now in circulation in the areas of economics and business,¹ academics can have a hard time figuring out where to submit their work for publication. According to recent surveys (McKiernan et al., 2019; Niles et al., 2019) most faculty members say they care most about whether the journal is read by the people they most want to reach—but they think their colleagues most value journal prestige.

Journal rankings are intended to reflect the place of a journal within its field, the relative difficulty of being published in that journal, and the prestige associated with it. They are used as official research evaluation tools in several countries. Consequently, the ranking of academic journals is a highly contentious dimension of research assessment, and vigorously debated (Seglen, 1997; Palacios-Huerta and Volij, 2004; Willmott, 2011). Negative consequences of rankings are generally well-documented and relate to the problems of using journal rankings for performance measurement purposes (Adler and Harzing, 2009; Baum, 2011; McKinnon, 2017). It further triggers unintended competition in the academic system between subject areas to justify resource investments and, as a consequence, a substantial amount of research in new fields is published in highly ranked journals rather than specialized ones (Chan et al., 2006; Treviño et al., 2010).

Prevailing methods for ranking journals may be broadly classified as (i) peer assessment methods or evaluations, provided simply through surveys of academic leaders or through committee vote and (ii) publication citation-based methods or bibliometric measures of journals, based on citation analysis, journal impact factor and other metrics (see Mingers and Yang, 2017 for a review). Since no consensus has been reached as to the superiority of a given criterion and in light of the well-known shortcomings and criticisms of these approaches (Frey and Rost, 2010), hybrid journal rankings have gained attention and peer evaluation for new fields of academic research

¹ The Journal Quality List proposed by Harzing (2020) contains 13 different rankings of more than 900 journals in the following broad areas: Economics, Finance, Accounting, Management, and Marketing. The 2019 Edition of the Journal Citation Reports® (JCR) published by Clarivate Analytics provides a combination of impact and influence metrics from 2018 Web of Science source data. The report includes 11,877 journals from 81 countries. The most well-known indicator in the JCR is the Journal Impact Factor (JIF).

remains an important component of a journal's quality. These are intended to deliver a more balanced view on journal quality by combining both subjective and objective data.

The objective of this survey is to present different lists of journals that researchers in the field of wine economics care about or value the most for their publications. This is an attempt to offer more than yet another journal ranking. This exercise is of potential merit for the field of wine economics and those active within it, especially young scholars who are facing a competitive environment. In a first part, a citation-based list of papers is proposed, based on the four major specialized journals in the field of wine economics, i.e. the *Journal of Wine Economics* (JWE), the *International Journal of Wine Business Research* (IJWBR), the *Journal of Wine Research* (JWR) and *Wine Economics and Policy* (WEP).

In a second part, a peer evaluation is based on a questionnaire with a list of journals arranged in alphabetical order and sent out to academic researchers in the field of wine economics for their evaluation. The information and link to the survey was sent to 440 valid email addresses of academic researchers. The survey recorded a low 14% response rate but three indices are calculated to account for familiarity with the journals, prestige and pertinence for the field.

Next section reviews the literature and the following section presents the methodology used in this paper. The results based on citations and on peer evaluation are presented in two consecutive sections.

2. Literature Review

The first and the most-well-known journal metric, the Journal Impact Factor (JIF) was originally developed by Garfield and Sher (1963) and Garfield (1972) for the Life Science Literature. The idea of ranking economic journals started with Coats (1971) and a further debate in *Economic Inquiry* (Billings and Viksnins, 1972; Moore, 1972). Bornmann et al. (2017) report 22 papers for general economic journals but there are further rankings available which focus on specific (sub)disciplines like Finance (Currie and Pandher, 2011), Marketing (Steward and Lewis, 2010), Agricultural Economics (Herrmann et al., 2011), International Business (DuBois and Reeb,

2000), Risk Management and Insurance (Outreville and Malouin, 1985), Health Care Management (Haley (2016).

There are numerous journal rankings available (see Tuselmann et al., 2016) and there is no generally accepted single ranking. There have been several efforts to rank journals in economics and business using criteria such as peer evaluation and journal familiarity (Hawkins, Ritter, and Walter 1973; Malouin and Outreville, 1987; Axarloglou and Theoharakis, 2003; Currie and Pandher, 2011; Herrmann et al., 2011), and citation frequency (Bush, Hamelman, and Staaf, 1974; Liebowitz and Palmer 1984; Engemann and Wall, 2009). For the user of journal rankings, it is often not clear which metric should be used among the available solutions and Malouin and Outreville (1987) even argue that results are biased by a “country effect”, i.e. journals tend to rank higher in their own countries. McDonough and Spring (1975) suggest that in fact each criterion is a valid component of a journal's quality, but that each by itself provides only partial information on the quality. A robust solution may be a meta-ranking that aggregates different rankings (Chang et al., 2011; Bornmann et al., 2017).

Although citation-based measures remain the most common method for ranking journals, the peer assessment approach is the preferred approach for specialized fields like Accounting and Finance (Wu et al., 2009; Currie and Pandher, 2011) or Marketing (Steward and Lewis, 2010 Theußl et al., 2014). Applied to the finance literature by Coe and Weinstock (1983) and Borde et al. (1999) by surveying the perceptions of finance journal quality among finance department chairs at AACSB accredited business schools, the peer assessment method is extended by Oltheten et al. (2005), who survey finance journal ranking perception in a international sample of 2,336 faculty names taken from the Worldwide Directory of Finance Faculty maintained by Ohio State University.

Faculty perceptions and readership patterns are also common approaches in Accounting (Lowensohn and Samuelson, 2006), Marketing (Hult et al., 2009), Health Care Management (Menachemi et al., 2015) or Tourism and Hospitality (Mckercher et al., 2006). Herrmann et al. (2011) present a survey-based ranking of journals relevant for agricultural economists which includes for the first-time new journals in the field of wine business and economics, i.e. the *Journal of Wine Economics* and the *International Journal of Wine Business Research*.

The objective of this paper is therefore to present a ranking of journals that are relevant for wine economists. To assess the place of a journal within its field, the relative difficulty of being published in that journal, and the prestige associated with it we propose to compare a citation-based list of journals with a peer evaluation of the same list of journals.

3. Methodology

To date, most rankings privilege articles in selected journals, although they are also arguments for incorporating a more encompassing set of publications, including books, book chapters, conference proceedings. Our study considers only publications in academic journals. Then, choosing journals on which to base a ranking clearly establishes what the field identifies as the most relevant journals. Therefore, an initial list of journals was built based on citations of papers published in the four major journals specialized in wine economics and business, i.e. the *Journal of Wine Economics* (JWE), the *International Journal of Wine Business Research* (IJWBR), *Wine Economics and Policy* (WEP) and the *Journal of Wine Research* (JWR).

As any ranking is necessarily backward looking, it should rely on the most recent expression of journal quality available. If we only look at citations in papers published in the previous year, the result would severely be biased. On the other hand, the further one goes back in time, the less relevant the data are to any journal's current research quality. Ideally, then, the data should go back just far enough to reflect some steady-state level of papers' impact. The Thompson Reuters *JCR* Impact Factor considers only papers published in the previous two years. The research published on ranking use citation data on papers published over a period of three years (DuBois and Reeb, 2000), five years (Laband and Piette, 1994; Kalaitzidakis et al, 2003) or even seven years (Palacios-Huerta and Volij, 2004; Engemann and Wall, 2009). To construct a citation-based list of journals we therefore look at citations made over a four-year period (2016 to 2019) in at least two different volumes (years) to avoid many citations in only one or two papers.

For the peer evaluation, the method of selecting journals for inclusion is critical to the unbiased nature of the study; a listing generated entirely by the researcher omits journals with which the researcher is unfamiliar. This problem can be corrected for such subjectivity by allowing the

respondents to write down journals they consider important. This approach was used here. The initial questionnaire was built with a list of 70 journals cited in the four major journals specialized in wine economics and business and arranged in alphabetical order. The list excludes top ranked journals in general economics, finance or management.² Due to the selection process, there is a clear focus on agricultural economics and marketing-oriented journals. It also includes a dummy journal (*Journal of Wine Business Management*) and a brand-new journal with the inaugural issue published in 2017 (*International Journal of Hospitality Beverage Management*).

The questionnaire for this survey was presented on-line. In the first part, respondents are asked to indicate "whether or not the following journals are known to you, if you are aware of their existence or if they are unknown to you" and to add pertinent journals that could have been omitted to the list. The purpose is to determine a familiarity index. The second part is proposing two scales of evaluation ranking from A to E. Letters are preferred to numbers (see DuBois and Reeb, 2000). The first scale refers to the evaluation of the level of prestige attached to each journal based on perceived quality by each respondent and the second scale is relative to the relevance of the journal to the field of wine economics.

The information and link to the survey was sent to 440 valid email addresses of academic researchers who participated at recent annual meetings of the American Association of Wine Economics (AAWE), the European Association of Wine Economists (EuAWE) and the Academy of Wine Business Research (AWBR).³ Respondents were also asked to indicate those journals they currently have an association as a reviewer or previous author. One section of the questionnaire elicits academic descriptive information: academic rank, university link and areas of expertise.

The on-line survey remained open for about a month from mid-June to mid-July 2020. The average time to complete the questionnaire was less than ten minutes. At the end of the period,

² This condition may be rather restrictive as some of the leading general economics journals may be read by wine economists but not necessarily regarded as a market for their own research.

³ To avoid a selection bias, the sample is based on meetings (people having a paper on the program) rather than membership to an academic association. Most of the participants have probably already published in one of the journals and may be members or not of one or more than one association.

the survey recorded a low 14% response rate with 61 usable answers for the first part of the questionnaire. Summary statistics for respondent characteristics are provided in Appendix 1.

The analysis is based on three indices- the Popularity/Familiarity Index (PFI) that has been used in previous studies on ranking marketing journals (Hult et al., 2009), a Quality/Prestige Index (QPI) and a Pertinence/Relevance Index (PRI) for the field of wine economics. These indices should be used to develop a complete picture of a journal's influence in the field (Theoharakis and Hirst, 2002). Familiarity of a journal by the respondent is based on self declaration (it is well known, i.e. response is 1, as oppose to aware of existence or unknown, i.e. response is 0). Respondent's perceived quality and pertinence of journal is based on the A–E scale (Currie and Pandher, 2011).

The PFI index $PFI_i = \text{SUM}(R_i) / X$ where R_i is the number of times journal i was ranked as well known and X represents the maximum number of times a journal was ranked. PFI varies from 0 to 1. As an example of the PFI calculation, WEP's PFI is based on dividing the number of times WEP was ranked well known (36 times) by the total number of times JWE was ranked (59 times), resulting in a PFI of 0.69. The Quality/Prestige Index (QPI) and the Pertinence/Relevance Index (PRI) are based on average values of the proposed ranking (from A to E) transformed in value points from 5 to 1.

4. Citation-based Results

Table 1 presents the results for the first 25 most cited journals by origin. Clearly as shown by Chan (2001), citation-based ranking of wine journals is subject to journal self-citation bias, which is the tendency to cite articles in the same journal. The last column gives the total number of citations during the period 2016-2019 originating from the four major wine economics and business reviews.

Table 1: The 25 most quoted journals by journal of origin and total

	IJWBR	JWE	JWR	WEP	Total
International Journal of Wine Business Research	420	20	160	133	733
Journal of Wine Economics	82	351	60	34	527
Journal of Wine Research	119	33	173	78	403
Food Quality and Preference	95	32	118	100	345
Wine Economics and Policy	69	5	45	143	262
Journal of Consumer Research	113	12	55	8	188
Journal of Business Research	97	4	26	46	173
British Food Journal	69	6	42	56	173
American Journal of Enology and Viticulture	6	21	83	12	122
Agribusiness	28	14	29	25	96
Journal of Marketing	67	2	16	7	92
Tourism Management	55	1	29	4	89
American Journal of Agricultural Economics	19	31	4	33	87
Journal of Marketing Research	59	2	13	9	83
Strategic Management Journal	45	5	18	15	83
Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research	14	22	32	3	71
Family Business Review	68	1	1	0	70
European Journal of Marketing	44	0	6	17	67
Journal of Cleaner Production	16	5	11	35	67
Agricultural Economics	10	30	19	6	65
<i>Journal of Political Economy</i>	18	30	8	8	64
<i>Journal of Management</i>	38	2	5	18	63
Journal of Consumer Marketing	36	1	10	14	61
Journal of Business Venturing	26	3	14	11	54
<i>American Economic Review</i>	15	25	2	10	52

In bold are the journals specialized in wine business, all ranked in the top 20. Five food and agricultural journals are listed in the top 20 and a large number of marketing-oriented journals complete this list. Interestingly, prestigious economic and management journals (in italic) rank in the last fifth of the proposed list.

However, there is a bias in favor of IJWBR which publishes each year far more papers than the other journals. IJWBR publishes 4 issues per year with an average number of 35 papers per year when JWE publishes 3 issues per year with an average number of 15 papers per year, JWR

publishes 4 issues per year with an average number of 22 papers per year and WEP publishes 2 issues per year with an average number of 19 papers per year. To correct for this bias we calculate an adjusted ranking of the journals by giving the same weight to the four reviews. The list is presented in Table 2.

The JWE ranks first with an average value of 7.5 citations per published article over the period 2016-2019. The review *Food Quality and Preference* maintains its ranks while the *British Food Journal* ranks a little higher. Almost the same journals appear in the top 25 with the notable exception of the *Family Business Review* replaced by the *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*.

Table 2: Adjusted Citation-based List of Journals

	Adj Total
Journal of Wine Economics	7.56
International Journal of Wine Business Research	6.90
Journal of Wine Research	4.39
Food Quality and Preference	3.87
Wine Economics and Policy	2.97
British Food Journal	1.81
Journal of Consumer Research	1.74
Journal of Business Research	1.66
American Journal of Enology and Viticulture	1.49
American Journal of Agricultural Economics	1.13
Agribusiness	1.09
Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research	0.87
Agricultural Economics	0.87
<i>Journal of Political Economy</i>	0.82
Strategic Management Journal	0.81
Tourism Management	0.79
Journal of Marketing	0.79
Journal of Cleaner Production	0.78
Journal of Marketing Research	0.72
<i>American Economic Review</i>	0.68
European Journal of Marketing	0.61
<i>Journal of Management</i>	0.60
Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry	0.59
Journal of Consumer Marketing	0.57
Journal of Agricultural Economics	0.54

5. Peer Evaluation of Journals

Table 3 presents the PFI index for the top 20 journals. A complete list of 50 journals is presented in Appendix 2. The JWE ranks first with a PFI of 1.0 since it is the most often ranked journal. In the top list we find almost the same journals as in the citation-based analysis with few exceptions. The *European Review of Agricultural Economics* ranks higher while *Food Quality and Preference* ranks much lower as well as the two specialized reviews on viticulture, i.e. the *American Journal of Enology and Viticulture* and the *Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research*. *Food Policy*, another European journal, ranks in the top 20. These results are probably explained by the large number of respondents from France and Italy (35% of the respondents). It is interesting to note that the dummy journal which do not exist (*Journal of wine Business Management*) is well known for 26% of the respondents but unknown for 46%.

Table 3: The PFI Index for the Top 20 Journals

	PFI index
Journal of Wine Economics	1.00
American Journal of Agricultural Economics	0.71
International Journal of Wine Business Research	0.71
Journal of Wine Research	0.71
Wine Economics and Policy	0.69
British Food Journal	0.65
European Review of Agricultural Economics	0.58
Journal of Business Research	0.58
Journal of Marketing	0.58
Agricultural Economics	0.56
Journal of Agricultural Economics	0.54
Journal of Consumer Research	0.54
Journal of Marketing Research	0.54
Agribusiness	0.52
Food Policy	0.50
Journal of Marketing Management	0.48
Journal of Consumer Marketing	0.46
Journal of Cleaner Production	0.42
Journal of Consumer Psychology	0.42
Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics	0.40

Table 4 presents the QPI index for the top 30 journals. The results reveal the lower quality/prestige perception of journals specialized in wine economics and business with the exception of the *Journal of Wine Economics*. However, these results are based on a small sample of 43 usable answers.

Table 5 presents the PRI index for the top 30 journals. JWE ranks again first and in the top 10 the ranking of journals is close to the ranking proposed by the familiarity index. The major journals in the field of wine business rank in the top 5. 12 journals specialized in agricultural economics are also listed as well as 5 food business journals. This list is probably the closest to the objective of the survey to propose a ranking of preferred journals which researchers in the field of wine economics care about or value the most for their publications.

Table 4: The QPI Index for the Top 30 Journals

	QPI Index	
	mean	SD
American Journal of Agricultural Economics	4.8	0.4
Journal of Agricultural Economics	4.5	0.7
Journal of Consumer Research	4.4	1
Strategic Management Journal	4.4	1
Agricultural Economics	4.3	0.7
Food Policy	4.3	0.8
Journal of Marketing Research	4.3	1.1
Journal of Consumer Psychology	4.3	1
European Review of Agricultural Economics	4.2	0.9
Journal of Business Research	4.1	0.9
Journal of Marketing	4.1	1.1
Journal of Cleaner Production	4.1	0.9
Tourism Management	4.1	0.9
Journal of Wine Economics	4	0.9
Food Quality and Preference	4	1.4
British Food Journal	3.9	1
Applied Economics Perspective and Policy (AAEA Journal)	3.9	1
American Journal of Enology and Viticulture	3.9	0.7
Journal of Business Venturing	3.9	1
Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics	3.8	0.8
Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics	3.7	1
Small Business Economics	3.7	1
Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry	3.7	0.8
Journal of Marketing Management	3.6	0.8
Journal of Consumer Marketing	3.6	1.1
Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics	3.6	0.8
Journal of Rural Studies	3.6	1
Wine Economics and Policy	3.5	1
Agribusiness	3.5	1
Journal of Agricultural and Food Industrial Organization	3.5	1.1

Table 5: The PRI Index for the Top 30 Journals

	PRI Index	
	mean	SD
Journal of Wine Economics	4.6	0.9
Wine Economics and Policy	4.5	0.7
American Journal of Agricultural Economics	4.2	1.1
Journal of Wine Research	4.2	0.9
International Journal of Wine Business Research	4.1	1.1
Food Quality and Preference	4	1.3
International Journal of Wine Research	4	0.9
Australia and New Zealand Wine Industry Journal	3.9	1.1
British Food Journal	3.9	1
Agricultural Economics	3.8	1
Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics	3.8	0.8
European Review of Agricultural Economics	3.8	0.7
Journal of Agricultural Economics	3.8	1
Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research	3.7	0.9
American Journal of Enology and Viticulture	3.6	0.8
Agribusiness	3.5	1
Food Policy	3.5	1.2
Appetite	3.4	1.3
Applied Economics Perspective and Policy (AAEA Journal)	3.4	0.9
Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics	3.4	0.8
European Journal of Agronomy	3.4	1.2
International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management	3.4	1.3
Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics	3.4	0.9
Tourism Management	3.4	1.2
Agricultural and Resource Economics Review	3.3	1
International Journal of Food and Science Technology	3.3	0.8
International Journal of Hospitality Management	3.3	1.3
Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics	3.3	0.9
Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture	3.3	0.8
Journal of Agricultural and Food Industrial Organization	3.2	1

6. Conclusion/Discussion

There is no such thing as a correct ranking of academic journals. Instead, there is a universe of rankings, each the result of a set of subjective decisions by its constructor (Amir, 2002). The objective of this research is to propose different lists of journals that researchers in the field of wine economics care about or value the most for their publications. In a first part, a citation-based list of papers is proposed, based on the four major specialized journals in the field of wine economics. In a second part, a peer evaluation is based on a questionnaire designed with a list of journals arranged in alphabetical order and sent out to academic researchers in the field of wine economics for their evaluation.

This exercise is of potential merit for the field of wine economics and those active within it, especially young scholars who are facing a competitive environment. The consequences of using journal quality as a proxy for article quality are a matter of concern for both the field and individual scholars. (Singh et al., 2007).

The limit of this analysis is dependent on the number of participants to the survey. Unfortunately, the answer rate for this first attempt is low and may be due to the time period at which the survey was launched or to, we hope not, the lack of interest for the field. We anticipate a second round for peer evaluation based on these results and with a limited number of journals proposed for evaluation.

7. References

Adler N.J. and A.W. Harzing (2009). When knowledge wins: Transcending the sense and nonsense of academic rankings. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8(1): 72-95.

Amir, R. (2002). Impact-adjusted citations as a measure of journal quality, *CORE Discussion Papers 2002/74*, Université catholique de Louvain, Center for Operations Research and Econometrics.

Axaroglou, K. and V. Theoharakis (2003). Diversity in Economics: An Analysis of Journal Quality Perceptions. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1(6): 1402-1423.

Baum, J.A.C. (2011). Free-riding on power laws: Questioning the validity of the impact factor as a measure of research quality in organization studies. *Organization*, 18 (4) (2011), pp. 449-466

Billings, B. and G. Viksnins (1972). The relative quality of economics journals: an alternative rating system. *Economic Inquiry*, 10(4), 467–469.

Borde, S.F., Cheney, J.M. and J. Madura (1999). A note on perceptions of finance journal quality. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting*, 12(1): 89–96.

- Bornmann, L., A. Butz and K. Wohlrabe (2017). What are the top five journals in economics? A new meta-ranking. *Applied Economics*, 50(2): 1-17.
- Bush, W. C., Hamelman, P. W. and R.J. Staaf (1974). A quality index for economic journals. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 56(1):123-125.
- Chan, K. C. (2001). A Citation-Based Ranking of Journals in Financial Research: Some New Results. *Journal of Financial Education*, 27(1): 36-52.
- Chan, K. C., Fung, H.-G. and W.K. Leung (2006). International business research: Trends and school rankings. *International Business Review*, 15(4): 317–338.
- Chang, C.-L., Maasoumi, E. and M. McAleer (2016). Robust ranking of journal quality: An application to economics. *Econometric Reviews*, 35(1): 50–97.
- Coats, A. (1971). The role of scholarly journals in the history of economics: An essay. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 9(1): 29–44.
- Coe, R.K. and I. Weinstock (1983). Evaluating the finance journals: the department chairperson's perspective. *Journal of Financial Research*, 6(4): 345–349.
- Currie, R.R. and G.S. Pandher (2011). Finance journal rankings and tiers: An active scholar assessment methodology. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 35(1): 7-20.
- DuBois, F.L. and D. Reeb (2000), The Ranking of International Business Journals, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31(4): 689-704.
- Engemann, K.M. and H.J. Wall (2009). A Journal Ranking for Ambitious Economist. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*, 91(3): 127-139.
- Frey, B. S. and K. Rost (2010). Do rankings reflect research quality? *Journal of Applied Economics*, 13(1): 1–38.
- Garfield, E. and I.H. Sher (1963). New factors in the evaluation of scientific literature through citation indexing. *American Documentation*, 14(3): 195-201.
- Garfield, E. (1972). Citation analysis as a tool in journal evaluation. *Science*, 178: 471–479.
- Harzing, A.W.K. (2020). Journal Quality List. 66th edition, 15 February 2020, downloaded from www.harzing.com 1 may 2020.
- Hawkins, R. G., Ritter, L. S. and I. Walter (1973). What economists think of their journals? *Journal of Political Economy*, 81(4): 1017-1032.
- Herrmann, R., Berg, E., Dabbert, S., Pöchtrager, S. and K. Salhofer (2011). Going Beyond Impact Factors: A Survey-based Journal Ranking by Agricultural Economists. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 62(3): 710–732.
- Hult, G.T.M, Reimann, M. and O. Schilke (2009). Worldwide faculty perceptions of marketing journals: Rankings, trends, comparisons, and segmentations. *Global EDGE Business review*, 3(3): 1-23

- Kalaitzidakis, P., T.P. Mamuneas and T. Stengos (2003). Rankings of Academic Journals and Institutions in Economics. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1(6): 1346-1366.
- Laband, D. and M. Piette (1994). The Relative Impact of Economic Journals. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 32(2): 640-666.
- Liebowitz, S. J. and J.P. Palmer (1984). Assessing the relative impacts of economics journals. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 22(1):77-88.
- Lowensohn, S. and D. P. Samelson (2006). An Examination of Faculty Perceptions of Academic Journal Quality within Five Specialized Areas of Accounting Research. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 21(3): 219-239.
- Malouin, J.L. and J.F. Outreville (1987). The Relative Impact of Economics Journals: A Cross-Country Survey and Comparison. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 39(3): 267-277.
- Menachemi, N, Hogan, T.H. and J.L. DelliFraine (2015). Journal Rankings by Health Management Faculty Members: Are There Differences by Rank, Leadership Status, or Area of Expertise? *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 60(1):17-28.
- McDonough and C. C. Spring (1975). The relative quality of economic journals revisited. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business*, 15(1): 92-97.
- Mckercher, B., Law, R. and T. Lam (2006). Rating Tourism and Hospitality Journals. *Tourism Management*, 27(6):1235-1252.
- McKiernan, E.C., L.A. Schimanski, N.C. Muñoz, M. L. Niles and J.P. Alperin (2019). Use of the Journal Impact Factor in academic review, promotion, and tenure evaluations. *PeerJ Preprints 7*: e27638v2, <https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27638v2>
- McKinnon, A.C. (2017). Starry-eyed II: The Logistics Journal Ranking Debate Revisited. *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, 47(6): 431-446. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPDLM-02-2017-0097>
- Mingers, J. and L. Yang (2017). Evaluating journal quality: A review of journal citation indicators and ranking in business and management. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 257(1): 323-337.
- Moore, W. J. (1972). The relative quality of economics journals: a suggested rating system. *Economic Inquiry*, 10(2): 156–169.
- Niles, M.L., L. A. Schimanski, E. C. McKiernan and J. P. Alperin (2019). Why we publish where we do: Faculty publishing values and their relationship to review, promotion and tenure expectations, *bioRxiv* 706622, <https://doi.org/10.1101/706622>
- Oltheten, E., Theoharakis, V. and N. Travlos (2005). Faculty perceptions and readership patterns of finance journals: a global view. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 40(1): 223-239.

- Outreville, J.F. and J.L. Malouin (1985). What are the Major Journals that Members of ARIA Read? *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 52(4): 723-733.
- Palacios-Huerta, I. and O. Volij (2004). The Measurement of Intellectual Influence. *Econometrica*, 72(3): 963-977.
- Seglen, P. O. (1997). Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research. *British Medical Journal*, 314: 498-502.
- Singh, G., Haddad, K.M. and C.W. Chow (2007). Are articles in top management journals necessarily of higher quality? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 16(4): 319-331.
- Steward, M. and B. Lewis (2010). A comprehensive analysis of marketing journal rankings. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 32(1): 75-92.
- Theoharakis, Vasilis and Andrew Hirst (2002), Perceptual Differences of Marketing Journals: A Worldwide Perspective, *Marketing Letters*, 13 (4), 389-402.
- Theußl, S., Reutterer, T. and K. Hornik (2014). How to derive consensus among various marketing journal rankings? *Journal of Business Research*, 67(5): 998-1006.
- Treviño, L. J., Mixon, F. G., Jr., Funk, C. A. and A.C. Inkpen (2010). A perspective on the state of the field: International business publications in the elite journals as a measure of institutional and faculty productivity. *International Business Review*, 19(4): 378-387.
- Tüselmann, H., Sinkovics, R.R. and G. Pishchulov (2016). Revisiting the standing of international business journals in the competitive landscape. *Journal of World Business*, 51(4): 487-498.
- Willmott, H. (2011). Journal list fetishism and the perversion of scholarship: Reactivity and the ABS list. *Organization*, 18(4): 429-442.
- Wu, J., Hao, Q. and M.Y.M Yao (2009). Rankings of academic journals in accounting, finance, and information system: Perception from the college chairpersons. *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, 17(1): 66-105.

Appendix 1: Characteristics of the Respondents (n=61)

	n	%
Position		
Professor	30	49.2
Associate professor	18	29.5
Researcher	6	9.8
Other	7	11.5
Field		
Agricultural Economics / Environment	17	27.9
Management / International Business	13	21.3
General Economics	10	16.4
Marketing	10	16.4
Finance and Accounting	3	4.9
Other	8	13.1
Gender		
Male	47	77.0
Female	12	19.7
Age class		
40 years old and less	3	4.9
41-50 years old	18	29.5
51-60 years old	18	29.5
61 years old and older	22	36.1
Institution's country*		
France	15	23.4
USA	11	17.2
Canada	8	12.5
Italy	7	10.9
Australia	5	7.8
Spain	4	6.3
Germany	3	4.7
Denmark	2	3.1
Argentina	1	1.6
Belgium	1	1.6
Greece	1	1.6
Hungary	1	1.6
Lebanon	1	1.6
Norway	1	1.6
Poland	1	1.6
Portugal	1	1.6
South Africa	1	1.6

* n=64 as three respondents are affiliated to more than one institution in different countries

Appendix 2: The PFI index and detailed answers for the top 50 journals

	PFI index	It is well known	Aware of existence	Unknown to you
Journal of Wine Economics	1.00	85.2	11.5	3.3
American Journal of Agricultural Economics	0.71	60.7	18.0	21.3
International Journal of Wine Business Research	0.71	60.7	24.6	14.8
Journal of Wine Research	0.71	60.7	27.9	11.5
Wine Economics and Policy	0.69	59.0	26.2	14.8
British Food Journal	0.65	55.7	21.3	23.0
European Review of Agricultural Economics	0.58	49.2	21.3	29.5
Journal of Business Research	0.58	49.2	23.0	27.9
Journal of Marketing	0.58	49.2	34.4	16.4
Agricultural Economics	0.56	47.5	27.9	24.6
Journal of Agricultural Economics	0.54	45.9	23.0	31.1
Journal of Consumer Research	0.54	45.9	27.9	26.2
Journal of Marketing Research	0.54	45.9	21.3	32.8
Agribusiness	0.52	44.3	31.1	24.6
Food Policy	0.50	42.6	29.5	27.9
Journal of Marketing Management	0.48	41.0	24.6	34.4
Journal of Consumer Marketing	0.46	39.3	27.9	32.8
Journal of Cleaner Production	0.42	36.1	19.7	44.3
Journal of Consumer Psychology	0.42	36.1	18.0	45.9
Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics	0.40	34.4	36.1	29.5
Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics	0.37	31.1	32.8	36.1
Food Quality and Preference	0.37	31.1	14.8	54.1
International Journal of Wine Research	0.37	31.1	37.7	31.1
Journal of Rural Studies	0.37	31.1	27.9	41.0
Strategic Management Journal	0.37	31.1	21.3	47.5
Tourism Management	0.33	27.9	26.2	45.9
International Journal on Entrepreneurship and Small Business	0.31	26.2	34.4	39.3
Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics	0.31	26.2	27.9	45.9
Journal of Product & Brand Management	0.31	26.2	24.6	49.2
Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services	0.31	26.2	26.2	47.5
<i>Journal of Wine Business Management</i>	<i>0.31</i>	<i>26.2</i>	<i>27.9</i>	<i>45.9</i>
Small Business Economics	0.29	24.6	23.0	52.5
Appetite	0.25	21.3	24.6	54.1
Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics	0.25	21.3	36.1	42.6
Agricultural and Resource Economics Review	0.21	18.0	47.5	34.4
American Journal of Enology and Viticulture	0.21	18.0	31.1	50.8
Applied Economic Perspective and Policy (AAEA Journal)	0.21	18.0	21.3	60.7

Family Business Review	0.21	18.0	26.2	55.7
International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management	0.21	18.0	26.2	55.7
International Journal of Economics and Business Research	0.21	18.0	36.1	45.9
International Journal of Tourism Research	0.21	18.0	34.4	47.5
Journal of Food Products Marketing	0.21	18.0	27.9	54.1
Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research	0.21	18.0	32.8	49.2
Australia and New Zealand Wine Industry Journal	0.19	16.4	24.6	59.0
International Food and Agribusiness Management Review	0.19	16.4	26.2	57.4
International Small Business Journal	0.19	16.4	31.1	52.5
Journal of Small Business Management	0.19	16.4	36.1	47.5
Journal of Travel Tourism Marketing	0.19	16.4	19.7	63.9
Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research	0.17	14.8	31.1	54.1
International Journal of Hospitality Management	0.17	14.8	37.7	47.5
Journal of Agricultural and Food Industrial Organization	0.15	13.1	16.4	70.5