

RANKING HETERODOX ECONOMIC JOURNALS AND DEPARTMENTS: SUGGESTED METHODOLOGIES

Dr. Frederic S. Lee

RESPONSE TO THE PREVIOUS REFEREE REPORTS

1. Perspective on scientific communities: I made some slight alternations. However, I found the referee's comments not that helpful in part because I argued in the paper that knowledge is socially constructed. Thus I do not see much if any conflict between the view of scientific communities delineated in the paper and the perspective given in the 7 books I was suppose to read. In fact I only read two of them and I found that their potential contribution to the paper to be rather small. Moreover, I did not find what they had to say of particular relevance to economics.
2. The paper does not assume that the mainstream is monistic; rather it takes the position that the mainstream is distinctly different from heterodox economics like Christianity is distinctly different from atheism. In making this distinction, I am not presuming that the mainstream is homogeneous; and even if that assumption was made, it would be irrelevant to the paper.
3. It is correct that I argue that heterodox economics is pluralistic as well as arguing that there is a tendency for developing an integrative theory—there is a co-operative tendency in heterodox economics. The referee then claims that there are some in heterodox economics that would want if they had the chance to have their heterodox approach dominate all others. Of course no names are mentioned because there are very very few names that could be mentioned in this regard. Given my extensive relationship among heterodox economists around the world I would say that these few can essentially be completely disregarded.
4. The section on the basis for evaluating and ranking heterodox economic departments is general while its application to UK departments is particular. It cannot be any other way given the huge demand for data which is generally not readily available. The paper cannot be all embracing—it would make the paper longer than the journal itself. Many studies are required—this is how science works, always with the help of friends.
5. I have reflected on the use of the terms exports and imports and think they are most appropriate for the task. If the referee believes that the terms are problematical then he/she needs to say how.
6. The referee's view that the 'internal' ranking methodology developed in the paper is never going to be useful in the debate about the way heterodox economics is marginalized is, perhaps, an informed opinioned. I disagree with it and I believe that most of my heterodox colleagues would argue that rankings is one among many factors that can be useful in the debate. In any case, various heterodox economists and the US

and in Europe have asked me about my methodology/rankings because they see as something that might be useful to them in their local struggles.

7. The referee complains that the rankings can be misused. This is clearly a possibility, but this is not a good reason to reject an effort to develop a good ranking methodology. Presumably the referee would not argue that pencils should not be produced even though someone could use one to blind another person.

8. The issues of aggregation and weighting have been answered in the paper; in any case such aggregation and weighting that are used in the paper are also widely used in other ranking exercises.

9. Referee's More Detailed Comments:

a. P11/12—the issue is different than the one addressed in the paper—but not incompatible with it.

b. P11 para1—developing an integrative theory is what is happening—the issue of mimicking or not the mainstream is not relevant to the paper.

c. P11 para 2—dealt with it I hope.

d. P12—issue dealt with

e. P15—dealt with

f. Table 1—dealt with

g. P17—dealt with I hope

h. P18—dealt with—more discussion introduced to the paper

i. P20—dealt with

j. P21—dealt with—but in any case not that relevant since the ranking was an experiment in the use of a methodology, not trying to make a factual statement about what the real ranking of heterodox UK departments is.

k. P22-28—dealt with

l. P29—dealt with, evidence given

m. P30/31—referee may feel that way, but it should not be presumed that heterodox economists at East Anglia feel that way. Perhaps the referee could carry out a study what heterodox economists in various departments feel about the ranking qua

methodology. If ‘bad’ things emerge then an evaluation of the methodology can commence—this is how science works.