

Collaborative Research in Economics in Pakistan: The Case of *Pakistan Development Review* from 1973 to 2009

Sajjad Ullah Jan¹ and Dr. Mumtaz A. Anwar²

¹Government Degree College, Darband, Mansehra

²Honorary Professor. Department of Library and Information Science, University of the Punjab

Abstract: The patterns of collaborative authorship (extent of international collaboration and degree of collaboration) and institutional affiliation in the papers of the *Pakistan Development Review* were determined by using bibliometric techniques. The sample used was the papers published during 1973-2009. Of the 1627 papers, 723 (44.44%) were the result of collaborative effort. International collaboration was observed only in 94 papers. The degree of collaboration was 0.44 as whole and the year-wise calculated degree ranged between 0.13 and 0.76. The year 2009 was the most productive year in terms of collaborative research.

Keywords: Pakistan Development Review; Economics; Bibliometrics; Collaborative authorship

1. Introduction

Collaborative research is that which is carried out in group or groups. It involves the ideas/mental and physical efforts of two or more individuals. There is no clear indication as to when collaboration in research started. Of the many writers who have written on this topic, the work of Price (1963) is considered very valuable. Using *Chemical Abstracts* and the increasing trend of collaboration in the field of chemistry, he anticipated that by 1980 the single-authored papers will become extinct. Bruffee (1973) presented the argument that scholars working in groups produce better work than when they produce alone. The works of these two scholars can be regarded as catalyst in the production of collaborative research as well as in catching attention of bibliometricians. Presently collaborative authorship, especially in the pure and applied sciences, is observed as a very common trend and it is interesting that collaboration is taking place irrespective of geographical boundaries.

Received: 23.1.2013 Accepted: 22.11.2013
© ISAST

ISSN 2241-1925



Collaboration in research helps in the productivity of papers; clarification of ideas; enhancing quality of research; division of labour; helping younger colleagues in gaining experience; exploration of new areas/topics; and in getting benefits of lengthy copyright period. The present study was carried out to know the collaborative trends in economics in Pakistan. However, the study is limited to the papers of *Pakistan Development Review* published during the period 1973-2009.

The *Pakistan Development Review (PDR)*, an international economics journal, started in 1958 as the *Economic Digest* by the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE) which is one of the oldest specialized institutions in the discipline of economics in Pakistan. *PDR* has been publishing regularly since 1961 with a short pause during 1971-1972. It contains theoretical and empirical contributions with a main focus on Pakistan's socio-economic problems. The contents of *PDR* are abstracted / indexed in international databases, for example, Econlit, World Agricultural Economics, International Bibliography of the Social Sciences, and Rural Sociology Abstracts (PIDE, 2010). Thus, being an important journal of economics from Pakistan, it is targeted to determine the collaborative research trends in Pakistan using the papers published during 37 years, 1973 to 2009.

2. Literature review

A number of studies have been conducted on the analysis of collaborative research in different disciplines. Some of these studies are reviewed here.

Vimala and Reddy (1996), who analyzed the doctoral theses in the field of zoology, concluded that multiple-authorship was dominant, and the degree of collaboration was 0.75 as a whole. They observed that the trend of solo-writing declined during 1901-1995 and anticipated that the proportion of single authorship was likely to be insignificant after the year 2030. Nwagwu (2007) studied the patterns of authorship in the biomedical literature of Nigeria using a total of 6820 papers published during the period 1967-2002 derived from MEDLINE. He found that 77 percent of the papers had multiple authors while only 23 percent of the papers had single authors. On an average, there were 3.44 authors per paper with a collaborative coefficient of 0.644.

Pillai (2007) conducted a study of 11,412 journal and 1,328 book citations in physics for the determination of trends in authorship pattern and collaborative research using the data collected from the doctoral dissertations of the Indian Institute of Science. It was that found joint authorship was a preferred pattern and on average the degree of collaboration in journals was 0.08. Pradhan, Panda, and Chandrakar (2011) studied the trends in authorship and collaborative patterns in Indian chemistry literature using 53,977 articles published during the period 2000-2009 derived from the ISI Web of Science. The average number of authors per article was 3.55. They found that only 3.03 percent of the articles were single-authored and 96.97 percent multi-authored with the highest

percentage going to three-authored articles. The degree of collaboration during was 0.03.

Rana and Agarwal (1994) studied the authorship and collaborative research patterns in Indian wildlife and fisheries based on data collected from *Wildlife Review and Fish Review* published from 1980 to 1989. It was found that the proportion of single-authored papers had decreased from 63.68 percent in 1980 to 52.74 percent in 1989. Similarly, an increase was observed in the average number of authors per paper from 1.57 in 1980 to 1.70 in 1989 which resulted in the increase of the degree of collaboration from 0.36 to 0.47.

The co-authorship and sub-authorship collaboration was examined in the journal literature of Psychology and Philosophy by Cronin, Shaw and Berre (2003). They found that out of 2,707 articles, published in 2001, 74 percent were single-authored. Zafrunnisha and Reddy (2009) examined the authorship pattern and degree of collaboration in the field of psychology using 141 Ph. D. theses. The multi-authored papers were dominant and the degree of collaboration was 0.53. Park (2006) studied the authorship characteristics of the Asian and Pacific region using top 20 journals in the field of Library and Information science from 1967 to 2005. It was found that collaborative authorship was strong in information science journals in which regional collaboration was strong between Australia and China. In the library science journals single-authored and multi-authored articles were about equally represented. Nandi and Bandyopadhyay (2008) analyzed 68 papers published during the period 1998-2002 in the *Indian Economic Review*. They found that the majority of the papers (n=45, 66.17%) were single-authored and 23 (33.82%) were multiple-authored and the degree of collaboration had gradually decreased.

On the basis of literature reviewed above, it is safe to say that the researchers usually work jointly in sciences whereas there is a mixed trend of authorship in social sciences where single-authored papers are dominant. No such study seems to have been conducted to determine the authorship trends in economics literature in Pakistan.

3. Objectives and method

This study was designed to achieve the following objectives:

1. To determine the patterns of collaborative authorship in the multi-authored papers of *PDR*
2. To identify the prolific authors in these multi-authored papers
3. To find out the extent of international collaboration
4. To determine the degree of collaboration
5. To determine the frequency of institutional occurrences in the collaborative papers

The bibliometric techniques of analysis were used in achieving the above objectives. A total of 1627 papers published during 1973-2009 were examined,

out of which 723 (44.44%) were the result of collaborative effort. The articles with authors having different geographical addresses were regarded as the result of international collaboration. The degree of collaboration was calculated by using Subramanyam (1983) formula which is $C = \frac{Nm}{Ns + Nm}$. In this formula “C” stands for degree of collaboration, “Ns” stands for total single-authored and “Nm” for total multi-authored articles.

$$\text{Degree of collaboration } C = \frac{Nm}{Ns + Nm} = \frac{723}{904 + 723} = 0.44$$

4. Findings and discussion

Patterns of Collaborative Authorship: Table 1 presents the patterns of research collaboration in the papers of *PDR*. Out of the 723 collaborative articles, two-authored accounted for 522 (72.20%) and three-authored 172 (23.79%). There are 25 (3.46%) four-authored and only three (0.41%) five-authored articles. Papers by seven and eight authors appeared only once. These 723 papers were produced by 1688 authors with an average of 2.33 authors per paper. On the other hand, 1627 papers were produced by 2593 authors with an average of 1.59 authors per article which was not very high.

The year-wise percentage of collaboration shows that the year 1973 received less collaboration which increased in the next publication years. In the 37 years, maximum collaborative works appeared in the periods 1998-2000 and 2006-2009. The trend of solo writing is similar to the one found by Nandi and Bandyopadhyay (2008) and Sudhier and Abhila (2011) where single-authored articles in majority.

Table 1. Patterns of collaborative authorship

Year	Articles with Number of						T. A	T. Au	Avg. au(s)/A	% of Collaborative Articles out of 1627
	2A	3A	4A	5A	7A	8A				
1973	---	03	---	---	---	---	3	9	3	.18
1974	09	---	---	---	---	---	9	18	2	.55
1975	05	01	---	---	---	---	6	13	2.17	.37
1976	04	05	---	---	---	---	9	23	2.55	.55
1977	04	---	---	01	---	---	5	13	2.6	.31
1978	06	---	---	---	---	---	6	12	2	.37
1979	04	02	---	---	---	---	6	14	2.33	.37
1980	04	---	---	---	---	---	4	8	2	.25
1981	03	01	---	---	---	---	4	9	2.25	.25
1982	04	---	---	---	---	---	4	8	2	.25
1983	04	---	---	---	---	---	4	8	2	.25
1984	06	03	01	---	---	---	10	25	2.5	.61
1985	15	03	---	---	---	---	18	39	2.17	1.11

Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries (QQML) Special Issue 175
Bibliometrics and Scientometrics: 171- 181, 2015

1986	13	02	---	---	---	---	15	32	2.13	.92
1987	16	02	01	---	---	---	19	42	2.21	1.17
1988	21	07	---	---	---	---	28	63	2.25	1.72
1989	18	03	01	---	---	---	22	49	2.23	1.35
1990	05	---	---	---	---	---	5	10	2	.31
1991	21	02	---	---	---	---	23	48	2.09	1.41
1992	19	03	---	---	---	---	22	47	2.14	1.35
1993	24	08	01	---	---	---	33	76	2.3	2.03
1994	22	07	---	---	---	---	29	65	2.24	1.78
1995	17	06	02	---	---	---	25	60	2.4	1.54
1996	09	06	02	---	---	---	17	44	2.59	1.04
1997	14	03	---	---	---	---	17	37	2.18	1.04
1998	26	06	01	---	---	---	33	74	2.24	2.03
1999	22	11	01	---	---	---	34	81	2.38	2.09
2000	26	08	---	---	---	---	34	76	2.24	2.09
2001	17	08	---	---	---	---	25	58	2.32	1.54
2002	15	05	03	---	---	---	23	57	2.48	1.41
2003	15	07	01	---	---	---	23	55	2.39	1.41
2004	15	07	---	---	---	---	22	51	2.32	1.35
2005	15	09	03	01	---	---	28	74	2.64	1.72
2006	32	10	02	01	01	---	46	114	2.48	2.83
2007	25	16	01	---	---	---	42	102	2.43	2.58
2008	18	08	03	---	---	---	29	72	2.48	1.78
2009	28	10	02	---	---	01	41	102	2.49	2.52
Total	521	172	25	03	01	01	723	1688	2.34*	44.44

Table Key: 1A= 1 Authored Papers, 2A= 2 Authored and so on, TA= Total Articles,. T. Au= Total Authors, Avg. au(s)/A= Average author/ article.

*. This figure represents average number of authors per article during the period (1973-2009).

Prolific Authors: Prolific authors are considered those who contributed 10 or more articles in collaboration with other researchers. Table 2 shows the names of those authors in which M. Ghaffar Chaudhry is the leading contributor with 20 articles followed by Rehana Siddiqui, Sohail Jehangir Malik and Musleh-uddin with 17 articles each. The third position is occupied by Mohammad Afzal and Ejaz Ghani with 16 articles each. A total of 29 authors contributed 10 or more articles each in which there are seven authors who contributed 11 articles each and five authors who contributed 10 articles each.

Table2, Prolific Authors in Collaborative works

Rank	Author	No. of Papers
1	M. Ghaffar Chaudhry	20
2	Rehana Siddiqui	17
2	Sohail Jehangir Malik	17

2	Musleh-uddin	17
3	Mohammad Afzal	16
3	Ejaz Ghani	16
4	Sarfraz Khan Qureshi	14
4	Abdul Qayyum	14
4	Eatzaz Ahmad	14
5	Zeba Ayesha Sathar	13
5	Munir Ahmad	13
5	Qazi Masood Ahmad	13
6	Ashfaq H. Khan	12
6	Ghulam Mohammad Arif	12
6	Naushin Mahmood	12
6	Shahnaz Kazi	12
6	Hafiz A. Pasha	12
7	Mohammad Irfan	11
7	M. Aynul Hasan	11
7	Kalbe Abbas	11
7	Ather Maqsood	11
7	Shamim A. Sahibzada	11
7	Toseef Azid	11
7	Fazal Husain	11
8	Syed Mubashir Ali	10
8	Mir Annice Mahmood	10
8	Rizwana Siddiqui	10
8	Attiya Yasmeen Javid	10
8	Muhammad Iqbal	10
---	---	---

International Collaboration: The international collaboration, based on the authors' addresses, identified only 94 (13.00%) of 723 articles (Table 3). A strong collaboration was observed between Pakistan and USA with 21 (22.34%) of the 94 internationally collaborative works. The volume of collaboration between Pakistan and Canada, Pakistan and UK, and Pakistan and Australia was 19 (20.21%), 9 (9.57%), and 5 (5.32%) respectively. Pakistan and Holland, and Canada and USA are found collaborating in 4 (4.26%) and 3 (3.19%) articles respectively. And Turkey and UK, Japan and USA, and Pakistan and Malaysia collaborated in two (2.13%) articles each. There is only one-time collaboration between different countries in 28 (29.79%) articles. The host country, Pakistan, appears in 79 (84.04%) out of 94 articles. This is an indication that either the research of the Pakistani authors is regarded of quality, and therefore, attractive to the authors outside the host country, or as the focus of the journal is on the local issues the local authors can be beneficial to international authors.

International collaboration in a journal shows the scope as well as the popularity of the journal in the international community of scholars. Thus it creates an

attraction for the foreign authors to collaborate with the local authors. International collaboration can also help in solving local as well as international problems. Therefore, it is a very healthy phenomenon in *PDR* and beneficial for solving local economic and social issues in international perspectives.

Table 3. International Collaboration in the Papers of *PDR* (N = 94)

Ra nk	Countries	Frequ ency	%	Ra nk	Countries	Frequ ency	%
1	Pakistan and USA	21	22.3 4	8	Pakistan and Yemen	1	1.06
2	Pakistan and Canada	19	20.2 1	8	USA and UK	1	1.06
3	Pakistan and UK	9	9.57	8	Pakistan and Saudi Arabia	1	1.06
4	Pakistan and Australia	5	5.32	8	Philippines and Bangladesh	1	1.06
5	Pakistan and Holland	4	4.26	8	Pakistan, Canada and Turkey	1	1.06
6	Canada and USA	3	3.19	8	Germany and Holland	1	1.06
7	Turkey and UK	2	2.13	8	Pakistan and Taiwan	1	1.06
7	Japan and USA	2	2.13	8	Pakistan, USA and UK	1	1.06
7	Pakistan and Malaysia	2	2.13	8	Pakistan, USA and Canada	1	1.06
8	Singapore and USA	1	1.06	8	Pakistan and Germany	1	1.06
8	Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Australia	1	1.06	8	Pakistan and U.A.E	1	1.06
8	India and Switzerla nd	1	1.06	8	Pakistan and Thailand	1	1.06
8	Pakistan and Philippine	1	1.06	8	Italy and Chile	1	1.06

8	s Pakistan and Turkey	1	1.06	8	Pakistan and Japan	1	1.06
8	Pakistan and Scotland	1	1.06	8	Pakistan and Austria	1	1.06
8	Pakistan and Singapore	1	1.06	8	Germany and Taiwan	1	1.06
8	Pakistan and Kuwait	1	1.06	8	Pakistan and France	1	1.06
8	Pakistan and Switzerla nd	1	1.06	8	Taiwan and Philippine	1	1.06
Tot al	---	---	---	---	---	94	100

Degree of Collaboration: The extent of collaboration can be understood by using the formula for the degree of collaboration developed by Subramanyam (1983) as provided in the method section above. The degree of collaboration (C) for 723 papers is 0.44. This value shows that for the entire 37 years of the journal the collaboration was neither very low nor very high. Table 4 provides details when the formula is applied on the year-wise data. The degree of collaboration ranged between 0.13 and 0.76. The data show ups and downs in collaboration. However, a general increase in (C) is observed which is very sharp in 2009. This trend is against the result of Nandi and Bandyopadhyay (2008) who found that the degree of collaboration was decreasing in the *Indian Economic Review*. Thus, on the basis of the observed authorship patterns in Table 1 and the calculated (C) values, we can expect the dominancy of multi-authored articles in the coming years in the papers of *PDR*.

Table 4, Year-wise Degree of Collaboration

Year	Ns	Nm	(C)
1973	20	3	.13
1974	16	9	.36
1975	15	6	.29
1976	9	9	.5
1977	16	5	.24
1978	21	6	.23
1979	14	6	.3
1980	15	4	.21

Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries (QQML) Special Issue 179
Bibliometrics and Scientometrics: 171- 181, 2015

1981	14	4	.23
1982	10	4	.29
1983	10	4	.29
1984	18	10	.36
1985	17	18	.52
1986	25	15	.38
1987	25	19	.44
1988	27	28	.51
1989	34	22	.392
1990	9	5	.36
1991	39	23	.37
<hr/>			
1992	46	22	.33
1993	44	33	.43
1994	44	29	.40
1995	41	25	.38
1996	39	17	.31
1997	22	17	.44
1998	38	33	.47
1999	27	34	.56
2000	27	34	.56
2001	34	25	.43
2002	25	23	.48
2003	27	23	.46
2004	24	22	.48
2005	26	28	.52
2006	28	46	.63
2007	25	42	.63
2008	20	29	.59
2009	13	41	.76

Institutional Affiliation of the Authors: A total of 394 institutions had 1957 occurrences in both single-authored and multi-authored papers. Table 5 provides the list of those institutions having occurrences in ten or more collaborative papers. The Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, the host institution of the journal, ranked first with 340 occurrences, followed by the University of Karachi, Quaid-e-Azam University, and Social Policy and Development Centre with 80, 48, and 18 occurrences respectively.

The table revealed that in the top 14 ranked institutions there are nine Pakistani institutions five foreign/international institutions. It shows that *PDR* is an attractive source for the foreign scholars to publish in.

Table 5, Institutional Occurrences in Collaborative Papers

S. No.	Name of the Institution	Frequency of Occurrence	Rank
1	Pakistan Institute of Development Economics	340	1
2	University of Karachi	80	2
3	Quaide-e-Azam university	48	3
4	Social Policy and Development Centre	18	4
5	International Food Policy Research Institute	16	5
6	Pakistan Agricultural Research Council	16	5
7	World Bank	15	6
8	International Islamic University, Pakistan	14	7
9	Erasmus University	14	7
10	State Bank of Pakistan	14	7
11	Bahauddin Zakariya University	14	7
12	University of Agriculture, Faisalabad	13	8
13	International Monetary Fund (IMF)	11	9
14	Acadia University	10	10

5. Limitations of the study

One of the limitations is the gap in literature created by the unpublished third issue of volume 47. Another limitation was the unavailability of institutional affiliations of three authors.

6. Conclusion

The results of the present study confirm the results of earlier studies that the social scientists usually prefer to work alone. However, an increasing trend of collaboration among Pakistani economists was observed from 2005 to 2009 suggesting that multi-authored works were growing which was a good sign for the development of the field. The concerned authorities in Pakistan need to look at this phenomenon seriously and create research environment where team-work is encouraged. This will help developing more collaborative research on the pattern of pure and applied sciences.

International collaboration in the *PDR* papers is low. Such cooperation is helpful for benefiting from the experiences of other countries. Therefore, Pakistani researchers should be encouraged to get involved in international scholarly organizations and develop relations with research scholars worldwide. It is reasonable to assume that the researchers from the developed

countries will have an interest in the economic and social issues of Pakistan. Collaboration with international researchers and their institutions will enhance the research ability of Pakistani authors and will improve the quality of research.

References

- Bruffee, K. A. (1973). Collaborative Learning: Some Practical Models. *College English*, 34 (5), 634-643.
- Cronin, B., Shaw, D., & Barre, K. L. (2003). A cast of thousands: Coauthorship and subauthorship collaboration in the 20th century as manifested in the scholarly journal literature of psychology and philosophy. *JASIST*, 54 (9):855-871.
- Nandi, A. and Bandyopadhyay, A. K. (2008). *Indian Economic Review* (1998-2002): A bibliometric study. *SRELS Journal of Information Management*, 15 (1), 95-100.
- Nwagwu., W. E. (2007). Patterns of authorship in the biomedical literature of Nigeria. *Library and Information Science Research Electronic Journal*, 17(1), 2-28.
- Pakistan Institute of Development Economics. (2010). *The Pakistan Development Review*. Retrieved April 8, 2010, from http://www.pide.org.pk/index.php?com_content&view=Article&id=91&Itemid=93.
- Park, T. K. (2006). *Authorship from the Asia and Pacific region in top library and information science journals*. Retrieved October 05, 2010, from <http://www3.ntu.edu.sg/home/assfo0/publications/2006/2006ALIEP-Park.pdf>
- Pillai, K. G. S. (2007). Authorship patterns in physics literature: An informetric study on citations in doctoral theses of the Indian Institute of Science. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, 54, 90-94.
- Pradhan, P., Panda, S., & Chandrakar. J. (2011). *Authorship pattern and degree of collaboration in Indian chemistry literature*. Presented at 8th International CALIBER - 2011, Goa University, Goa, March 02-04-2011.
- Price, D. S. (1963). *Little science, big science*. New York: Columbia University Press, New York, 86-91.
- Rana, M. S. & Agarwal, S. (1994). Authorship trends in Indian wildlife and fisheries literature- a bibliometric study. *Annals of Library Science and Documentation*, 41(1), 13-18.
- Subramanyam, K. (1983). Bibliometric studies of research collaboration: A review. *Journal of Information Science*. 6(1):33-38.
- Sudhier, K. G. and Abhila, I. S. (2011). *Publication Productivity of Social Scientists in the Centre for Development Studies, Thiruvananthapuram: A Bibliometric Analysis*. Retrieved May 2, 2011, from <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/dxml/bitstream/handle/1944/1654/62.pdf?sequence=1>.
- Vimala, V. & Reddy, V. P. (1996). Authorship pattern and collaborative research in the field of Zoology. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 1(2), 43-50.
- Zafrunnisha, N. and Reddy, V. P. (2009). Authorship pattern and degree of collaboration in Psychology. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, 56, 255-261.