

Singapore Management University

Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection School of Social Sciences

School of Social Sciences

1-2019

Knowledge circulation in urban geography/urban studies, 1990-2010: Testing the discourse of Anglo-American hegemony through publication and citation patterns

Lily KONG

Singapore Management University, lilykong@smu.edu.sg

Junxi Qian

University of Hong Kong

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/sooss_research



Part of the [Asian Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies Commons](#)

Citation

KONG, Lily, & Qian, Junxi.(2019). Knowledge circulation in urban geography/urban studies, 1990-2010: Testing the discourse of Anglo-American hegemony through publication and citation patterns. *Urban Studies*, 56(1), 44-80.

Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/sooss_research/2280

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Social Sciences at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection School of Social Sciences by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email cherylids@smu.edu.sg.

Knowledge circulation in urban geography/urban studies, 1990–2010: Testing the discourse of Anglo-American hegemony through publication and citation patterns

Lily Kong Singapore Management University, Singapore

Junxi Qian The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Published in *Urban Studies*, 56 (1), 44-80. DOI: 10.1177/0042098017717205

Abstract

This article approaches the question of Anglo-American hegemony in urban studies by examining publication and citation patterns. The past one or two decades have witnessed critical arguments about how knowledge production in social sciences is characterised by centre–periphery relations, and risks universalising US–American and European knowledge and epistemology. While not much systematic analysis has been done to address the extent to which urban knowledge has been shaped by Anglo-American centrism, it is not difficult to tell that the field is dominated by the Anglophone world in terms of authorship, institutional affiliation, the cities under scrutiny, and the urban theories arising. This article undertakes systematic analysis by collecting papers published between 1990 and 2010, in journals indexed by the categories ‘Geography’ and ‘Urban Studies’ in the ISI Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) database. We develop a series of analyses by examining the sites of knowledge production, contributors, key research interests, and the circulation/impact of works. We also single out research on urban China to explore questions such as the place of research on non-Anglo-American contexts in international forums. In all, this article argues that the dominant position of the Anglophone world in the production and circulation of urban knowledge is clearly discernible. But the Anglophone dominance does not necessarily mean that other research interests and orientations have not found a footing. Instead, we suggest that the growing but still small niche of urban China research presents tremendous opportunities for generating cross-context dialogues. The potential has not been fully delivered, as yet.

Keywords

Anglo-American hegemony, knowledge circulation, knowledge production, urban China studies, urban geography/urban studies

英美霸权, 知识传播, 知识生产, 中国城市研究, 城市地理学/城市研究

Introduction

We live in a world where urban dwellers make up a larger proportion of the world’s population than rural inhabitants. Cities and towns are not just residential sites, but integral to economic production, distribution and consumption, and shape (and are shaped by) social life, cultural expression and political power. This is true of highly industrialised countries as well as developing countries. Some even assert that cities dominate our economies and the experience of social life (Paddison, 2001). Looking ahead, the number of urban residents and the importance of urban places are set to increase. Understanding the nature of the urban, and developing a vastly expanded repository of knowledge on cities across the globe, has perhaps never been more urgent and important.

The study of cities and towns appropriately engages much of humanities and social sciences. Study of the city, namely, ‘urban studies’, is broad and interdisciplinary. It is impossible to strictly outline the disciplinary boundaries of academic knowledge on cities. The very capaciousness of this field means that it is so profoundly implicated in the conventions, institutions and politics of knowledge production. This article takes up an issue in urban research that is worth more reflection than it has hitherto been given, namely, the uneven spatiality of production and circulation of knowledge on cities and the lingering phantom of Anglo-American hegemony.

In recent years, volumes on urban studies and its development as a field – handbooks, readers, textbooks, progress reports, and state-of-the-art reviews – have appeared regularly. It is not difficult to tell that English-language materials are dominated by the Anglophone world in terms of authorship and the institutions that these authors are from, especially the UK and USA. Concurrently, there is a second way in which the literatures are dominated by the Anglophone world; that is, the cities under scrutiny, the urban theories arising, and the conceptions of the ‘city’ are all largely anchored in Anglo-American contexts, while the rest of the Anglophone world is also more represented than non-Anglophone societies. *Prima facie*, therefore, knowledge on cities appears to be Anglo-centric in character.

This Anglo-American hegemony in urban studies may be contextualised within the larger landscapes of knowledge production in ‘mainstream’ social sciences. The past one or two decades have witnessed the proliferation of critical voices arguing that the knowledge production in social sciences is contingent on geopolitical orders and the power hierarchies conditioned by the modern world-system (Wallerstein, 1997). There is a centre–periphery relation in intellectual activities (Keim, 2011), which is defined on the basis of ‘the continuing, in some respects even increasing dominance of US-American and (West) European knowledge production’ (Çelik et al., 2014: 5).

One foremost consequence of this centre–periphery hierarchy is the universalisation of some epistemologies and intellectual traditions, which usually stem from Europe or North America, while obfuscating the historical contingencies and contexts of any ensemble of questions and ideas (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1999). Critics have attacked the varied versions of universalist claims to knowledge, be it Eurocentrism, Anglo-American hegemony or simply US dominance (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1999; Chakrabarty, 2000; Chow and de Kloet, 2014).

Adding to this observed inequality is the fact that, in a global age, knowledge is now less about explaining locally situated issues and phenomena, but more and more in mobility and ‘circulation’ – indeed, ‘knowledge does not only circulate, but is also produced in circulation’ (Çelik et al., 2014: 5). Yet, circulation usually takes place among intellectual communities occupying unequal positions within international scholarly circuits. Despite the expansion of research and education in emerging economies (such as China, India, Brazil and others), it is still easier to imagine them to be at the receiving, rather than the producing end, of knowledge. A corollary of this view is that Western hegemony is not only economic and political, but intellectual and educational (Mignolo, 2002). As Chow and de Kloet (2014) and Mignolo (2014) pointedly argue, the spectre of the ‘West’ disciplines the ways in which non-Western scholars think and narrate, resulting in ‘captive minds’ that depend on the epistemic universe of the powerful.

There are, therefore, arguments urging social sciences to radically ‘provincialise’ its knowledge production (Chakrabarty, 2000). In sociology, commentators have been advocating the ‘indigenisation’ of knowledge and the recognition of theoretical and epistemological constructions emerging from the intellectual ‘peripheries’ (Bhambra, 2014). Even more provocative proposals include the suggestion of ‘learning from the periphery’ (Comaroff and Comaroff, 2012), or the warning that we should be wary of Western scholars taking the lead in producing knowledge on the non-West, lest the project of de-Westernisation is to be re-Westernised (Mignolo, 2014). In a different vein, those not content with the idea of indigenising knowledge have deliberated on the potentially productive nature of inbetweenness (Bunnell et al., 2005; Simonsen, 2002), and suggested that straddling the borders between different intellectual traditions helps to avoid parochialism and retreat to local knowledge at the expense of dialogue and comparison (Chow and de Kloet, 2014).

While the extent to which knowledge production reproduces Anglo- or Eurocentrism varies a great deal between social sciences disciplines, this problem is arguably more relevant to intellectual activities that are more sensitive to, and contingent on, local contexts (e.g. research in sociology, anthropology, geography, urban studies, cultural studies, more so than, say, psychology). Some insights can be drawn from human geography, a ‘cousin’ discipline of urban studies, where impassioned debates have already emerged, pointing out that Eurocentrism in geography is mainly in the form of *Anglo-American hegemony*. An overarching argument is that what we refer to as ‘international’ publication outlets, especially those indexed by the Thomson Reuters ISI databases, are in fact not at all international.

First, publications in international journals reflect geographical biases. Not only are contributors predominantly based in UK and US institutions, but the mainstream debates also tend to address Anglo-American contexts and problems (Aalbers, 2004; Yeung, 2001). Professional journals are mostly edited, refereed and published by Anglo-American academics and publishers, who act as gatekeepers disciplining and policing the extent to which alternative epistemologies and thoughts are presented (Kitchin, 2005). Beyond Anglo-American dominance, it is the rest of the Anglophone world (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and to a lesser extent, Hong Kong and Singapore, etc.) that has a relatively competitive edge in engaging with mainstream debates (Gutiérrez and López-Nieva, 2001). As Minca (2000: 287) has compellingly contended, ‘the boundaries as well as the rules/coordinates of what passes for “international” debate within our discipline are determined from within the Anglo-American universe’.

The second reason for Anglo-American hegemony is the use of English as the lingua franca of international academic publishing. This linguistic dominance not only excludes scholars not versed in English, but also means that the scholarships not published in English only reach out to a limited audience, while Anglophone research gains more currency as ‘universal’ theories and knowledge (Garcia-Ramon, 2003; Peake, 2011). Even if scholars whose native languages are not English make it to the international publishing space, the theoretical and analytical narratives tend to be framed within Anglo-American debates and literatures, raising questions about the translatability and interchangeability of terminologies and ideas used in different communities of knowledge (Aalbers, 2004; Simonsen, 2002).

Third, contributions from non-Anglo-American authors to international journals are more likely to be viewed as exotic and interesting local cases, supplying empirical materials only ‘for later breakdown, synthesis and summary by British and American geographers’, in the latter’s endeavours of theoretical constructions and elaborations (Bański and Ferenc, 2013: 286; Berg and Kearns, 1998; Vaiou, 2003).

Finally, the neoliberal move towards benchmarking academic institutions according to productivity and market competitiveness has further reinforced the hegemony of ‘international’ journals, as sole indicators of ‘best’ quality and ‘world-class’ status (Paasi, 2005, 2015). The enormous pressure to publish in English-language journals, unsurprisingly, obliges the ‘peripheries’ of knowledge to adapt to the intellectual claims made by the ‘cores’.

This study

This article argues that while the critiques of Eurocentrism and Anglo-American hegemony generate strong momentums in disrupting the ‘intellectual involution’ (Yeung, 2002: 2100) of social sciences, recent developments in areas such as urban studies and human geography nonetheless prompt us to rethink the dichotomy of centre–periphery. More sensitivity is needed to attend to the ways in which scholars from diverse intellectual traditions adjust to, but also disrupt, Anglo-American hegemony. A slippage in the deployment of terminology is to equate *Anglophone scholarships* with *scholarships of Anglophone countries*. In fact, however, it is nowadays more likely than ever for Anglo-American or, broadly, Western scholars to step out of the comfort zones of knowledge production, and develop research projects which examine non-Western contexts not merely as case studies to be explained by Eurocentric theories. Concomitantly, it is widely recognised, at least in principle, that contributions from scholars based in ‘peripheries’ of knowledge production are to be welcomed by international journals (although meeting the criteria of scholarly ‘excellence’ risks re-privileging Western thoughts and epistemologies). Finally, a growing group of academics

work across boundaries between different intellectual traditions, such as scholars native to developing countries but employed by Anglo-American institutions. The existence of ‘inbetween’ intellectuals renders the binary of centre–periphery less applicable than a discourse of hybridity.

Based on these observations, this article draws a few points of view to develop a less dichotomous perspective to reflect on the indisputable existence of Anglo-American bias in urban studies, while keeping attentive to how this bias is being responded to, and sometimes bypassed and transcended. These points help to nuance an otherwise one-sided portrayal of Anglo-American hegemony:

1. While Anglo-American hegemony can still be observed in human geography and urban studies, for sure, the situation is gradually changing. In international journals, the share of contributions from outside the Anglophone world is on the rise (Rodríguez-Pose, 2006). Concurrently, the coverage of regional contexts is diversifying, as the journals become more aware of, and receptive to ‘non-white knowledge’ (Derudder, 2011; Peake, 2011). In fact, recent years have witnessed an exponential increase in publications focusing on, for example, China, India, and Southeast Asia.
2. The risk of international journals addressing predominantly the Anglo-American contexts has been recognised through new critical interventions. In urban studies, the need to acknowledge ‘urban theories beyond the West’ (Edensor and Jayne, 2012), and to use them to problematise and reshape theoretical agendas, is widely advocated. The project of provincialising Western urban theories is without question on the agenda (Derickson, 2015; Sheppard et al., 2013). This has escalated in the popularisation of postcolonial urban theories and comparative urbanism. At the centre of the agenda are the arguments that urban scholars need to challenge core Western assumptions such as modernity (Robinson, 2004), and that studies must keep sight of local difference and uniqueness, while resisting the temptations of exoticising and parochialising (McFarlane and Robinson, 2012; Ren and Luger, 2015; Robinson, 2014).
3. During the past few decades, diverse intellectual communities, whose members research non-Western contexts but participate in international journals as forums of communication, have been formed (Aalbers and Rossi, 2007; Peake, 2011). We have in mind, for instance, the quickly enlarging cohort of urban China scholars whose works make increasingly customary appearances in Anglophone journals. Sensitive to local debates and contexts, these scholars are often involved in the formation of national intellectual circles, and do not merely act as conveyors and spokespersons for Western theories.

Mindful of these recent developments, this article attempts to approach the question of Anglo-American hegemony in urban studies by examining publication and citation patterns. We do so through building a database that consists of urban-related papers published between 1990 and 2010, and in journals indexed by the categories of ‘Geography’ and ‘Urban Studies’ in the ISI Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) database (as of 2015).¹ Based on the bibliographical information contained in the database, we develop a series of analyses to unpack to the extent to which knowledge on cities has been ‘internationalised’ in terms of contributors, sites of knowledge production, research topics, and citation patterns.

To avoid losing sight of the internal nuances submerged by these analyses, we single out the research on urban China, a fast-growing niche within urban studies, as a point of entry into important questions such as: (1) the place of research on non-Western or non-Anglo-American contexts in international publishing outlets; (2) the attention that emerging powers such as China have received; and (3) the exchange of knowledge and ideas between the intellectual ‘core’ and alternative intellectual circles. Overall, based on findings from our data analysis, this article argues that the dominance of the Anglophone world in production and circulation of urban knowledge manifests itself in very explicit ways. In terms of both productivity and impact, the discipline is largely shaped by Anglophone countries, a small cohort of Anglophone institutions, and an elite of high-impact, in most cases Anglo-American, authors. But diverging from the more pessimistic accounts reviewed above, this article also argues that the Anglo-American dominance does not necessarily mean that other research interests and orientations have been suppressed and stifled. Drawing from the case of urban China scholarship, we suggest that the growing but still small niche of urban China research is a totally

legitimate subarea within urban studies, although its potential of breeding cross-context dialogues has not been fully delivered.

Methods

In this section, we provide a brief explanation of the sources of data and methods of analysis utilised in this study, as well as the limitations of the approach that we adopt. Publications examined in this paper were collected using the ISI Web of Science (WoS) database, and the types of articles include research articles, review articles, and proceedings,² but exclude editorials, book chapters, book reviews, etc. Bibliographic information and citation records of each article were downloaded for analysis. The database that resulted consists of two parts. On the one hand, because all research published in the category 'Urban Studies' is, by default, urban knowledge, we simply collected all articles published between 1990 and 2010, from the 39 journals indexed in this category. On the other hand, to excavate urban knowledge from the wider discipline of geography, we used a variety of keywords³ to select articles from the 76 journals in the category 'Geography'. In total, 20,394 articles from 'Urban Studies' and 8988 articles from 'Geography' were selected into the database. Within this aggregate of articles, we used 'China' as the keyword to single out a sub-database that approximates what may be called 'urban China studies'. There were five journals indexed in both categories at the time of search, namely, *European Planning Studies*, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *Urban Geography*, and *Urban Policy and Research*.

The database is analysed by utilising the software package Histcite. Histcite is a toolkit developed by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), the very institution that created the citation indexes. It is used for bibliometric analyses, i.e. the mining of bibliographic information to systematically illustrate, in graphic formats, the publication and citation patterns.⁴ Overall, the functions provided by Histcite enable us to undertake two strands of analyses: (1) the 'productivity' of authors, institutions and countries, calculated by way of the quantities of articles published; (2) the 'impacts' and consumption of knowledge, in terms of the authors, institutions and countries that are the most heavily cited, and the works that cite specific articles (as recorded by WoS).⁵ The collections of 'Geography' articles and 'Urban Studies' articles are analysed separately.

Before we proceed to present the findings, we would like to acknowledge some limitations in our methodology. First, the selection of articles excludes urban knowledge from many other categories listed in the WoS Social Sciences Citation Index. They include anthropology, area studies, cultural studies, economics, planning and development, political science, political administration, sociology, transportation, among others. The choice of concentrating on 'Geography' and 'Urban Studies' is mainly because these disciplines are the ones with which the authors are the most familiar, and the desire to contribute to the debate about knowledge production within our disciplines. This article, in this sense, only presents partial evidence of the Anglo-American hegemony in the production of urban knowledge; explorations in other academic fields may be pursued by subsequent works.

Second, the reliance on citation records requires important caveats. If citations are the 'most objectified of the indices of symbolic capital' (Bourdieu, 1990: 76, in Paasi, 2015: 513), they constitute relations of uneven power between scholars. A Matthew effect may be true to citation patterns, as 'influential' articles and authors become ever more likely to be cited, overshadowing potential contributions of other works (Foster et al., 2007). Meanwhile, the decision of which article to cite or not cite is not as rational as the highly standardised formats of the Citation Indexes might imply. An amalgam of factors – access to literatures, the editorial and copyediting processes, the wish to pander to prestigious figures or small circles, etc. – all make an influence on our reference lists. Besides, a proper reading of citation data requires sensibility to contexts – some 'hotter' fields and topics have larger citation networks but not necessarily superior scholarly qualities (Yeung, 2002). Without being oblivious to these pitfalls, and without canonising high-impact articles, we nonetheless admit that citation data seem to be the most systematic, straightforward instrument available to us for measuring the contours and dynamics of knowledge circulation.

Finally, it is well known that WoS includes predominantly English-language journals.⁶ Given that there is a plethora of national intellectual traditions that do not record knowledge in English, any study that depends solely on WoS data results in a partial representation of the field in question (Schuermans et al., 2010). Nevertheless, for those of us who try to establish a voice in the ‘international’ publishing space, WoS profoundly shapes our understandings of the contours of the disciplines, and, as the pragmatist stance of Rodríguez-Pose (2004) suggests, it is probably still the principal zone in which cross-context dialogue and exchange are plausible, and likely to occur.

Publication and citation pattern in urban geography/urban studies, 1990–2010

We begin with an analysis of authorship patterns. Table 1 shows that 25.55% of articles in Geography have at least one author based in a US institution, followed by the UK, which claims 20.77% of the articles.⁷ The figures are, respectively, 40.42% and 12.88% in Urban Studies. Given that the total number of articles originating from a US or UK institution is around 45% and 53% respectively, the leading positions of the USA and UK are clear. If we divide the timespan of the study into two periods (1990–2000 and 2000–2010), the sum share of the USA and UK has been stable but slightly declining (52.07% and 47.07% in Geography; 58.60% and 49.59% in Urban Studies). However, if we take into account other Anglophone countries that are also forerunners on the lists, such as Canada (7.84% in Geography and 4.80% in Urban Studies, 1990–2010) and Australia (5.30% in Geography and 2.85% in Urban Studies, 1990–2010), the dominant role of the Anglophone world in producing the majority of knowledge on cities is indisputable.

Table 1. The 20 most productive countries in Geography and Urban Studies, 1990–2010.

No.	Country Geography	Number of papers	Percentage	Country Urban studies	Number of papers	Percentage
1	USA	2296	25.55%	USA	8244	40.42%
2	UK	1867	20.77%	UK	2627	12.88%
3	Canada	705	7.84%	Canada	979	4.80%
4	Australia	476	5.30%	Netherlands	701	3.44%
5	Netherlands	358	3.98%	Australia	582	2.85%
6	Germany	273	3.04%	China	419	2.05%
7	China	267	2.97%	Germany	352	1.73%
8	Spain	238	2.65%	Spain	328	1.61%
9	France	154	1.71%	Japan	273	1.34%
10	Italy	132	1.47%	France	268	1.31%
11	Sweden	131	1.46%	Sweden	242	1.19%
12	Japan	130	1.45%	Israel	238	1.17%
13	Israel	109	1.21%	Italy	231	1.13%
14	Singapore	100	1.11%	Singapore	207	1.02%
15	South Africa	97	1.08%	Belgium	179	0.88%
16	New Zealand	95	1.06%	Turkey	176	0.86%
17	Belgium	92	1.02%	South Africa	160	0.78%
18	Brazil	84	0.93%	Denmark	130	0.64%
19	Turkey	74	0.82%	Taiwan	128	0.63%
20	Austria	68	0.76%	South Korea	127	0.62%

Nonetheless, compared with Gutiérrez and López-Nieva (2001), who found that the Anglophone world took up more than 80% of knowledge production in major human geography journals, urban research has accommodated a greater diversity of intellectual outputs in terms of the provenance of articles. Countries in Continental Europe (such as the Netherlands, Germany, France, Spain and Italy) and developed or emerging economies in Asia (Singapore, China, Israel and Japan), have all shaped the contours of knowledge by contributing a notable, albeit still small, proportion of articles. A telling example is the contribution made by scholars based in China (not including Hong Kong and Taiwan). From 1990 to 2000, authors from Mainland China contributed just 25 articles to Geography and 54 to Urban Studies, while the numbers increased geometrically to 242 and 376 for the period of 2000–2010.

An examination of the most productive institutions and authors adds further nuance to the appraisal of Anglophone hegemony in urban knowledge production. If we look at the top 50 institutions in terms of the numbers of articles published in, respectively, Geography and Urban Studies journals, a stark picture emerges, pointing to the persistent and entrenched dominance of Anglophone institutions as the most ‘active’ sites of knowledge production – mainly those based in the USA (16 and 36), the UK (22 and 7) and Canada (6 and 2) (Table 2). Although the respective shares of the three countries fluctuated a little through the first and second decades of the period of study, this collective dominance has hardly changed.⁸ In particular, US institutions demonstrate an overwhelming, if not monopolising, presence in the category of ‘Urban Studies’, although trailing the UK slightly in ‘Geography’. In fact, eight US universities are among the top ten institutions in Urban Studies. Given the strong association of urban studies with US scholarly traditions, which set in place the more or less ‘standard’ discourses of urban modernity and postmodernity (reflected by the Chicago and Los Angeles Schools), it may be postulated that what we call ‘international’ urban knowledge is in fact largely *internal* to intellectual debates in the USA (to a lesser extent, UK and Canada). That said, beyond an overwhelming Anglophone dominance, alternative voices have not been entirely tranquilised. Scholars from the National University of Singapore and the University of Hong Kong, to name two notable examples, have been known for concentrating on dissecting Asian urbanisms in the contexts of rapid development and urbanisation. Making into the top-50 lists are also Dutch universities, especially the University of Amsterdam and Utrecht University.

Table 2. The 50 most productive institutions in Geography and Urban Studies, 1990–2010.

No.	Institution Geography	Number of papers	Institution Urban studies	Number of papers
1	Ohio State Univ	110	Univ Illinois	375
2	Natl Univ Singapore	103	Univ N Carolina	294
3	Univ British Columbia	98	Univ Wisconsin	273
4	Univ Toronto	94	Univ Calif Los Angeles	233
5	Univ Manchester	91	Univ Calif Berkeley	220
6	Univ Calif Los Angeles	88	Univ So Calif	218
7	UCL	85	Natl Univ Singapore	201
8	Univ Amsterdam	81	Ohio State Univ	187
9	Univ Wisconsin	81	Rutgers State Univ	177
10	Univ Utrecht	77	Univ British Columbia	173
11	Univ Bristol	76	Univ Connecticut	167
12	Univ Hong Kong	75	Univ Penn	166
13	Univ Sheffield	75	Wayne State Univ	161
14	Univ Illinois	74	Univ Glasgow	154
15	Univ Southampton	72	Univ Michigan	154
16	Univ Washington	68	Univ Amsterdam	152
17	Univ Minnesota	67	Univ Calif Irvine	151
18	Arizona State Univ	66	Harvard Univ	150
19	Univ Oxford	66	Univ Hong Kong	146
20	Univ Leeds	62	Univ Texas	146
21	Univ Durham	60	Univ Toronto	139
22	Univ Cambridge	59	Penn State Univ	137
23	Univ Loughborough	59	Delft Univ Technol	135
24	Univ Georgia	58	Univ Minnesota	128
25	York Univ	58	Univ Georgia	127
26	Rutgers State Univ	56	Univ Colorado	126
27	Univ Birmingham	56	Univ Maryland	123
28	Univ London	55	Florida State Univ	121
29	Univ Strathclyde	54	Univ Washington	120
30	Univ Calif Berkeley	50	Columbia Univ	119
31	Univ Glasgow	50	Univ Newcastle Upon Tyne	115
32	Univ N Carolina	50	Texas A&M Univ	112
33	Univ Newcastle Upon Tyne	50	MIT	110
34	Texas A&M Univ	49	UCL	110
35	Univ Melbourne	49	Georgia State Univ	107
36	McMaster Univ	48	Indiana Univ	107
37	Univ Arizona	44	Arizona State Univ	106
38	Queens Univ	43	Cleveland State Univ	105
39	Univ So Calif	43	Univ Florida	103
40	Macquarie Univ	42	Univ Sheffield	101
41	Univ Colorado	42	Michigan State Univ	100
42	Kings Coll London	41	Univ Utrecht	100
43	Open Univ	41	Cornell Univ	98
44	Univ Waterloo	41	NYU	96
45	Univ London London Sch Econ & Polit Sci	40	Univ Manchester	96
46	Univ Reading	40	Univ Cambridge	95
47	Cardiff Univ	39	Univ Kentucky	91
48	Penn State Univ	39	Univ Birmingham	90
49	Univ Edinburgh	39	Univ Massachusetts	88
50	Univ Newcastle	39	Univ Cincinnati	87

In parallel, Table 3 presents the top 50 authors in terms of the numbers of publications. If we trace the latest institutional affiliations of these authors (as of 2010), it is found that this cohort of the most ‘active’ knowledge producers are characterised by no less remarkable Anglo-American, and broadly, Anglophone bias. In Geography, the UK takes the lead by being the base of 14 authors, followed by the USA, Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, and Hong Kong. Combined, the Anglophone world (USA, UK, Canada, Australia, New Zealand) is home to 36 of the 50 most productive authors. In Urban Studies, the USA alone claims 36 of the top 50 authors, partly due to the strong publishing momentum of those specialising in real estate, housing, land use, land policy, urban economics, econometrics analysis, etc. In total, scholars from Anglophone countries (in this list, USA, UK and Canada) occupy 40 places in the Urban Studies top-50 list.

Table 3. The 50 most productive authors in Geography and Urban Studies, 1990–2010.

No.	Author Geography	Institution	Number of papers	Author Urban studies	Institution	Number of papers
1	Taylor PJ	Loughborough University	34	Sirmans CF	Florida State University	65
2	Wu FL	Cardiff University	34	Turnbull GK	Georgia State University	41
3	Pacione M	University of Strathclyde	29	Galster G	Wayne State University	40
4	Johnston R	University of Bristol	24	Wu FL	Cardiff University	38
5	Rowland RH	California State University	24	McMillen DP	University of Illinois	36
6	Nijkamp P	Free University of Amsterdam	23	Priemus H	Delft University Technology	33
7	Forrest J	Macquarie University	21	Ambrose BW	Penn State University	29
8	Jim CY	The University of Hong Kong	20	Musterd S	University Amsterdam	29
9	Fan CC	University of California	19	Quigley JM	University of Calif Berkeley	28
10	Harris R	McMaster University	19	Nijkamp P	Free University of Amsterdam	27
11	Jonas AEG	University of Hull	19	Rohe WM	University N Carolina	27
12	Ward K	University of Manchester	19	Sullivan EJ	Lewis & Clark Law School	27
13	Wilson D	University of Illinois	19	Harris R	McMaster University	26
14	Derudder B	Ghent University	18	Clark WAV	University Calif Los Angeles	19
15	Witlox F	Ghent University	18	Hendershott PH	University of Aberdeen	25
16	Gibson C	University of Wollongong	17	McDonald JF	Roosevelt University	25
17	Wallace R	The New York State Psychiatric Institute	17	Coulson NE	Penn State University	24
18	Wei YHD	University of Utah	17	Nelson AC	University of Utah	24
19	Hubbard P	Loughborough University	16	Rosenthal SS	Syracuse University	24
20	Li X	Sun Yat-sen University	16	Talen E	Arizona State University	24
21	McNeill D	University of Western Sydney	16	Freilich RH	Harvard University	23
22	Poulsen M	Macquarie University	16	Yavas A	Penn State University	23
23	Hall T	Griffith University	15	Benjamin JD	American University	21
24	Lees L	King's College London	15	Brueckner JK	University Calif Irvine	21
25	McDowell L	University of Oxford	15	Forsyth A	Cornell university	21
26	Shearmur R	INRS Urbanisation	15	Haurin DR	Ohio State University	21
27	Kwan MP	Ohio State University	14	Immergluck D	Georgia Inst Technology	21
28	Raco M	King's College London	14	Ling DC	University of Florida	21
29	Scott AJ	University of California	14	Quercia RG	University of N Carolina	21
30	Warf B	University of Kansas	14	Thisse JF	University Catholique Louvain	21
31	Batty M	University College London	13	van Kempen R	University of Utrecht	21
32	Kratke S	European University Viadrina	13	Bourassa SC	University of Louisville	20
33	Musterd S	University of Amsterdam	13	Ihlanfeldt KR	Florida State University	20
34	Rietveld P	Free University	13	Kahn ME	University Calif of Los Angeles	20
35	Sui DZ	Texas A&M University	13	Kearns A	University of Glasgow	20
36	Beaverstock JV	Loughborough University	12	Ong SE	Natl University Singapore	20
37	Boyle M	National University of Ireland	12	Shilling JD	Depaul University	20
38	Bromley RDF	University of Wales Swansea	12	Wachter SM	University of Penn	19
39	Clark WAV	University of California	12	Bates T	Wayne State University	19
40	Graham S	University of Durham	12	Capozza DR	University of Michigan	19
41	McCann P	University of Waikato	12	Cervero R	University of California	19
42	Peck J	University of British Columbia	12	Cullingworth B	University of Cambridge	19
43	Shen JF	The Chinese University of Hong Kong	12	Hoesli M	University of Geneva	19
44	Yeoh BSA	National University of Singapore	12	Jim CY	University of Hong Kong	19
45	Chang TC	National University of Singapore	11	Markusen A	University of Minnesota	19
46	Dijst M	Utrecht University	11	Miceli TJ	University of Connecticut	19
47	Ellis M	University of Washington	11	Reese LA	Michigan State University	19
48	Ford LR	San Diego State University	11	Zenou Y	Stockholm University	19
49	Keil R	York University	11	Anas A	State University of New York	18
50	Kong L	National University of Singapore	11	Beauregard RA	New School University	18

Some nuances, however, are worth noting. In particular, while it is impossible to quantify research interests of scholars, suffice it to say that scholars based in Anglophone countries do not necessarily restrict their research to the same national contexts. For example, Fulong Wu, Mei-Po Kwan, and Cindy Fan are ethnic Chinese who are based in Anglo-American institutions but focus, at least partly, on China. As we mentioned earlier, ‘inbetween’ academics of this kind act as key mediators of knowledge production and exchange, a point to which we will return when we discuss knowledge production on urban China.

A different lens via which to scrutinise the power relations of knowledge production is the ‘impact’ exerted by published articles, estimated in this study by citation data.⁹ We start by looking at the geographical distribution of citations, conceived of as the number of citations that each country has garnered. The pattern is in a similar vein to that emerging from the previous analyses – the USA and UK sit at the top of the lists (USA has a share of 34.40% of total citations in Geography and 43.26% in Urban Studies; UK takes 29.91% in Geography and 17.04% in Urban Studies). If we decompose the data to the two periods of 1990–2000 and 2000–2010, it appears that the sum share of the USA and UK is steadily, though slowly, declining (in Geography, from 67.37% to 63.22%; in Urban Studies, from 65.55% to 56.69%). Meanwhile, the ‘second-tier’ countries (Canada, the Netherlands, China, Australia, Germany) each claim a visible, yet much smaller share (at least 2% but no more than 8%, 1990–2010). Institutions receiving the most citations are congruent with the general tendency of concentrating in the Anglophone world.

Table 4 reveals the 50 most heavily cited articles in Geography and Urban Studies, respectively. By looking at the institutional affiliations of first authors of the articles, it is discernible that high-impact articles emerged predominantly from the powerful trinity of UK, USA and Canada (41 articles in Geography and 44 in Urban Studies), while contributions from continental Europe and China also make a modest presence. Even if we expand our analysis to include the 500 most cited articles in Geography and Urban Studies, the pattern of citations which we have sketched so far will still apply. This prompts us to argue that high-impact and agenda-setting works tend to be more expressive of Anglo-American hegemony in urban knowledge circulation.

Table 4. The 50 most cited articles in Geography and Urban Studies, 1990–2010.

No.	Authors	Year	Journal	Title	Cites
<i>Part 1: Geography</i>					
1	Peck J, Tickell A	2002	<i>Antipode</i>	Neoliberalizing space	1220
2	Storper M, Venables AJ	2004	<i>Journal of Economic Geography</i>	Buzz: Face-to-face contact and the urban economy	705
3	Martin R, Sunley P	2003	<i>Journal of Economic Geography</i>	Deconstructing clusters: Chaotic concept or policy panacea?	672
4	Brenner N, Theodore N	2002	<i>Antipode</i>	Cities and the geographies of ‘actually existing neoliberalism’	605
5	Peck J	2005	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	Struggling with the creative class	569
6	Marston SA	2000	<i>Progress in Human Geography</i>	The social construction of scale	531
7	Amin A, Thrift N	1992	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	Neo-Marshallian nodes in global networks	427
8	Chace JF, Walsh JJ	2006	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Urban effects on native avifauna: A review	423
9	Clarke KC, Gaydos LJ	1998	<i>International Journal of Geographical Information Science</i>	Loose-coupling a cellular automaton model and GIS: Long-term urban growth prediction for San Francisco and Washington/Baltimore	390
10	Smith N	2002	<i>Antipode</i>	New globalism, new urbanism: Gentrification as global urban Strategy	389
11	Frenken K, van Oort F, Verburg T	2007	<i>Regional Studies</i>	Relate variety, unrelated variety and regional economic growth	388
12	White R, Engelen G	1993	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	Cellular-automata and fractal urban form – A cellular modelling approach to the evolution of urban land-use patterns	366
13	Porter ME	2003	<i>Regional Studies</i>	The economic performance of regions	357
14	Brenner N	2001	<i>Progress in Human Geography</i>	The limits to scale? Methodological reflections on scalar structuration	355
15	Tzoulas K, Korpela K, Venn S, Yli-Pelkonen V, Kazmierczak A, et al.	2007	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Promoting ecosystem and human health in urban areas using Green Infrastructure: A literature review	350
16	Amin A	2002	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	Spatialities of globalisation	347

No.	Authors	Year	Journal	Title	Cites
17	McCarthy J, Prudham S	2004	<i>Geoforum</i>	Neoliberal nature and the nature of neoliberalism	346
18	Jessop B	2002	<i>Antipode</i>	Liberalism, neoliberalism, and urban governance: A state-theoretical perspective	344
19	Chiesura A	2004	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	The role of urban parks for the sustainable city	341
20	Grothmann T, Patt A	2005	<i>Global Environmental Change – Human and Policy Dimensions</i>	Adaptive capacity and human cognition: The process of individual adaptation to climate change	335
21	Anthrop M	2004	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Landscape change and the urbanization process in Europe	331
22	Anthrop M	2005	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Why landscapes of the past are important for the future	323
23	Pulido L	2000	<i>Annals of the Association of American Geographers</i>	Rethinking environmental racism: White privilege and urban development in southern California	314
24	Harrison B	1992	<i>Regional Studies</i>	Industrial districts – Old wine in new bottles	300
25	Amin A	2002	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	Ethnicity and the multicultural city: Living with diversity	290
26	Florida R	2002	<i>Annals of the Association of American Geographers</i>	The economic geography of talent	290
27	Robinson J	2002	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	Global and world cities: A view from off the map	287
28	Bulkeley H	2005	<i>Political Geography</i>	Reconfiguring environmental governance: Towards a politics of scales and networks	284
29	Savard JPL, Clergeau P, Mennechez G	2000	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Biodiversity concepts and urban ecosystems	282
30	de Vries S, Verheij RA, Groenewegen PP, Spreeuwenberg P	2003	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	Natural environments – Healthy environments? An exploratory analysis of the relationship between greenspace and health	280
31	Kwan MP	1998	<i>Geographical Analysis</i>	Space-time and integral measures of individual accessibility: A comparative analysis using a point-based framework	279
32	Mitchell D	1995	<i>Annals of the Association of American Geographers</i>	The end of public space –Peoples parks, definitions of the public, and democracy	274

No.	Authors	Year	Journal	Title	Cites
33	MacLeod G, Goodwin M	1999	<i>Progress in Human Geography</i>	Space, scale and state strategy: Rethinking urban and regional governance	251
34	Brenner N	1998	<i>Environment and Planning D – Society & Space</i>	Between fixity and motion: Accumulation, territorial organization and the historical geography of spatial scales	243
35	Briggs DJ, Collins S, Elliott P, Fischer P, Kingham S, et al.	1997	<i>International Journal of Geographical Information Science</i>	Mapping urban air pollution using GIS: A regression-based Approach	238
36	Markusen A	2006	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	Urban development and the politics of a creative class: Evidence from a study of artists	225
37	Scott AJ	1997	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	The cultural economy of cities	221
38	Li X, Yeh AGO	2000	<i>International Journal of Geographical Information Science</i>	Modelling sustainable urban development by the integration of constrained cellular automata and GIS	216
39	Scott AJ, Storper M	2003	<i>Regional Studies</i>	Regions, globalization, development	215
40	Young OR, Berkhout F, Gallopín GC, Janssen MA, Ostrom E, et al.	2006	<i>Global Environmental Change – Human and Policy Dimensions</i>	The globalization of socio-ecological systems: An agenda for scientific research	213
41	Mentens J, Raes D, Hermy M	2006	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Green roofs as a tool for solving the rainwater runoff problem in the urbanized 21st century?	212
42	Slater T	2006	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	The eviction of critical perspectives from gentrification research	210
43	Sheppard E	2002	<i>Economic Geography</i>	The spaces and times of globalization: Place, scale, networks, and positionality	208
44	Bowler DE, Buyung-Ali L, Knight TM, Pullin AS	2010	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Urban greening to cool towns and cities: A systematic review of the empirical evidence	206
45	MacLeod G	2001	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	New regionalism reconsidered: Globalization and the remaking of political economic space	202
46	Swyngedouw E, Heynen NC	2003	<i>Antipode</i>	Urban political ecology, justice and the politics of scale	202

No.	Authors	Year	Journal	Title	Cites
47	Li X, Yeh AG	2002	<i>International Journal of Geographical Information Science</i>	Neural-network-based cellular automata for simulating multiple land use changes using GIS	201
48	Taylor PJ	2001	<i>Geographical Analysis</i>	Specification of the world city network	200
49	Peck J	2001	<i>Progress in Human Geography</i>	Neoliberalizing states: Thin policies/hard outcomes	199
50	Storper M, Scott AJ	2009	<i>Journal of Economic Geography</i>	Rethinking human capital, creativity and urban growth	190
Part 2: Urban Studies					
1	Porter ME	2000	<i>Economic Development Quarterly</i>	Location, competition, and economic development: Local clusters in a global economy	793
2	Arnold CL, Gibbons CJ	1996	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	Impervious surface coverage – The emergence of a key environmental indicator	666
3	Peck J	2005	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	Struggling with the creative class	569
4	Anselin L, Varga A, Acs Z	1997	<i>Journal of Urban Economics</i>	Local geographic spillovers between university research and high technology innovations	491
5	Kelejian HH, Prucha IR	1998	<i>Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics</i>	Generalized spatial two-stage least squares procedure for estimating a spatial autoregressive model with autoregressive disturbances	467
6	Ewing R, Cervero R	2010	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	Travel and the built environment	454
7	Gordon IR, McCann P	2000	<i>Urban Studies</i>	Industrial clusters: Complexes, agglomeration and/or social networks?	452
8	McGranahan G, Balk D, Anderson B	2007	<i>Environment and Urbanization</i>	The rising tide: Assessing the risks of climate change and human settlements in low elevation coastal zones	437
9	Amin A, Thrift N	1992	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	Neo-Marshallian nodes in global networks	427
10	Chace JF, Walsh JJ	2006	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Urban effects on native avifauna: A review	423

No.	Authors	Year	Journal	Title	Cites
11	Anselin L, Bera AK, Florax R, Yoon MJ	1996	<i>Regional Science and Urban Economics</i>	Simple diagnostic tests for spatial dependence	422
12	Adriaensen F, Chardon JP, De Blust G, Swinnen E, Villalba S, et al.	2003	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	The application of 'least-cost' modelling as a functional landscape model	402
13	Brenner N	1999	<i>Urban Studies</i>	Globalisation as reterritorialisation: The re-scaling of urban governance in the European union	379
14	Rauch JE	1993	<i>Journal of Urban Economics</i>	Productivity gains from geographic concentration of human-capital – Evidence from the cities	371
15	Forrest R, Kearns A	2001	<i>Urban Studies</i>	Social cohesion, social capital and the neighbourhood	369
16	Tzoulas K, Korpela K, Venn S, Yli-Pelkonen V, Kazmierczak A, et al.	2007	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Promoting ecosystem and human health in urban areas using Green Infrastructure: A literature review	350
17	Wellman B	2001	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	Physical place and cyberplace: The rise of personalized networking	341
18	Chiesura A	2004	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	The role of urban parks for the sustainable city	341
19	Ewing R	1997	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	Is Los Angeles-style sprawl desirable?	337
20	Innes JE, Booher DE	1999	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	Consensus building and complex adaptive systems – A framework for evaluating collaborative planning	331
21	Antrop M	2004	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Landscape change and the urbanization process in Europe	331
22	Lovering J	1999	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	Theory led by policy: The inadequacies of the 'new regionalism' (illustrated from the case of Wales)	329
23	Antrop M	2005	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Why landscapes of the past are important for the future	323

No.	Authors	Year	Journal	Title	Cites
24	Amin A	1999	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	An institutionalist perspective on regional economic development	322
25	Frank LD, Sallis JF, Conway TL, Chapman JE, Saelens BE, et al	2006	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	Many pathways from land use to health – Associations between neighborhood walkability and active transportation, body mass index, and air quality	315
26	Swyngedouw E	2005	<i>Urban Studies</i>	Governance innovation and the citizen: The Janus face of governance-beyond-the-state	310
27	Beaverstock JV, Smith RG, Taylor PJ	1999	<i>Cities</i>	A roster of world cities	309
28	Gordon P, Richardson HW	1997	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	Are compact cities a desirable planning goal?	303
29	Ellen IG, Turner MA	1997	<i>Housing Policy Debate</i>	Does neighborhood matter? Assessing recent evidence	302
30	Stone CN	1993	<i>Journal of Urban Affairs</i>	Urban regimes and the capacity to govern – A political-economy approach	298
31	Waddell P	2002	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	UrbanSim – Modeling urban development for land use, transportation, and environmental planning	298
32	DiPasquale D, Glaeser EL	1999	<i>Journal of Urban Economics</i>	Incentives and social capital: Are homeowners better citizens?	293
33	Robinson J	2002	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	Global and world cities: A view from off the map	287
34	Holzer HJ	1991	<i>Urban Studies</i>	The spatial mismatch hypothesis – What has the evidence shown	285
35	Galster G, Hanson R, Ratcliffe MR, Wolman H, Coleman S, et al.	2001	<i>Housing Policy Debate</i>	Wrestling sprawl to the ground: Defining and measuring an elusive concept	284
36	Savard JPL, Clergeau P, Mennechez G	2000	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Biodiversity concepts and urban ecosystems	282
37	Flyvbjerg B, Holm MS, Buhl S	2002	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	Underestimating costs in public works projects – Error or lie?	281
38	Rosenthal SS, Strange WC	2001	<i>Journal of Urban Economics</i>	The determinants of agglomeration	273

No.	Authors	Year	Journal	Title	Cites
39	Campbell S	1996	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	Green cities, growing cities, just cities? Urban planning and the contradictions of sustainable development	272
40	Brueckner JK	2000	<i>International Regional Science Review</i>	Urban sprawl: Diagnosis and remedies	266
41	Innes JE	1995	<i>Journal of Planning Education and Research</i>	Planning-theory emerging paradigm – Communicative action and interactive practice	259
42	Scott AJ	2006	<i>Journal of Urban Affairs</i>	Creative cities: Conceptual issues and policy questions	254
43	Gallup JL, Sachs JD, Mellinger AD	1999	<i>International Regional Science Review</i>	Geography and economic development	250
44	Brueckner JK	2003	<i>International Regional Science Review</i>	Strategic interaction among governments: An overview of empirical studies	249
45	Henderson JV	2003	<i>Journal of Urban Economics</i>	Marshall's scale economies	241
46	Ihlanfeldt KR, Sjoquist DL	1998	<i>Housing Policy Debate</i>	The spatial mismatch hypothesis: A review of recent studies and their implications for welfare reform	236
47	Leitao AB, Ahern J	2002	<i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>	Applying landscape ecological concepts and metrics in sustainable landscape planning	234
48	Innes JE	1996	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	Planning through consensus building – A new view of the comprehensive planning ideal	233
49	Alberti M	2005	<i>International Regional Science Review</i>	The effects of urban patterns on ecosystem function	233
50	Giuliano G, Small KA	1991	<i>Regional Science and Urban Economics</i>	Subcenters in the Los-Angeles region	232

An interpretation of the *topics* addressed by high-impact articles, however, requires more caution, as nowadays many phenomena do not sit easily within the confines of nation-states, owing to heightened intensities of knowledge transfer and policy mobility at the global scale. Putting aside the articles more oriented towards physical sciences approaches, high-impact articles address a diversity of theoretical questions. Among them, some topics, such as post-industrial urban economy, multicultural cities, the ‘end’ of public space, and social cohesion/capital in neighbourhoods, are probably more specific to Anglo-America or Western contexts. Issues in urban planning, such as urban sprawl, compact cities, multi-centred city-regions, collaborative planning, etc., are also highly susceptible to local socioeconomic contexts and political cultures. In contrast, for other theoretical debates, such as neoliberalism, creative class and cities, gentrification, social construction of scale, new regionalism, globalisation, and urban governance, the contextual boundaries are blurred at best, not only because of recent developments such as the ‘heading-south’ of neoliberalism and revanchism (e.g. Swanson, 2007), but the interlinked and interlocked nature of global economy itself (Wyly, 2015). Also, Robinson’s (2002) paper advocating the reconceptualisation of the city in terms of its ‘ordinariness’ is the 27th most cited paper in Geography and 33rd in Urban Studies. In this sense, to say that

the theoretical debates advanced by Anglo-American authors are solely to address Anglo-American contexts is probably an oversimplified view. Nonetheless, the dominance of Anglo-American academics in developing theoretical perspectives and discourses which are potentially pertinent to contexts beyond their native countries cannot be denied.

Table 5 lists the 50 authors who are the most heavily cited. The composition of this ensemble of the most 'popular' scholars is generally comparable with that of the most productive ones. The USA and UK together claim 38 and 40 places, respectively, in Geography and Urban Studies. Of the top 20 high-impact scholars in each category, only 3 and 2 are based outside the USA–UK nexus, respectively. Similar to what occurs to the most productive authors, the picture is made slightly less monolithic by a group of scholars based in the USA or the UK but reach out to other contexts. For example, Fulong Wu ranks 6th in Geography and garnered more citations than any other in Urban Studies. Although our data only provide an approximation of realities, the success of Wu as a specialist on China tells a story that problematises a rigid rhetoric of Anglo-American hegemony. The appointment of Wu to the esteemed Bartlett Chair in Urban Planning, University College London, echoes this viewpoint. Nonetheless, the point must be made that in general the Anglophone academia has been effective in shaping the ways in which the field knows itself, by setting the parameters of knowledge production and transfer.

A different perspective to gauge the consumption of knowledge is via the lens of the works that have actually *cited* a set of articles. Because the bibliographic information downloaded from WoS don't include the *citing* articles, which understandably form a much larger body of data than the *cited* ones, we use the 100 most cited articles in Geography and Urban Studies as a subset of the database, and collected all works that cited the articles at question.¹⁰ Overall, the consumption of citations, it seems to us, creates a slightly more internationalised dynamic of knowledge exchange than the cited articles. In a sense, the 'outbound' flow of knowledge is still largely channelled within the Anglophone core (in Geography and Urban Studies, the USA and UK combined did 48.77% and 47.29% of acts of citing, respectively). But the shares of countries such as China and the Netherlands in citations are higher than their respective *contributions* to knowledge (China: 7.10% and 7.13%; the Netherlands: 5.56% and 5.30%). This is understandable because demonstrating familiarity with a corpus of literatures is a precondition to publishing in the same forums. In fact, the Chinese Academy of Sciences is the single most active *citing* institution (5th in Geography and 4th in Urban Studies) outside the USA–UK nexus. In terms of the most active citing authors, the entries on the lists are modestly more diverse, with authors from Continental Europe and Asia taking 9 places of the top 20 in Geography, and 10 in Urban Studies. It is reasonable to say that the consumption of urban knowledge for scholars outside the Anglophone core is disproportionately large, in comparison to the activeness of *production*.

Table 5. The 50 most cited authors in Geography and Urban Studies, 1990–2010.

No.	Author Geography	Institution	Cites	Author Urban studies	Institution	Cites
1	Peck J	Univ British Columbia	2639	Wu FL	Cardiff Univ	1772
2	Brenner N	NYU	1363	Anselin L	Univ Illinois	1553
3	Tickell A	Univ Bristol	1353	Glaeser EL	Harvard Univ	1471
4	Taylor PJ	Loughborough University	1260	Innes JE	Univ Calif Berkeley	1407
5	Storper M	London Sch Econ	1221	Cervero R	Univ Calif Berkeley	1271
6	Wu FL	Cardiff Univ	1185	Antrop M	Univ Ghent	1248
7	Amin A	Univ Durham	1184	Kearns A	Univ Glasgow	1247
8	Scott AJ	Univ California	1137	Galster G	Wayne State Univ	1186
9	Kwan MP	Ohio State Univ	1087	Musterd S	Univ Amsterdam	1139
10	Li X	Sun Yat-sen Univ	1080	Brueckner JK	Univ Calif Irvine	1136
11	Thrift N	Univ Warwick	988	McMillen DP	Univ Illinois	1090
12	Fan CC	University of California	917	Ihlanfeldt KR	Florida State Univ	1043
13	MacLeod G	Univ Durham	913	Healey P	Univ Newcastle	1033
14	Antrop M	Univ Ghent	851	Ewing R	Univ Utah	1006
15	Theodore N	Univ Illinois	846	Porter ME	Harvard Univ	990
16	Martin R	Univ Cambridge	845	Rosenthal SS	Syracuse Univ	989
17	Lees L	King's College London	833	Taylor PJ	Northumbria Univ	976
18	Yeh AGO	Univ Hong Kong	819	Peck J	Univ British Columbia	936
19	Ward K	University of Manchester	796	Strange WC	Univ Toronto	909
20	Venables AJ	Univ London London Sch Econ & Polit Sci	759	Sirmans CF	Florida State Univ	889
21	Mitchell D	Syracuse Univ	752	Atkinson R	Univ York	886
22	Jonas AEG	University of Hull	750	Clark WAV	Univ Calif Los Angeles	876
23	Swyngedouw E	Univ Manchester	735	Amin A	Univ Durham	871
24	Sunley P	Univ Southampton	722	Scott AJ	Univ Calif Los Angeles	852
25	Clarke KC	Univ California	718	Swyngedouw E	Univ Manchester	813
26	Florida R	Univ Toronto	695	Brenner N	NYU	775
27	Smith N	CUNY	631	Gulinck H	Katholieke Univ Leuven	743
28	Valentine G	Univ Leeds	630	Jim CY	Univ Hong Kong	729
29	Beaverstock JV	Loughborough Univ	611	Small KA	Univ Calif Irvine	729
30	McDowell L	Univ Oxford	604	Kelejian HH	Univ Maryland	714
31	Marston SA	Univ Arizona	578	Ellen IG	NYU	704
32	Jim CY	Univ Hong Kong	577	Talen E	Arizona State Univ	696
33	Goodwin M	Univ Exeter	541	Forrest R	City Univ Hong Kong	678
34	Healey P	Univ Newcastle	540	Haurin DR	Ohio State Univ	675
35	Robinson J	Open Univ	538	Arnold CL	Univ Connecticut	666
36	Witlox F	Ghent Univ	537	Gibbons CJ	Univ Connecticut	666
37	Frenken K	Univ Utrecht	522	Gordon P	Univ So Calif	654
38	McCarthy J	Penn State Univ	507	Richardson HW	Univ So Calif	646
39	Gibson C	Univ Wollongong	485	Frank LD	Univ British Columbia	641
40	Batty M	Univ College London	476	DiPasquale D	Tufts Univ	633
41	Theobald DM	Colorado State Univ	476	Duranton G	Univ Toronto	629
42	Johnston R	Univ Bristol	472	McDonald JF	Roosevelt Univ	629
43	Ma LJC	Univ kron	471	Jeynes WH	California State Univ	619
44	Hermey M	Katholieke Univ Leuven	469	Markusen A	Univ Minnesota	613
45	Derudder B	Ghent Univ	468	Rietveld P	Free Univ Amsterdam	608
46	Raco M	King's College London	466	Yeh AGO	Univ Hong Kong	607
47	Wei YHD	Univ Utah	465	McCann P	Univ Waikato	602
48	Bulkeley H	Univ Durham	463	Quigley JM	Univ Calif Berkeley	600
49	Keil R	York Univ	454	Wang YP	Heriot Watt University	595
50	Lin GCS	Univ Hong Kong	454	Mcgranahan G	IIED	590

Urban China research: Reproducing Anglo-American hegemony?

During the past two or three decades, urban China studies has received increasing recognition in the international publishing space, evidenced by the rapid growth of articles published in ISI-indexed journals and the enhanced participation of scholars based in China in international journals. Urban China scholars now constitute a vibrant and growing intellectual community, and the area is maturing quickly. Of course, hitherto our findings have not painted an optimistic picture for a small niche such as urban China studies, because the analysis of the best-doing countries, institutions and authors, in terms of either productivity or impact, reveals the persistent Anglo-American dominance in shaping the agendas and discourses of the discipline. A central question emerging from these seemingly contradictory scenarios concerns the positioning of urban China studies vis-à-vis the Anglo-American ‘core’ of knowledge production. Do urban China scholars reproduce Anglo-American debates and implant them to China, as they rely heavily on the academic discourses emerging from the Anglo-American contexts, or are they innovative and capable in devising vocabularies and discourses which are sensitive to local contexts? Mindful of these questions, this section tries to tease out some aspects of the internal ‘texture’ of the production and circulation of knowledge on urban China.

In this study, urban China studies is represented by a subset of the database, which contains 467 articles in Geography, and 530 in Urban Studies. A preliminary point that we can draw, therefore, is that urban China studies is still a considerably small area that is less likely to substantively shape the intellectual and theoretical agendas of Urban Studies. But the modest size of the area conceals the rapid growth it has undergone: while we have a record of 90 articles in Geography and 133 in Urban Studies for the period of 1990–2000, the figures are 377 and 396 for 2000–2010, respectively.

Consistent with the framework adopted in the previous section, we begin by locating the most active sites of production by identifying the countries and institutions that are origins of the largest numbers of articles. As Table 6 illustrates, in Geography and Urban Studies alike, China is the largest source of contributions (39.83% and 40.38%), attesting to expanded opportunities for scholars outside the Anglophone core to participate in international publishing. However, urban China studies is not a closed area whereby only endogenously produced knowledge is considered authentic. Urban China is of interest to academics based in USA, UK, Canada, Singapore, Hong Kong, the Netherlands, etc. Collectively, USA, UK and Canada contribute 55.03% and 52.45% of China articles in the respective categories, surpassing China-based scholars. If we attend to the most productive institutions, it is evident that Chinese institutions (6 of top 20 institutions in Geography, and 6 in Urban Studies) are overshadowed by universities in Hong Kong and the National University of Singapore and, to a lesser extent, Anglo-American universities. The strong momentum of Hong Kong and Singapore in publishing on China is arguably due to the fact that they have geographical and cultural proximity to China – scholars there are highly versed in English-language publishing, while possessing the language and cultural ability to navigate Chinese contexts.

Table 6. The 20 most productive countries in urban China studies, 1990–2010.

No.	Country Geography	Number of papers	Percentage	Country Urban studies	Number of papers	Percentage
1	China	186	39.83%	China	214	40.38%
2	USA	160	34.26%	USA	170	32.08%
3	UK	69	14.78%	UK	83	15.66%
4	Canada	28	6.00%	Canada	25	4.72%
5	Singapore	22	4.71%	Singapore	22	4.15%
6	Netherlands	13	2.78%	Hong Kong	15	2.83%
7	Australia	12	2.57%	Japan	14	2.64%
8	Japan	12	2.57%	Australia	13	2.45%
9	Germany	10	2.14%	Netherlands	12	2.26%
10	Hong Kong	8	1.71%	Sweden	7	1.32%
11	Taiwan	6	1.28%	Taiwan	7	1.32%
12	Spain	4	0.86%	Finland	3	0.57%
13	Finland	3	0.64%	Italy	3	0.57%
14	South Korea	3	0.64%	South Korea	3	0.57%
15	Sweden	3	0.64%	Spain	3	0.57%
16	Belgium	2	0.43%	Turkey	3	0.57%
17	France	2	0.43%	India	2	0.38%
18	New Zealand	2	0.43%	Czech Republic	1	0.19%
19	Switzerland	2	0.43%	Denmark	1	0.19%
20	Turkey	2	0.43%	Estonia	1	0.19%

An examination of the most active authors on urban China attests to the rise of China-based scholars; even the so-labelled ‘Anglo-American’ contributors to urban China scholarship constitute a complex scenario, comprising of a notable number of Chinese expatriates. The lists of the top 20 most productive authors show that the landscape of knowledge production on urban China, at least with reference to the cohort of the most active researchers, is relatively clear-cut, as most names appearing here correspond with the most productive institutions (such as the pairings of FL Wu and Cardiff University, DYH Wei and University of Utah, CC Fan and UCLA, etc., Table 7). In Geography and Urban Studies, respectively, 10 and 12 are based outside the Anglophone world, variously in Hong Kong, Mainland China and Singapore. Interestingly, of those based in Anglo-American institutions, the majority are ethnic Chinese, and many even received part of their academic training in Mainland China. In sum, this group of urban China specialists consists largely of ‘inbetween’ scholars who are presumably more sensitive to local specificities, but also have been steeped in the practices and expectations of Anglo-American institutions, with the expertise to negotiate the conventions and norms of international publishing. Indeed, this cohort of inbetween scholars have played important roles in building dialogues, and translating between different systems of theories, vocabularies and discourses. On the one hand, versed in the Chinese language and more sensitive to local concerns and sensibilities, they have become the ‘to-go’ scholars for Anglophone academics who are keen on expanding the scope of urban knowledge. On the other hand, these inbetween scholars have, through works and partnerships, contributed to the rise of a new group of China-based scholars heavily involved in international publishing. It may be reasonable to say that ‘inbetween’ ethnic Chinese scholars, in one sense, reproduce the inherent inequality in the global landscapes of knowledge production, for closeness to the Anglophone publishing industry, in one way or another, shapes their academic prestige and reputation. Nonetheless, they have actively contributed to ongoing diversification and hybridisation of Anglophone- and Chinese-language academic knowledge and vocabularies.

Table 7. The 20 most productive authors in urban China studies, 1990–2010.

No.	Author Geography	Number of papers	Institution	Author Urban studies	Number of papers	Institution
1	Wu FL	29	Cardiff University	Wu FL	35	Cardiff University
2	Wei YHD	17	University of Utah	Li SM	13	Hong Kong Baptist University
3	Fan CC	16	University of California	Wang YP	11	Heriot-Watt University
4	Jim CY	13	The University of Hong Kong	Zhu JM	11	National University of Singapore
5	Lin GCS	11	The University of Hong Kong	He SJ	10	Sun Yat-Sen University
6	Shen JF	11	The Chinese University of Hong Kong	Jim CY	9	The University of Hong Kong
7	Li SM	9	Hong Kong Baptist University	Lin GCS	9	The University of Hong Kong
8	Ma LJC	9	University of Akron	Shen JF	8	The Chinese University of Hong Kong
9	Pannell CW	9	University of Georgia	Wei YHD	8	University of Utah
10	Zhou YX	8	Peking University	Han SS	7	National University of Singapore
11	Chan KW	7	University of Washington	Huang YQ	7	State University of New York
12	Chen WY	7	The University of Hong Kong	Liu YT	7	South China University of Technology
13	He SJ	7	Sun Yat-Sen University	Yeh AGO	7	The University of Hong Kong
14	Huang YQ	6	State University of New York	Zhang L	7	Fudan University
15	Li X	6	Sun Yat-sen University	Gu CL	6	Tsinghua University
16	Gu CL	5	Tsinghua University	Wu WP	6	Virginia Commonwealth University
17	Han SS	5	University of Singapore	Chen WY	5	The University of Hong Kong
18	Smith CJ	5	State University of New York	Tang BS	5	The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
19	Wang YP	5	Heriot-Watt University	Webster C	5	Cardiff University
20	Zhang L	5	Fudan University	Wong SW	5	University of Hong Kong

Turning attention to citation patterns, while the citation network of urban China studies is not as wide as those discussed earlier, the performance of urban China articles is far from mediocre. In Geography, the highest cited article (Li and Yeh, 2002) has harvested 201 citations, and ranks 47 in all Geography articles; in fact, all top 50 articles on urban China make it into the top 450 articles in ‘Geography’. In Urban Studies, 36 of the top 50 articles on China rank within the top 500 of the category at large. The patterns of countries and institutions receiving the most citations are similar to the results based on productivity.

In terms of high-impact authors, scholars from Chinese institutions, Anglo-American institutions, and other parts of the world have uneven shares in the list of most cited authors. Take the 20 most cited China studies scholars in Geography, for example: four are from Mainland China institutions, eight from Anglo-American ones, and the remaining eight from other parts of the world, including Hong Kong and Singapore; in Urban Studies, the figures are, respectively, four, nine and seven. In general, China-based scholars are less likely to exert a large influence than ethnic Chinese based outside the Mainland.¹¹ In the meantime, it is authors based in Anglo-American institutions and Hong Kong that tend to concentrate at the upper half of the lists. We speculate that a miscellany of factors explains this: (1) scholars based in Anglophone institutions (USA, UK and Hong Kong universities) are viewed as more authoritative voices; (2) they are more prone to theorising and agenda setting while Mainland scholars are more interested in empirical studies; and (3) the bulk of knowledge created by Chinese scholars circulates only within the domestic intellectual circles, which is not reflected in the WoS database. The latter two factors are related to the institutional context of Mainland Chinese academia. Nowadays, in Mainland Chinese academic institutions, publishing in English-language journals is highly valued, and prioritised in most universities over Chinese language publications and policy consultancies. Yet, understandably, Mainland scholars may not have been socialised into theoretical vocabularies and discourses preferred by ‘international journals’ to the same extent as ethnic Chinese outside China. Hence, focusing on presenting empirical analyses may be a safer strategy for Chinese scholars to navigate a relatively unfamiliar terrain of academic endeavours, relying on the theorising work of an elite of expatriate ethnic Chinese (but the difference is being steadily narrowed). In the meantime, there is a sophisticated system of academic publishing in the Chinese language, with a good diversity of high-quality journals, and publications in Chinese are still recognised as evidence of academic merit and achievement. The experiences of domestic Chinese scholars may not be generalised as exemplary of non-Western or non-Anglophone academics. But some degree of commonality exists between Chinese scholars and those from other emerging economies, such as India, Brazil and South Korea, in terms of: (1) the pressure to publish in international journals, and the disadvantages they are likely to face, if they want to advance new theorisations and research agendas; (2) tension between publishing in Anglophone journals and publishing in indigenous languages, and how differentiated values accorded to these two types of publications will shape publishing behaviours of non-Western academics in the long run.

With these observations in mind, we are raising some critical questions that project back onto the problematique of centre–periphery relations. What is the implication of the steady growth of a niche area of research on urban China amidst the persistent dominance of Anglo-American debates? With regard to the active involvement of academics based in Anglo-American institutions in the interpretation and knowledge construction on urban China, should it be met by applause or alarm? Is the state of inbetweenness of ethnic Chinese publishing in international journals a productive one, or does it contribute to colonial subjects wearing ‘white masks’ (Fanon, 1986), estranged from local contexts? While the bibliometric analysis is not able to address these epistemological questions, it nonetheless hints at some promises and constraints internal to the status quo of knowledge production. Given these questions, we proceed to explore some further questions: (1) what specific knowledge feeds into urban China studies, and what research endeavours, in turn, draw from this area; (2) to what extent urban China studies depend on Anglo-American debates, or is there a likely *spillover* of knowledge that disrupts entrenched, Anglo-American perspectives and vocabularies; (3) what are the convergences and divergences between urban China studies and ‘mainstream’ debates in terms of key research topics?

To answer these questions, we used Histcite to sort out the references that urban China articles have *cited* to build their own rhetorics. Table 8 presents a summary of the 50 works (in each category) on which China articles most heavily relied. An interesting finding is that almost all the 50 most-cited references address directly the Chinese context; in other words, they are more or less within the rubric of what we may call ‘China studies’. A considerable proportion of them are urban China articles that already exist in the database. Topics covered by this ensemble of ‘foundational’ works are all highly specific to the urban experiences of post-reform China, ranging from urbanisation and landscape change, to regional development, to domestic migration, to housing and land development. These works contributed to context-specific academic discourses and vocabularies, such as urbanisation in transitional economy, urbanisation from below, the *hukou* system, regional disparity, and the dual-track land/housing development (fostered by the parallel forces of the state and the market). Exceptions to China-specific articles include McGee’s chapter on *desakota* urbanism, Szelenyi’s influential work on cities after socialism, Myrdal’s classic work on the underdevelopment of regions, Sassen’s book on global cities, and Logan and Molotch’s thesis on the political economy of place. All these works, in our opinion, shed light on the political economy and socio-spatial changes that constitute Chinese urbanism without necessarily imposing a Western epistemological nomenclature.

Table 8. Cited references used by urban China articles

No.	Author	Name	Year	Publisher/journal/book name	Records
<i>Part I: Geography</i>					
1	D Solinger	<i>Contested Citizenship In Urban China</i>	1996	University of California Press	44
2	KW Chan	<i>Cities With Invisible Walls</i>	1994	Oxford University Press	37
3	GCS Lin	<i>Red Capitalism</i>	1997	UBC Press	34
4	CC Fan	Of belts and ladders: State policy and uneven regional development in post-Mao China	1995	<i>Annals AAG</i>	33
5	FL Wu	Changes in the structure of public housing provision in urban China	1996	<i>Urban Studies</i>	33
6	LJC Ma; Gonghao Cui	Administrative changes and urban population in China	1987	<i>Annals AAG</i>	30
7	LJC Ma	Urban transformation in China, 1949–2000: A review and research agenda	2002	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	26
8	Fan CC	The elite, the natives, and the outsiders: Migration and labor market segmentation in urban China	2002	<i>Annals AAG</i>	25
9	JR Logan; YJ Bian; FQ Bian	Housing inequality in urban China in the 1990s	1999	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	24
10	SM Li	Housing consumption in urban China: A comparative study of Beijing and Guangzhou	2000	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	23
11	VFS Sit; C Yang	Foreign-investment-induced exo-urbanisation in the Pearl River Delta, China	1997	<i>Urban Studies</i>	23
12	KW Chan	Post-Mao China: A two-class urban society in the making	1996	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	22
13	TG McGee	The emergence of desakota regions in Asia: Expanding a hypothesis	1991	<i>Extended Metropolis</i>	22
14	YP Wang; A Murie	Social and spatial implications of housing reform in China	2000	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	21
15	YX Zhou; LJC Ma	Economic restructuring and suburbanization in China	2000	<i>Urban Geography</i>	21
16	AGO Yeh; FL Wu	The new land development process and urban development in Chinese cities	1996	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	20
17	CC Fan	Uneven development and beyond: Regional development theory in post-Mao China	1997	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	19
<hr/>					
No.	Author	Name	Year	Publisher/journal/book name	Records
18	CC Fan	Migration and labor-market returns in urban China: results from a recent survey in Guangzhou	2001	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	19
19	YQ Huang; WAV Clark	Housing tenure choice in transitional urban China: A multilevel analysis	2002	<i>Urban Studies</i>	19
20	JC Oi	Fiscal reform and the economic foundations of local state corporatism in China	1992	<i>World Politics</i>	19
21	DYH Wei	<i>Regional Development in China</i>	2000	Routledge	19
22	YJ Bian; JR Logan	Market transition and the persistence of power: The changing stratification system in urban China	1996	<i>American Sociological Review</i>	18
23	CK Leung	Personal contacts, subcontracting linkages, and development in the Hong Kong-Zhujiang Delta Region	1993	<i>Annals AAG</i>	18
24	CP Lo	Economic reforms and socialist city structure: A case study of Guangzhou, china	1994	<i>Urban Geography</i>	18
25	LJC Ma; M Fan	Urbanisation from below: The growth of towns in Jiangsu, China	1994	<i>Urban Studies</i>	18
26	CW Pannell	China's urban geography	1990	<i>Progress in Human Geography</i>	18
27	I Szelenyi	<i>Cities after Socialism</i>	1996	Blackwell	18
28	M Zhou; JR Logan	Market transition and the commodification of housing in urban China	1996	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	18
29	DE Dowall	Establishing urban land markets in the People's Republic of China	1993	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	17
30	P Gaubatz	China's urban transformation: Patterns and processes of morphological change in Beijing, Shanghai and Guangzhou	1999	<i>Urban Studies</i>	17
31	SM Li	The housing market and tenure decisions in Chinese Cities: A multivariate analysis of the case of Guangzhou	2000	<i>Housing Studies</i>	17
32	FL Wu	The global and local dimensions of place-making: Remaking Shanghai as a World City	2000	<i>Urban Studies</i>	17
33	KW Chan	Economic growth strategy and urbanization policies in China, 1949–1982	1992	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	16
34	RJR Kirby	<i>Urbanization in China</i>	1985	Columbia University Press	16

No.	Author	Name	Year	Publisher/journal/book name	Records
35	AG Walder	Local governments as industrial firms: An organizational analysis of China's transitional economy	1995	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>	16
36	CC Fan	Economic opportunities and internal migration: A case study of Guangdong Province, China	1996	<i>The Professional Geographer</i>	15
37	XH Hu; DH Kaplan	The emergence of affluence in Beijing: Residential social stratification in China's capital city	2001	<i>Urban Geography</i>	15
38	SM Li; YM Siu	Residential mobility and urban restructuring under market transition: A study of Guangzhou, China	2001	<i>The Professional Geographer</i>	15
39	GCS Lin; SPS Ho	The state, land system, and land development processes in contemporary China	2005	<i>Annals AAG</i>	15
40	CP Lo	Socialist ideology and urban strategies in China	1987	<i>Urban Geography</i>	15
41	YP Wang; A Murie	Commercial housing development in urban China	1999	<i>Urban Studies</i>	15
42	DYH Wei; LJC Ma	Changing patterns of spatial inequality in China, 1952-1990	1996	<i>Third World Planning Review</i>	15
43	FL Wu	China's changing urban governance in the transition towards a more market-oriented economy	2002	<i>Urban Studies</i>	15
44	AGO Yeh; XQ Xu; HY Hu	The social space of Guangzhou City, China	1995	<i>Urban Geography</i>	15
45	KW Chan; XQ Xu	Urban population growth and urbanization in China since 1949: Reconstructing a baseline	1985	<i>The China Quarterly</i>	14
46	DE Dowall	Urban residential redevelopment in the People's Republic of China	1994	<i>Urban Studies</i>	14
47	G Myrdal	<i>Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Regions</i>	1957	Harper Torchbooks	14
48	S Sassen	<i>The Global City</i>	1991	Princeton University Press	14
49	YP Wang; A Murie	The process of commercialisation of urban housing in China	1996	<i>Urban Studies</i>	14
50	M Whyte	<i>Urban Life in Contemporary China</i>	1984	University of Chicago Press	14
Part 2: Urban studies					
1	FL Wu	Changes in the structure of public housing provision in urban China	1996	<i>Urban Studies</i>	44
2	AGO Yeh; FL Wu	The new land development process and urban development in Chinese cities	1996	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	39

No.	Author	Name	Year	Publisher/journal/book name	Records
3	M Zhou; JR Logan	Market transition and the commodification of housing in urban China	1996	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	35
4	D Sollinger	<i>Contested Citizenship in Urban China</i>	1996	University of California Press	34
5	YP Wang; A Murie	The process of commercialisation of urban housing in China	1996	<i>Urban Studies</i>	33
6	KW Chan	<i>Cities with Invisible Walls</i>	1994	Oxford University Press	31
7	YP Wang; A Murie	Social and spatial implications of housing reform in China	2000	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	31
8	World Bank	<i>China: Implementation Options for Urban Housing Reform, A World Bank Country Study</i>	1992	World Bank	28
9	DE Dowall	Establishing urban land markets in the People's Republic of China	1993	<i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>	27
10	JR Logan; YJ Bian; FQ Bian	Housing inequality in urban China in the 1990s	1999	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	26
11	JM Zhu	Local growth coalition: The context and implications of China's gradualist urban land reforms	1999	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	26
12	YJ Bian; JR Logan	Market transition and the persistence of power: The changing stratification system in urban China	1996	<i>American Sociological Review</i>	25
13	P Gaubatz	China's urban transformation: Patterns and processes of morphological change in Beijing, Shanghai and Guangzhou	1999	<i>Urban Studies</i>	25
14	LJC Ma	Urban transformation in China, 1949-2000: A review and research agenda	2002	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	24
15	JC Oi	Fiscal reform and the economic foundations of local state corporatism in China	1992	<i>World Politics</i>	24
16	M Whyte	<i>Urban Life in Contemporary China</i>	1984	Harper Torchbooks	23
17	KW Chan	Post-Mao China: A two-class urban society in the making	1996	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	22
18	VFS Sit; C Yang	Foreign-investment-induced exo-urbanisation in the Pearl River Delta, China	1997	<i>Urban Studies</i>	22
19	FL Wu	The global and local dimensions of place-making: Remaking Shanghai as a World City	2000	<i>Urban Studies</i>	22

No.	Author	Name	Year	Publisher/journal/book name	Records
20	FL Wu	China's changing urban governance in the transition towards a more market-oriented economy	2002	<i>Urban Studies</i>	22
21	I Szelenyi	<i>Cities After Socialism</i>	1996	Blackwell	21
22	YQ Huang; WAV Clark	Housing tenure choice in transitional urban China: A multilevel analysis	2002	<i>Urban Studies</i>	20
23	SM Li	The housing market and tenure decisions in Chinese cities: A of Guangzhou	2000	<i>Housing Studies</i>	20
24	JR Logan;HL Molotch	<i>Urban Fortunes</i>	1987	University of California Press	20
25	YX Zhou; LJC Ma	Economic restructuring and suburbanization in China	2000	<i>Urban Geography</i>	20
26	GCS Lin; SPS Ho	The state, land system, and land development processes in contemporary China	2005	<i>Annals AAG</i>	19
27	FF Deng; YQ Huang	Uneven land reform and urban sprawl in China: The case of Beijing	2004	<i>Progress in Planning</i>	18
28	SM Li	Housing consumption in urban China: A comparative study of Beijing and Guangzhou	2000	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	18
29	LJC Ma; Gonghao Cui	Administrative changes and urban population in China	1987	<i>Annals AAG</i>	18
30	YP Wang; A Murie	<i>Housing Policy and Practice in China</i>	1999	Palgrave Macmillan	18
31	YP Wang; A Murie	Commercial housing development in urban China	1999	<i>Urban Studies</i>	18
32	YP Wang	Housing reform and its impacts on the urban poor in China	2000	<i>Housing Studies</i>	18
33	AGO Yeh; FL Wu	The transformation of urban planning system in midst of economic reform in PRC	1999	<i>Progress in Planning</i>	18
34	CC Fan	Of belts and ladders: State policy and uneven regional development in post-Mao China	1995	<i>Annals AAG</i>	17
35	RJR Kirby	<i>Urbanization in China</i>	1985	Columbia University Press	17
36	GCS Lin	<i>Red Capitalism</i>	1997	UBC Press	17
37	JR Logan	<i>The New Chinese City</i>	2002	Blackwell	17
38	V Nee	A theory of market transition: From redistribution to markets in state socialism	1989	<i>American Sociological Review</i>	17

No.	Author	Name	Year	Publisher/journal/book name	Records
39	FL Wu	The 'game' of landed-property production and capital circulation in China's transitional economy, with reference to Shanghai	1999	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	17
40	WP Wu	Migrant housing in urban China: Choices and constraints	2002	<i>Urban Affairs Review</i>	17
41	AGO Yeh; XQ Xu; HY Hu	The social space of Guangzhou, China	1995	<i>Urban Geography</i>	17
42	JM Zhu	From land use right to land development right: Institutional change in China's urban development	2004	<i>Urban Studies</i>	17
43	A Chen	China's urban housing reform: Price-rent ratio and market equilibrium	1996	<i>Urban Studies</i>	16
44	AGO Yeh; X Li	<i>Economic Development and Agricultural Land Loss in the Pearl River Delta, China</i>	1999	Habitat International	16
45	DE Dowall	Urban residential redevelopment in the People's Republic of China	1994	<i>Urban Studies</i>	15
46	J Lee	From welfare housing to home ownership: The dilemma of China's housing reform	2000	<i>Housing Studies</i>	15
47	CP Lo	Socialist ideology and urban strategies in China	1987	<i>Urban Geography</i>	15
48	AG Walder	Local governments as industrial firms: An organizational analysis of China's transitional economy	1995	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>	15
49	TW Zhang	Land market forces and government's role in sprawl: The case of China	2000	<i>Cities</i>	15
50	JM Zhu	Urban development under ambiguous property rights: A case of China's transition economy	2002	<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	15

In this sense, it seems to be normal for urban China scholars to frame their narratives *without* citing heavily publications that speak to Anglo-American contexts, and there is arguably a high degree of reliance on recycling knowledge within the circle of China studies. 'Big names' in mainstream Anglo-American debates are more often than not secondary to authorities specialising in China. This, interestingly, is not necessarily deemed unacceptable by journals and reviewers. Presumably, the criteria evaluating the quality of academic work may not be as rigid as commentators such as Aalbers (2004) and Kitchin (2005) suggested. This analysis, however, is ineluctably limited and biased, as different topics mean very different aggregates of literatures to be cited. For example, scholars of migrants in China may draw from Anglo-American debates on migration, but such citation behaviours are veiled by the computational analysis. Nonetheless, this analysis highlights a shared sensitivity to contextual contingencies amongst urban China scholars.

The final question to be explored, which, in our opinion, is critical to provincialising urban studies is whether urban knowledge emerging from contexts beyond the core is drawn by Anglo-American, or broadly Western, academics to denaturalise dominant assumptions, epistemologies, theories and vocabularies. Urban China studies offers a feasible window to engage with this question. Hence, we collected via WoS all the academic works which cited the 50 most cited urban China articles in Geography and Urban Studies. This analysis explores the flow of knowledge in a reverse direction to the previous one, namely, the extent to which urban China articles contribute to the epistemological and explanatory basis of subsequent works. The finding is not particularly encouraging. In both Geography and Urban Studies, it is evident that the ‘consumption’ of urban China articles is largely restricted to the community of China scholars. In fact, except Luca Salvati, who relied on insights from urban China scholarship to explore land use changes in Mediterranean urban regions, virtually all of the 20 scholars who the most heavily draw from urban China research (in either category) are themselves urban China specialists. In a similar vein, the institutions that most frequently cite urban China scholarship correspond with those that are the most active in producing urban China knowledge. To summarise, while it is safe for urban China articles to speak less about Anglo-American debates, in terms of getting articles published, this area has yet to demonstrate substantial potential of bridging different debates and energising comparative analyses.

Conclusion

Based on the analyses we have put together so far, some tentative conclusions may be drawn, not only as a summary of the findings detailed above, but also an invitation extended to urban scholars for further reflecting on the habitus of urban knowledge production and circulation, which is circumscribed in some ways and being opened in others. To begin with, although the overall publishing space has undoubtedly been diversified, it is still Anglophone academics, basing their research largely on the UK and North American contexts, who are likely to publish more, and publish more influential and debate-shaping works. With regard to both the sites of knowledge production and impact, the privileged position of the Anglophone world has not yet been substantially altered. The analysis of consumption of citations, meanwhile, echoes Foster et al.’s (2007: 310) study on economic geography – the circulation of knowledge is based on ‘dense professional networks, mostly channelling through Anglophone parts of the global North’. An examination of the works citing urban China articles further implies that there is relatively limited spillover of knowledge from the ‘periphery’ to the ‘core’ – indeed, knowledge on urban China, proliferation notwithstanding, is largely recycled within the small circle of China scholars.

Despite that a few scholars specialising on China and other non-Anglophone contexts, the majority of those who have made it to the lists of most productive and influential authors are less proactive in addressing the ‘peripheries’ of urban knowledge, as suggested by the current analyses at least. The championing for ‘ordinary’ cities, comparative urbanism, and urban theories beyond the West, seen from current analyses of high-impact articles and authors, is still a relatively small and inchoate intellectual movement, although it appears to be gaining greater momentum in the aftermath of the period of this study, i.e. post-2010, reflected by the publication of several critical commentaries and special issues within a relatively short period (McFarlane and Robinson, 2012; Robinson 2014, 2016; Robinson and Roy, 2016; Sheppard et al., 2013).

By signposting the comparative gesture in urban studies, we, however, do not argue that Western cities and cities beyond the West are conceptually and epistemologically incommensurable (Storper and Scott, 2016). The agenda that we advocate is to examine the differences, local variations, and semi-autonomous trajectories of urban changes, amidst the reinforcing interdependence and networking of global capitalism, cultures and consciousness; when possible, family resemblances and common conceptual grounds may be found, despite the fact that concepts and theories may be inherently contested and tensioned (Wyly, 2015).

Finally, to be fair to journals editors and reviewers criticised as the gatekeepers of Anglo-centric epistemology (e.g. Aalbers, 2004), we suggest that the norms of international publishing may themselves be changing. Small and peripheral as it is, and likely to remain so in a foreseeable future, urban China research is growing under the larger rubric of urban studies, and has indeed gone beyond reproducing Anglo-American debates. In particular, the examination of the references that China scholars have used to build their theoretical and

explanatory bases suggests that this subarea has developed some scholarly conventions resistant to uncritical borrowing from Anglophone literatures. Thanks to an enlarging cohort of inbetween scholars who navigate through the norms of international publishing but keep a grasp of local specificities, urban China studies has supplied fresh perspectives and vocabularies to urban scholarship in general (He and Qian, 2017). The challenge faced by this small field, in this sense, may be less about blindly following ‘bigger’ debates than its still very introspective nature, that is, the relative lack of momentum in *speaking back* to the centre. Surely, to alter this impasse would entail China scholars more proactively ‘selling’ their research, ideas and critical thinking. Even the ongoing critique of the Anglo-centric mindset in the intellectual core is insufficient if action beyond critique is not discernible. In other words, scholars in the ‘core’ need to engage with and debate the works emerging on urban China and other contexts on the terms of these newly emerging discourses. For those wishing to de-naturalise Western episteme, the small, yet vibrant and growing area of urban China studies will provide possibilities for opening and provincialising theoretical and empirical debates in urban studies, albeit in slow, patchy, and incremental ways.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This research received funding from Lee Kong Chian Fund for Research Excellence at Singapore Management University.

Notes

1. We are conscious that the same exercise could have been undertaken with other discipline categories such as sociology and anthropology for a fuller analysis of urban scholarship. See later discussion on limitations.
2. The SSCI database only records a small amount of conference papers, and the citations of them are usually marginal.
3. The keywords used include: urban; urban geography; urbanisation; city/cities; cityscapes; urbanscapes; urban place; urban landscapes; urban spaces; urban growth; urban planning; urban development; urbanism.
4. Link to Histcite: <http://interest.science.thomsonreuters.com.libproxy.smu.edu.sg/forms/HistCite/>.
5. The *citing* works of a *cited* article, however, are not restricted to those in the database used by this study.
6. Since many Scandinavian journals have opted to publish in English, ‘Geography’ and ‘Urban Studies’ in the WoS database now contain only a handful of non-English (or partly non-English) journals, which tend to concentrate at the lowest-impact quartiles. As of 2017, these journals include *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie* (in German), *Geografie* (in Czech), *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles* (in Spanish), *Geodetski Vestnik* (in Slovenian), *Revista de Geografía Norte Grande* (in Spanish), *Script Nova* (in Spanish), *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Geographischen Gesellschaft* (in German), *Revue de Géographie alpine* (partly in French, German and Italian), and *EURE* (in Spanish).
7. If one article has multiple authors, each author, as well as his/her institutional affiliation and country, is counted once. Therefore, the sum percentage of all countries is supposed to exceed 100%.
8. The sum share of USA, UK and Canada of the 50 most productive institutions: 42 of all 50 institutions in Geography and 43 in Urban Studies (1990–2000); and 48 of all 50 institutions in Geography and 44 in Urban Studies (2000–2010).

9. With Histcite, this study is able to calculate two types of citation data: Total Local Citation Score (TLCS), which records the sum of citations within the database that we built; and Total Global Citation Score (TGCS), which records the sum of citations with the whole WoS. In this study, citation numbers all refer to TGCS.
10. Because the software packages in this study automatically delete repeated entries, if one article cites more than one of the 200 articles at question, it will be counted only once.
11. In Urban Studies, the highest cited article (McGranahan et al., 2007) mentions China only tangentially but allows the three authors into the list of high-impact authors. The potentially distorting effect of this article needs to be heeded here.

References

- Aalbers MB (2004) Creative destruction through the Anglo-American hegemony: A non-AngloAmerican view on publications, referees and language. *Area* 36(3): 319–322.
- Aalbers MB and Rossi U (2007) A coming community: Young geographers coping with multi-tier spaces of academic publishing across Europe. *Social & Cultural Geography* 8(2): 283–302.
- Ban´ski J and Ferenc M (2013) ‘International’ or ‘Anglo-American’ journals of geography. *Geoforum* 45: 285–295.
- Berg LD and Kearns RA (1998) America unlimited. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16(2): 128–132.
- Bhambra GK (2014) Introduction: Knowledge production in global context: Power and coloniality. *Current Sociology* 62(4): 451–456.
- Bourdieu P (1990) *Homo academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press. Bourdieu P and Wacquant L (1999) On the cunning of imperialist reason. *Theory, Culture and Society* 16(1): 41–58.
- Bunnell T, Kong L and Law L (2005) Social and cultural geographies of South-East Asia. *Social & Cultural Geography* 6(1): 135–149.
- Celik E, Ersche C, Keim W, et al. (2014) Introduction. In: Keim W, Celik E and Wo¨hrer V (eds) *Global Knowledge Production in the Social Sciences: Made in Circulation*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–19.
- Chakrabarty D (2000) *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chow YF and de Kloet J (2014) The spectre of Europe: Knowledge, cultural studies and the ‘rise of Asia’. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 17(1): 3–15.
- Comaroff J and Comaroff JL (2012) *Theory From the South: Or, How Euro-America is Evolving Toward Africa*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Derickson KD (2015) Urban geography I: Locating urban theory in the ‘urban age’. *Progress in Human Geography* 39(5): 647–657.
- Derudder B (2011) Some reflections on the ‘problematic’ dominance of ‘Web of Science’ journals in academic human geography. *Area* 43(1): 110–112.
- Edensor T and Jayne M (2012) *Urban Theory Beyond the West*. London: Routledge.

- Fanon F (1986) *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto. Foster J, Muellerleile C, Olds K, et al. (2007) Circulating economic geographies: Citation patterns and citation behaviour in economic geography, 1982–2006. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 32(3): 295–312.
- Garcia-Ramon MD (2003) Globalization and international geography: The questions of languages and scholarly traditions. *Progress in Human Geography* 27(1): 1–5.
- Gutiérrez J and López-Nieva P (2001) Are international journals of human geography really international? *Progress in Human Geography* 25(1): 53–69.
- He S and Qian JX (2017) From an emerging market to a multifaceted urban society: Urban China studies. *Urban Studies* 54(4): 827–846.
- Keim W (2011) Counterhegemonic currents and internationalization of sociology: Theoretical reflections and an empirical example. *International Sociology* 26(1): 123–145.
- Kitchin R (2005) Disrupting and destabilizing Anglo-American and English-language hegemony in geography. *Social & Cultural Geography* 6(1): 1–15.
- Li X and Yeh AGO (2002) Neural-network-based cellular automata for simulating multiple land use changes using GIS. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* 16(4): 323–343.
- McFarlane C and Robinson J (2012) Introduction – Experiments in comparative urbanism. *Urban Geography* 33(6): 765–773.
- McGranahan G, Balk D and Anderson B (2007) The rising tide: Assessing the risks of climate change and human settlements in low elevation coastal zones. *Environment and Urbanization* 19(1): 17–37.
- Mignolo WD (2002) The geopolitics of knowledge and the colonial difference. *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 101(1): 57–96.
- Mignolo WD (2014) Spirit out of bounds returns to the East: The closing of the social sciences and the opening of independent thoughts. *Current Sociology* 62(4): 584–602.
- Minca C (2000) Venetian geographical praxis. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18(3): 285–289.
- Paasi A (2005) Globalisation, academic capitalism, and the uneven geographies of international journal publishing spaces. *Environment and Planning A* 37(5): 769–789.
- Paasi A (2015) Academic capitalism and the geopolitics of knowledge. In: Agnew J, Mamadouh V, Secor AJ, et al. (eds) *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Geography*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 509–523.
- Paddison R (ed.) (2001) *Handbook of Urban Studies*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Peake L (2011) In, out and unspeakably about: Taking social geography beyond an Anglo-American positionality. *Social & Cultural Geography* 12(7): 757–773.
- Ren J and Luger J (2015) Comparative urbanism and the ‘Asian city’: Implications for research and theory. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39(1): 145–156.

- Robinson J (2002) Global and world cities: A view from off the map. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 26(3): 531–554.
- Robinson J (2004) In the tracks of comparative urbanism: Difference, urban modernity and the primitive. *Urban Geography* 25(8): 709–723.
- Robinson J (2016) Thinking cities through elsewhere: Comparative tactics for a more global urban studies. *Progress in Human Geography* 40(1): 3–29.
- Robinson J (forthcoming) Introduction to a virtual issue on comparative urbanism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, DOI: 10.1111/1468–2427.12171.
- Robinson J and Roy A (2016) Debate on global urbanisms and the nature of urban theory. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40(1): 181–186.
- Rodriguez-Pose A (2004) On English as a vehicle to preserve geographical diversity. *Progress in Human Geography* 28(1): 1–4.
- Rodriguez-Pose A (2006) Is there an ‘Anglo-American’ domination in human geography? And, is it bad? *Environment and Planning A* 38(4): 603–610.
- Schuermans N, Meeus B and De Maesschalck F (2010) Is there a world beyond the Web of Science? Publication practices outside the heartland of academic geography. *Area* 42(4): 417–424.
- Sheppard E, Leitner H and Maringanti A (2013) Provincializing global urbanism: A manifesto. *Urban Geography* 34(7): 893–890.
- Simonsen K (2002) Global–local ambivalence. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 27(4): 391–394.
- Storper M and Scott A (2016) Current debates in urban theory: A critical assessment. *Urban Studies* 53(6): 1114–1136.
- Swanson K (2007) Revanchist urbanism heads south: The regulation of indigenous beggars and street vendors in Ecuador. *Antipode* 39(4): 708–728.
- Vaiou D (2003) Radical debate between ‘local’ and ‘international’: A view from the periphery. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21(2): 133–137.
- Wallerstein I (1997) Eurocentrism and its avatars: The dilemmas of social sciences. *Sociological Bulletin* 46(1): 21–39.
- Wyly E (2015) Gentrification on the planetary urban frontier: The evolution of Turner’s ‘noo’ sphere. *Urban Studies* 52(14): 2515–2550.
- Yeung HWC (2001) Redressing the geographical bias in social science knowledge. *Environment and Planning A* 33(1): 2–9.
- Yeung HWC (2002) Deciphering citations. *Environment and Planning A* 34(12): 2093–2102.