**FINANCIAL LITERACY:** **A BIBLIOMETRIC LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Abstract**

This research analyzes the evolution of financial literacy literature. Specifically, the study performs bibliometric analysis to examine the descriptive, intellectual, and conceptual structure of financial literacy research. This bibliometric analysis covers the period between 1963 and 2021, and is based on 4 489 articles retrieved from two databases: Web of Science and Scopus. The findings illustrate certain keywords that emerged between the two periods, and reveal that financial literacy research has not yet reached maturity.

**Keywords:** Financial literacy,Bibliometric analysis, Intellectual structure, Conceptual structure, Web of Science, Scopus, R package, VOSviewer

1. **Introduction**

Many definitions of financial literacy (FL) have been introduced in the literature. For example, Lusardi and Tufano (2015) define FL as “the ability to make simple decisions regarding debt contracts, in particular how one applies basic knowledge about interest compounding, measured in the context of everyday financial choices.” For Bhushan and Medury (2013), FL refers to the capacity to take adequate decisions about using money. In this research, we retain the definition proposed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in 2014 and used by many scholars since (e.g., Goyal & Kumar, 2021), which states that the FL is “knowledge and understanding of financial concepts and risks, and the skills, motivation and confidence to apply such knowledge and understanding in order to make effective decisions across a range of financial contexts, to improve the financial wellbeing of individuals and society, and to enable participation in economic life.”

Despite the growing popularity of the FL concept and many reviews of this concept in the literature, as well as the work conducted by many countries, individual persons are still having difficulties in making the right financial decisions (Gallego-Losada et al., 2021). In this regard, in the recent survey[[1]](#footnote-1) made by the Canada Life Assurance Company, only 41% of the respondents argue that they have a high level of confidence in their financial knowledge.

To better understand the FL concept, certain scholars have realized systematic literature reviews (e.g., Huston, 2010; Remund, 2010) or they reviewed some consequences of FL (e.g., Fox et al., 2005; Hastings et al., 2013; Santini et al., 2019), as well as reviews of some antecedents of this concept (e.g., Van Campenhout, 2015; Montalto et al., 2019; Santini et al., 2019; Steinert et al., 2018). Except meta-analysis conducted by a limited number of authors (e.g., Miller et al., 2014; Santini et al., 2019) studying the impact of FL, reviews on this concept are qualitative and are based on the authors’ views. Very few reviews focusing on the intellectual or/and conceptual structure evolution of the FL concept are quantitative and objective in the literature. Specifically, to the best of our knowledge, one study, Goyal and Kumar (2021), has used bibliometric analysis to explore the structure of knowledge (e.g., most influential authors), the conceptual structure, and the intellectual structure of FL. This research covered the 2000–2017 period, and retrieved 502 articles from Web of Science (WoS). The authors detected three main themes: 1) FL amongst distinct cohorts, 2) influence of FL on financial behavior and planning, and 3) the influence of financial education. They also identified some emerging themes like financial inclusion, financial capability, gender gap, tax and insurance literacy, and digital financial education. However, Bedi et al. (2019) analyze 2,096 papers from the Scopus database for the time period between 1964 and 2017 to explore only the structure of FL. The authors highlight that despite the increase of publication, the FL literature is still immature. In addition, some other scholars have recently employed bibliometric analysis regarding the FL field (e.g., Gallego-Losada et al., 2021; Ingale & Paluri, 2020; Abad-Segura & González-Zamar, 2019; Tomar et al., 2021).

The Goyal and Kumar (2021) study includes at least two limitations. First, the authors consider only articles in the WoS database. Second, the content analysis performed by the authors analyzes only ABCD-ranked journal articles between 2016 and 2019 (175 from 502 papers). The first limitation is important because prior scholars (e.g., Echchakoui, 2020; Escalona et al., 2010; Mongeon & Paul-Hus, 2016) have stated the importance of including the two databases. For example, Echchakoui (2020) showed that using only Scopus or WoS cannot give an adequate view of tendencies and knowledge in a specific field. The reason is that those databases are complementary even if they are correlated (Escalona et al., 2010). For this reason, Mongeon and Paul-Hus (2016) recommend that both the databases should be used in bibliometric analysis. The second limitation is also critical, because as we show in this paper, the research for FL began in 1963, so not considering articles between 1963 and 2016 will very probably not give a real picture of the evolution of FL.

To fill these gaps, this research conducts a bibliometric analysis to assess the evolution of the intellectual and the conceptual evolution of the FL concept in the literature. For bibliometric analysis, we assess 4,489 articles retrieved from WoS and Scopus. The main advantage of bibliometric analysis is that it is a quantitative and objective analysis, so it can eliminate the systematic review biases which can be induced by the researchers’ subjective judgment. The fact that the bibliometric analysis may be simply replicated is another benefit of this method (Aria et al., 2020). Specifically, using this method, we assess the structure of knowledge by exploring the main authors, articles, journals, institutions, and countries that most influenced the FL literature. We also explore the intellectual structure of the FL concept by performing co-citation analysis with regards to the authors and journals. Finally, we assess the conceptual structure of the FL concept by exploring the thematic evolution of this concept and the co-occurrence network of the authors’ keywords.

This research makes three main contributions. First, to the best of the authors’ knowledge, this research is the first investigating the evolution state of FL by using bibliometric analysis of the two databases WoS and Scopus. The utilization of this latter is important because it covers a large number of papers (NP), so it can eliminate bias in the paper selection. Second, the objectivity of the bibliometric method reduces the systematic review biases which can be induced by the researchers’ subjective judgment. Third, this research assesses the FL literature advance and show that this literature is not yet mature.

The rest of this paper is designed as follows. The first section presents the literature review of FL and bibliometric analysis. Methodology constitutes the second section, followed by results. The fourth section deals with the discussion. Finally, limitations and future research comprise the final section.

**1. Literature review**

**1.1 Financial literacy**

Table 1, extended from Goyal and Kumar’s (2021) research, illustrates the main review of FL. This table shows that only two bibliometric studies focused on the evolution of FL literature. The first is conducted by Bedi et al. (2019) and analyzes 2,096 papers retrieved from the Scopus database. This study covers the period between 1964 and 2017. The authors find that 1) the first publication on the FL construct in the Scopus database dates back to 1964, 2) the years of 2016 (with 328 publications) and 2017 (with 330 publications) are considered as the years of the transition of FL research from the embryonic stage to maturity stage, 3) the FL literature is still immature, and 4) authors from the three following countries dominate the FL research: the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia. The second bibliometric research is published by Goyal and Kumar (2021). This study retrieved 502 papers from the WoS database between 2000 and 2019. The authors also map the FL literature trends only between 2016 and 2019. Goyal and Kumar (2021) detect three main themes: 1) FL among distinct cohorts, 2) the influence of FL on financial behavior and planning, and 3) the influence of financial education. They also identify some emerging themes such as financial inclusion, financial capability, gender gap, tax and insurance literacy, and digital financial education. In addition, the co-citation network outlined by the authors reveals three clusters. The first cluster contains 33 papers (mostly empirical research) focused mainly on the relationship between FL and financial planning. The second cluster includes 47 documents mostly on the conceptual definition and measure of FL, and interested more in the impact of FL and education on financial behavior, particularly of young people. Finally, the third cluster comprises 27 papers and deals with the levels, causes, and consequences of FL.

Table 1: FL review extended from Goyal and Kumar (2021)

| **Authors** | **Year** | **Journal** | **Title** | **TC** | **Keywords** | **Focus** | **Type** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fox J; Bartholomae S; Lee J | 2005 | Journal of Consumer Affairs | Building the Case for Financial Education | 173 |  | Financial education to improve financial literacy. | Review |
| Collins Jm; O'rourke Cm | 2010 | Journal of Consumer Affairs | Financial Education and Counseling - Still Holding Promise | 80 |  | Financial education and counseling for adults. | Review |
| Huston Sj | 2010 | Journal of Consumer Affairs | Measuring Financial Literacy | 404 |  | Financial literacy definitions and measures. | Review |
| Remund Dl | 2010 | Journal of Consumer Affairs | Financial Literacy Explicated the Case for A Clearer Definition in an Increasingly Complex Economy | 255 |  | Financial literacy definitions and measures. | Review |
| Vaihekoski M | 2011 | European Journal of Finance | History of Financial Research and Education in Finland | 1 | Dissertation; financial education; Finland; graduate school; history; professors; research | Finance research and education history in Finland. | Review |
| Hastings JS; Madrian BC; Skimmyhorn Wl | 2013 | Annual Review of Economics | Financial Literacy Financial Education and Economic Outcomes | 207 | Personal finance; household finance | Financial literacy, financial education, and consumer financial outcomes. | Review |
| Fernandes D; Lynch Jr. JG; Netemeyer RG | 2014 | Management Science | Financial Literacy Financial Education and Downstream Financial Behaviors | 532 | Behavioral economics; causal effects; consumer behavior; design of experiments; education systems; financial education; financial literacy; government programs; household finance; meta-analysis; public policy; statistics | Relationship of financial literacy and of financial education to financial behaviors architecture, and regulation as tools to help consumer financial behavior. | Meta-analysis |
| Drever Ai; Odders-White E; Kalish CW; Else-Quest NM; Hoagland EM; Nelms EN | 2015 | Journal Of Consumer Affairs | Foundations of Financial Well-Being: Insights into The Role of Executive Function, Financial Socialization, and Experience-Based Learning in Childhood and Youth | 69 |  | Approaches to improve financial education, from early childhood through young adulthood. | Review |
| Miller M; Reichelstein J; Salas C; Zia B | 2015 | World Bank Research Observer | Can You Help Someone Become Financially Capable a Meta-analysis of the Literature | 75 |  | Financial education to increase financial knowledge and behaviors of consumers. | Meta-analysis |
| Totenhagen C; Casper D; Faber K; Bosch L; Wiggs C; Borden L | 2015 | Journal of Family and economic Issues | Youth Financial Literacy A Review of Key Considerations and Promising Delivery Methods | 22 | Financial literacy; financial education; youth; best practices; comprehensive review | Financial literacy education to identify characteristics of an adequate financial education programs | Review |
| Van Campenhout G | 2015 | Journal of Consumer Affairs | Revaluing The Role of Parents as Financial Socialization Agents in Youth Financial Literacy Programs | 52 |  | Role of parents in young people's financial socialization process. | Review |
| Williams AJ; Oumlil B | 2015 | International Journal of Bank Marketing | College Student Financial Capability A Framework for Public Policy Research and Managerial Action for Financial Exclusion Prevention | 8 | Financial literacy; financial capability; financial exclusion; financial; inclusion; student credit card debt; student debt | Different financial literacy approaches to solve problems related to deficits in financial knowledge among college students. |  |
| Kaiser T; Menkhoff L | 2017 | World Bank Economic Review | Does Financial Education Impact Financial Literacy and Financial Behavior and If So When | 63 |  | Relationship between financial behavior, financial education, and financial literacy. | Meta-analysis |
| Walstad W; Urban C; J. Asarta C; Breitbach E; Bosshardt W; Heath J; O'neill B; Wagner J; Xiao JJ | 2017 | Journal of Economic Education | Perspectives on Evaluation in Financial Education Landscape Issues and Studies | 23 | Financial education; financial literacy; program evaluation | Heterogeneity in the effectiveness of financial education programs. | Review |
| Burrus Bb; Krieger K; Rutledge R; Rabre A; Axelson S; Miller A; White C | 2018 | American Journal of Public Health | Building Bridges to a Brighter Tomorrow A Systematic Evidence Review of Interventions That Prepare Adolescents for Adulthood | 5 |  | Relationship between financial literacy, adolescent development healthy relationships, parent child communication, educational and career success, and healthy life skills. | Review |
| Peeters N; Rijk K; Soetens B; Storms B; Hermans K | 2018 | Journal of Consumer Affairs | A Systematic Literature Review to Identify Successful Elements for Financial Education and Counseling in Groups | 13 |  | Mixed financial education and counseling to help persons at risk for financial difficulties. | Review |
| Steinert Ji; Zenker J; Filipiak U; Movsisyan A; Cluver LD; Shenderovich Y | 2018 | World Development | Do Saving Promotion Interventions Increase Household Savings Consumption and Investments in Subsaharan Africa A Systematic Review and Metaanalysis | 23 | Financial inclusion; financial literacy; meta-analysis; savings; sub-Saharan Africa; systematic review | Relationship between saving promotion, consumption, and future-oriented investments in sub-Saharan Africa. | Meta-analysis |
| Abad-Segura E; Gonzalez-Zamar Md | 2019 | Education Sciences | Effects Of Financial Education and Financial Literacy on Creative Entrepreneurship a Worldwide Research | 22 | Financial education; bibliometric; business; creative entrepreneurship; scientific research | Impact of financial literacy and financial education with the creativity of individual entrepreneurship. | Bibliometric analysis |
| Bedi, H. S., Karn, A. K., Kaur, G. P., & Duggal, R. | 2019 | Our Heritage | Financial Literacy – A Bibliometric Analysis |  | Financial literacy; financial education, financial wisdom, financial environment, bibliometric analysis. | Financial literacy literature development | Bibliometric analysis |
| Montalto Cp; Phillips El; Mcdaniel AR | 2019 | Journal of Family and Economic Issues | College Student Financial Wellness Student Loans and Beyond | 18 | Financial capability; financial wellness; higher education; student; loans | Main facets of college student financial wellness and financial behavior. | Review |
| Santini FDO; Ladeira WJ; Mette FMB; Ponchio MC | 2019 | International Journal of Bank Marketing | The Antecedents and Consequences of Financial Literacy A Meta-analysis | 6 | Antecedents; consequents and moderators; financial literacy; meta-analysis | Antecedents and consequences of financial literacy. | Meta-analysis |
| Abad-Segura E; Gonzalez-Zamar MD | 2021 | 3c Empresa | Implications Of Financial Education on Creative Entrepreneurship Research Trends | 0 | Financial education; financial literacy; economy; finance; entrepreneurship; research; business | Impact of financial literacy and education on individual training, as a tool of creative entrepreneurship. | Bibliometric analysis |
| Compen B; DE Witte K; Schelfhout W | 2021 | British Journal of Educational Technology | The Impact of Teacher Engagement in An Interactive Webinar Series on The Effectiveness of Financial Literacy Education | 4 | Online teacher professional development; randomised controlled trial; webinar; financial literacy | Effect of teacher engagement on students’ effectiveness of Financial Literacy education. | Experiment |
| Gallego-Losada R; Montero-Navarro A; Rodrguez-Snchez Jl; Gonzlez-Torres T | 2021 | Finance Research Letters | Retirement Planning and Financial Literacy at the crossroads a Bibliometric Analysis | 1 | Bibliometric analysis; financial literacy; research trends; retirement planning | Financial literacy literature development in the different phases of retirement financial planning. | Bibliometric analysis |
| Goyal K; Kumar S | 2021 | International Journal of Consumer Studies | Financial Literacy a Systematic Review and Bibliometric Analysis | 36 | Bibliometric analysis; consumer economics; financial education; financial knowledge; financial literacy; systematic literature review | Financial literacy literature development. | Bibliometric analysis |
| Stahl C; Karlsson EA; Sandqvist J; Hensing G; Brouwer S; Friberg E; Maceachen E | 2021 | Disability and Rehabilitation | Social Insurance Literacy a Scoping Review on How to Define and Measure It | 2 | Social insurance; literacy; sick leave; health; work disability; workers? Compensation; scoping review | Social insurance literacy concept’s review. | Review |
| Tomar S; Kumar S; Sureka R | 2021 | Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning | Financial Planning for Retirement Bibliometric Analysis and Future Research Directions | 0 | Bibliographic coupling; bibliometric analysis; financial planning; retirement planning | Development of financial planning for retirement literature. | Bibliometric analysis |

TC: Number of citations

Some authors (Abad-Segura & González-Zamar; 2019; Gallego-Losada et al. 2021; Ingale & Paluri, 2020; Tomar et al., 2021) have used bibliometric analysis to study FL with another concept. For example, Abad-Segura and González-Zamar (2019) study 665 articles between 1990 and 2018 to explore the impact of FL and financial education on creative entrepreneurship. The results of this study reveal that 1) the top cited journals are *Research in Higher Education* (257 citations), *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* (171 citations), and *Higher Education* (128 citations); 2) the most productive universities are Columbia University (seven papers and 140 citations), the University of Toronto Canada (six papers and 435 citations), and Griffith University (six papers and 37 citations); 3) the most productive countries are the United States (236 papers), United Kingdom (82 papers), and Australia (43 papers); 4) the main productive authors are respectively Hall, S (h-index = 4, total citations [TC] = 104) and Worku, Z (h-index = 4, TC = 104); and 5) the highest frequency keywords are finance (115), education (112), human (58), higher education (44), economics (34), female (30), and financial management (25).

**1.2. Bibliometric methods**

According to Köseoglu et al. (2016), bibliometric analysis is a quantitative method that evaluates a field’s progression in the literature. In recent years, bibliometric analysis has been used by multiple scholars and in various fields such as marketing (e.g., Martínez-López et al., 2020; Valenzuela-Fernandez et al., 2019), management (e.g., Zupic & Čater, 2015), entrepreneurship (e.g., Ruiz-Alba et al., 2021), and innovation (e.g., Mortazavi et al., 2021). For example, Mortazavi et al. (2021) employ co-citation analysis of 293 papers to map inclusive innovation literature.

In the literature, the bibliometric analysis is performed by two procedure approaches: 1) the evaluative approach and 2) relational approach (Abbie-Gayle & Ioanna, 2019). In the evaluative approach, scholars assess the knowledge structure of a field by exploring the main authors, articles, journals, institutions, and countries that have most influenced the field of literature. The relational approach uses social network analysis to explore the connection network between authors, documents, institutions, journals, and keywords to discover unveiling patterns (Köseoglu et al., 2016). Zupic and Čater (2015) classify bibliometric methods into three structures: 1) intellectual structure, 2) conceptual structure, and 3) social structure. The intellectual structure of a field is defined as the knowledge base and origins of this field (Zupic & Čater, 2015). This structure is assessed by conducting the co-citation analysis of authors, journals, and documents. The conceptual structure of a field refers to the most studied topics related to this field. This is established by analysis of the most frequently used keywords and the co-occurrence of keywords. Finally, the social structure assesses the collaboration between authors in a specific field. The common analysis used to perform this structure is co-authorship analysis.

**2. Methodology**

**2.1. Data processing**

To conduct bibliometric analysis, we followed the Zupic and Čater (2015). This methodology has been used by several scholars (e.g., Köseoglu et al., 2019) and consists of five steps: 1) study or research design, 2) data collection, 3) data analysis, 4) data visualization, and 5) results interpretation.

In this study, we use the evaluative approach as well as the relational approach to assess the intellectual and the conceptual structures of the FL concept in the B2B market. The evaluative approach explores the most influential authors, papers, journals, institutions, and countries in the FL concept research. This study only uses the common analysis in a descriptive analysis of the database selected. As previously mentioned, we established the intellectual structure using co-citation analysis. This latter assesses the similarity between authors, journals, or articles (Zupic & Čater, 2015). For example, author co-citations refer to the occurrence in which two authors are cited jointly in one article. This study uses the author keywords frequency and the co-occurrence to assess the conceptual structure. The co-occurrence, also labeled co-word analysis, reveals the closest keywords or topics through clusters in a field (Köseoglu, 2016).

The authors collected the selected papers from two databases, WoS and Scopus, following the PRISMA method (see Figure 1). These are the main databases used in the bibliometric analysis in the literature. To retrieve the papers on the FL concept, we used the following query, used by Goyal and Kumar (2021): TITLE-ABS-KEY financ\* literacy” OR “financ\* knowledge” OR “financ\* education” OR “financ\* capability”. After this, we chose only English papers and peer reviewed papers (articles, proceedings, and reviews) in the following main areas: 1) social sciences, 2) psychology, 3) education, 4) business (e.g., finance and accounting) and management, and 5) economics and econometrics. This operation retrieved 8,784 articles, specifically 4,817 from Scopus and 3,967 from WoS. After duplication elimination between WoS and Scopus, the corpus retained was 6,455 articles (3,710 articles from Scopus and 2,745 from WoS). The final step of screening was verifying if each article was within the scope of this study. We rejected 2,041 papers through this step, and finally 4,414 articles retained (1,809 from the WoS database and 2,605 articles from Scopus database).

Figure 1. PRISMA model (Moher et al., 2009)



**2.2 Analysis procedure and software**

To analyze and visualize our data, we use multiple methods and three software applications. The descriptive analysis including the most productive authors and other indicators was performed by using the Notepad ++ and the Bibliometrix package of R software (Aria & Cuccurullo, 2017). To accomplish the co-citation analysis, we used the VOSviewer software (Van Eck & Waltman, 2010). This popular software for network mapping is largely used in bibliometric analysis. To deeply analyze the conceptual structure of the FL concept in the B2B literature, we also performed multidimensional analysis in the Bibliometrix package of R software.

**3. Results**

We present our results in three different sections: 1) descriptive analysis, 2) conceptual structure, and 3) intellectual structure. To assess the evolution of the FL literature development, we divide the database into two periods: 1) before 2015 and 2) 2016–2021. This division is based on Bedi et al.’s (2019) results, in which they find that 2016 is the transition year of FL literature’s maturation.

**3.1. Descriptive analysis and trends**

Table 2 illustrates the descriptive statistics conducted on the FL concept until December 31, 2021. Globally, the 4,414 papers published in this period include 3,646 articles, 117 conferences, 504 proceedings, and 147 reviews. The authors of these texts used 143,035 references and 7,646 keywords. The collaboration index was 2.1, and 8,170 authors contributed to this field.

Table 2 shows that the number of publications in the 2016–2021 (2,991 documents) period is more than double the publications in the 1963–2015 period (1,423 documents). The first publication began in 1963, which is consisted with Bedi et al.’s (2019) research in which they found the first publication on FL construct in Scopus database years back to 1964.

Table 2. Main information extracted from WoS and Scopus

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Timespan** | **Global** | **Period 1** | **Period 2** |
| **1963–2021** | **1963–2015** | **2016–2021** |
| Sources (journals, books, etc.) | 1,763 | 764 | 1,245 |
| Documents | 4,414 | 1,423 | 2,991 |
| Average years of publication | 5.94 | 12 | 3.05 |
| Average citations per documents | 11.01 | 24.26 | 4.71 |
| Average citations per year per doc | 1.35 | 2.03 | 1.03 |
| References | 143,035 | 44,299 | 103,748 |
| **Document types** |  |  |  |
| Article | 3,646 | 1,150 | 2,496 |
| Conference paper | 113 | 41 | 72 |
| Conference review | 4 |  | 4 |
| Proceedings paper | 504 | 184 | 320 |
| Review | 147 | 48 | 99 |
| **Document contents** |  |  |  |
| Keywords Plus (ID) | 4,580 | 1,906 | 3,592 |
| **Authors** |  |  |  |
| Authors | 8,170 | 2,582 | 6,101 |
| Author appearances | 11,530 | 3,316 | 8,214 |
| Authors of single-authored documents | 769 | 343 | 446 |
| Authors of multi-authored documents | 7,401 | 2,239 | 5,655 |
| **Authors collaboration** |  |  |  |
| Single-authored documents | 897 | 393 | 504 |
| Documents per author | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.49 |
| Authors per document | 1.85 | 1.81 | 2.04 |
| Co-authors per documents | 2.61 | 2.33 | 2.75 |
| Collaboration Index | 2.1 | 2.17 | 2.27 |

Figure 2. Annual publication of FL




Figure 2 presents the research’s production of FL output measured by the amount of publications per year. The annual production trend (see Figure 2) shows that the annual publication between 1963 and 2021 increased with an annual growth rate equal to 14.36%. Figure 2 also illustrates that the research grew and declined in some periods (e.g., 2006, 2008, 2012), but globally it has increased since 2012.

**3.1.1. Most influential authors, affiliations, and countries**

Globally, during the whole period between 1963 and 2021, the three most influential authors are Lusardi, A., Xiao, J., and Mitchell O. (see Table 3). Lusardi, A. has an h\_index equal to 24, which means at least 24 authors’ papers are cited at least 24 times. Table 3 and Figure 3 show that Lusardi, A. ranked in the first place in Period 1 (1965–2015), but in second place (h\_index = 10) in Period 2 (2016–2021) after Xiao, J. (h\_index = 11). This latter was in eighth position in Period 1 with an h\_index equal to 9, and 962 citations. As specifically illustrated by Figure 3, they are many changes in the most influential authors ranking between Period 1 and Period 2, and the global position of some authors (e.g., Mitchell, O.) comes from Period 1.

In the global period (1963–2021), the University of Wisconsin was the most influential affiliation (76 papers), followed by Washington University (62 papers) and Ohio State University (57 papers). As demonstrated by Figure 3, the University of Wisconsin has the second position in Period 1 (22 papers) and the first position in Period 2 (54 papers). However, Washington University was in eighth place in Period 1 (18 papers) and in third position in Period 2 (44 papers). One of the affiliations whose ranking highly changed between the two periods is the University of Georgia (from eleventh position with 15 papers in Period 1 to second position with 46 papers in Period 2).

Table 3. Most influential authors in FL globally and over two periods

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Global** | | | **Period 1** | | | **Period 2** | | |
|  | **1963–2021** | | | **1963–2015** | | | **2016–2021** | | |
| **Authors** | **h\_index** | **TC** | **NP** | **h\_index** | **TC** | **NP** | **h\_index** | **TC** | **NP** |
| Lusardi, A. | 24 | 6100 | 36 | 19 | 5602 | 21 | 10 | 498 | 15 |
| Mitchell, O. | 16 | 3773 | 25 | 9 | 3419 | 9 | 8 | 354 | 16 |
| Xiao, J. | 16 | 1418 | 27 | 8 | 962 | 8 | 11 | 456 | 19 |
| Serido, J. | 11 | 927 | 22 | 10 | 841 | 10 | 6 | 86 | 12 |
| Shim, S. | 11 | 996 | 23 | 10 | 898 | 10 | 7 | 98 | 13 |
| Danes, S. | 9 | 488 | 10 | 7 | 454 | 7 |  |  |  |
| Grable, J. | 9 | 785 | 13 | 9 | 776 | 11 |  |  |  |
| Joo, .S | 9 | 613 | 11 | 9 | 613 | 11 |  |  |  |
| Sherraden, M. | 9 | 694 | 29 | 9 | 624 | 12 |  |  |  |
| Zia, B. | 9 | 468 | 11 | 5 | 314 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Collins, J. | 8 | 332 | 15 | 7 | 296 | 8 |  |  |  |
| Kim, J. | 8 | 334 | 10 | 7 | 314 | 8 |  |  |  |
| Tang, C. | 8 | 390 | 10 | 7 | 362 | 7 |  |  |  |
| Alessie, R. | 7 | 1156 | 7 | 5 | 1059 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Bennett, D. | 7 | 226 | 12 | 5 | 167 | 5 | 5 | 59 | 7 |
| Boyle, P. | 7 | 226 | 12 | 5 | 167 | 5 | 5 | 59 | 7 |
| Chatterjee, S. | 7 | 175 | 12 | 4 | 119 | 4 | 5 | 56 | 8 |
| Despard, M. | 7 | 115 | 10 | 5 | 87 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Gerrans, P. | 7 | 167 | 9 | 5 | 123 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Grinstein-Weiss, M. | 7 | 160 | 10 | 7 | 155 | 9 |  |  |  |

TC: Total citations; NP: Number of papers.

Figure 3 shows that the most influential country since the first period is the United States. Specifically, it has 23,263 citations globally, but respectively 18,858 in Period 1 and 4,405 in Period 2. Therefore, the number of United States citations dropped because the number of documents retrieved in Period 1 is less than Period 2 (1,423 vs. 2,991, see Table 2). The second most cited country is the United Kingdom (global: 2,847 citations; Period 1: 2,358 citations; Period 2: 495 citations). This is followed by Germany (global: 1,997 citations; Period 1: 954 citations; Period 4: 1,043 citations).

Figure 3. Most influential authors, affiliations, and countries in FL globally over two periods

## **3.1.2. Most relevant journals and documents**

Table 4 demonstrates the three most influential journals in the 1963–2021 period are respectively the following: 1) *Journal of Consumer Affairs* (h\_index = 30; TC = 3,786; NP = 110), 2) *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning* (h\_index = 26; TC = 2,470; NP = 108), and 3) *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* (h\_index = 23; TC = 2,054; NP = 74). These journals are also the most influential journals in Period 1 (see Table 4). In addition, Figure 4 shows that these journals have the most growth rate in FL publication.


Table 4 shows that the most influential journal in Period 2 was the *International* *Journal of Consumer Studies* (h\_Index = 12), followed equally by *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* (h\_Index = 11) and *International Journal of Bank Marketing* (h\_Index = 11). In addition, some journals (*Social Indicators Research, World Development, International Review of Economics Education*) were ranked low in Period 2, but they were considered as influential journals in the Period 1 and globally (see Table 4).

Table 4. Most influential journals globally and over two periods

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Journal Name** | **Global**  **1963–2021** | | | | **Period 1**  **1963–2015** | | | | **Period 2**  **2016–2021** | | |
| **h\_Index** | **TC** | **NP** | **h\_Index** | | **TC** | **NP** | **h\_Index** | | **TC** | **NP** |
| *Journal of Consumer Affairs* | 30 | 3786 | 110 | 30 | | 3358 | 53 | 10 | | 428 | 57 |
| *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning* | 26 | 2470 | 108 | 26 | | 2148 | 63 | 9 | | 322 | 45 |
| *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* | 23 | 2054 | 76 | 20 | | 1641 | 33 | 11 | | 413 | 43 |
| *Journal of Pension Economics and Finance* | 20 | 2021 | 44 | 17 | | 1795 | 23 | 9 | | 226 | 21 |
| *International Journal of Consumer Studies* | 17 | 1028 | 59 | 12 | | 579 | 28 | 12 | | 449 | 31 |
| *Journal of Economic Psychology* | 17 | 1259 | 26 | 13 | | 1033 | 16 |  | |  |  |
| *Journal of Banking and Finance* | 15 | 961 | 24 | 9 | | 715 | 9 | 10 | | 246 | 15 |
| *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* | 14 | 527 | 27 | 9 | | 319 | 9 | 8 | | 208 | 18 |
| *International Journal of Bank Marketing* | 12 | 517 | 47 | 8 | | 120 | 9 | 11 | | 397 | 38 |
| *Social Indicators Research* | 10 | 443 | 14 | 6 | | 337 | 7 |  | |  |  |
| *World Development* | 10 | 404 | 12 | 6 | | 269 | 7 |  | |  |  |
| *International Review of Economics Education* | 9 | 175 | 15 | 7 | | 126 | 7 |  | |  |  |
| *Journal of Financial Economics* | 9 | 724 | 11 |  | |  |  | 8 | | 249 | 10 |
| *Sustainability (Switzerland)* | 9 | 236 | 30 |  | |  |  | 9 | | 236 | 30 |
| *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance* | 8 | 173 | 24 | 4 | | 49 | 4 | 7 | | 124 | 20 |

TC: Total citations; NP: Number of papers.

Figure 4. Trend of journal growth in FL



According to Table 5, globally the greatest number of document citations for a text (928) have been recorded by Lusardi, A. and Mitchell, O. in “The Economic Importance of Financial Literacy Theory and Evidence,” which was published in the *Journal of Economic Literature* in 2014. The second paper has 702 citations and is written by Lusardi, A. and Mitchell, O. S., entitled “Baby boomer retirement security the roles of planning FL and housing wealth” and published in the *Journal of Monetary Economics* in 2007. The third paper was also published by Lusardi, A. and Mitchell, O. S. (2007) in *Business Economics*, and its title was “Financial literacy and retirement preparedness evidence and implications for financial education.” Therefore, Lusardi, A. and Mitchell, O. S. have the three most influential documents in the 1963–2021 period. However, Table 5 illustrates that this predominance comes mostly from Period 1. Indeed, in Period 2 (2016–2021), the most cited paper (148 citations) is Hilton, J.’s (2016) “Open educational resources and college textbook choices: a review of research on efficacy and perceptions” in *Educational Technology Research and Development*.

Table 5. Most cited documents globally and over two periods

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Paper** | **1963-2021:**  **TC** | **Paper** | **1963-2015:**  **TC** | **Paper** | **2016-2021** |
| Lusardi, A., 2014, J Econ Lit | 928 | Lusardi, A., 2014, J Econ Lit | 928 | Hilton, J., 2016, Educ Tech Res Dev | 148 |
| Lusardi, A., 2007, J Monetary Econ | 702 | Lusardi, A., 2007, J Monetary Econ | 702 | Hertwig, R., 2017, Perspect Psychol Sci | 138 |
| Lusardi, A., 2007, Bus Econ | 585 | Lusardi, A., 2007, Bus Econ | 585 | Allgood, S., 2016, Econ Inq | 134 |
| Fernandes, D., 2014, Manage Sci | 514 | Fernandes, D., 2014, Manage Sci | 514 | Lusardi, A., 2017, J Polit Econ | 127 |
| Van, R. M., 2011, J Financ Econ | 475 | Van, R. M., 2011, J Financ Econ | 475 | Pasarelu, C., 2016, Cogn Behav Ther | 104 |
| Lusardi, A., 2010, J Consum Aff | 472 | Lusardi, A., 2010, J Consum Aff | 472 | Stolper, O., 2017, J Bus Econ | 102 |
| Huston, S., 2010, J Consum Aff | 451 | Huston, S., 2010, J Consum Aff | 451 | Farrell, L., 2016, J Econ Psychol | 101 |
| Lusardi, A., 2011, J Pension Econ Financ-A | 450 | Lusardi, A., 2011, J Pension Econ Financ-A | 450 | Xiao, J., 2016, Int J Consum Stud | 99 |
| Anderson, L., 2013, J Bus Res | 429 | Anderson, L., 2013, J Bus Res | 429 | Bucher-Koenen, T., 2017, J Consum Aff | 90 |
| Lusardi, A., 2008, Am Econ Rev | 423 | Lusardi, A., 2008, Am Econ Rev | 423 | Xiao, J., 2017, Int J Bank Mark | 84 |
| Van, R. M., 2012, Econ J | 293 | Van, R. M., 2012, Econ J | 293 | Dimmock, S., 2016, J Financ Econ | 76 |
| Joo, S., 2004, J Fam Econ Issues | 258 | Joo, S., 2004, J Fam Econ Issues | 258 | Grohmann, A., 2018, World Dev | 73 |
| Shim, S., 2010, J Youth Adolesc | 254 | Shim, S., 2010, J Youth Adolesc | 254 | Brown, M., 2016, Rev Financ Stud | 72 |
| Lusardi, A., 2011, J Pension Econ Financ | 238 | Lusardi, A., 2011, J Pension Econ Financ | 238 | Lusardi, A., 2019, Swiss J Econ Stat | 67 |
| Remund, D., 2010, J Consum Aff | 233 | Remund, D., 2010, J Consum Aff | 233 | Khan, S., 2019, Corp Soc Responsib Environ Manag | 65 |

TC: Total citations.

**3.2. Conceptual structure**

To explore the conceptual structure of the FL research, we present the two following subsections: 1) highest keywords frequency, 2) thematic map, and 3) keyword occurrence. To deeply analyze the evolution of the FL research, we also consider the two periods.

Figure 5: Keyword frequency in two periods

|  |
| --- |
| **Period 1: 1963-2015** |
|  |
| **Period 2: 2016-2021** |
|  |

**3.2.1. Highest keywords frequency**

Figure 5 shows the keywords most frequently used by the authors in the FL research in the two periods. We can notice that in Period 1, financial education was the highest frequency term (141 occurrences), followed respectively by financial capability (47 occurrences) and financial behavior (44 occurrences). In Period 2, the most frequent keywords were successively 1) financial education (276), 2) financial behavior (193), and 3) financial knowledge (162). In this period (2016–2021), some new keywords became important, namely financial inclusion (143 occurrences) and financial wellbeing (51 occurrences).

**3.2.2. Thematic map**

Figure 6 shows the thematic map of the three periods plotted in R into a two-dimensional form: 1) centrality (x axis), and 2) density (y axis). Centrality concerns the strength of the links from one research topic to others (Callon & Courtial, 1991). It assesses the importance of a theme (Callon & Courtial, 1991). Density refers to the internal emergence of keywords in a cluster (Callon & Courtial, 1991). It is a measure of a theme’s development over time (He, 1999). We employed mean values of centrality and density to categorize the keywords thematically into four quadrants (see Figure 6). Quadrant I (upper-right quadrant), characterized by both high centrality and density, reveals the motor themes in a field. Quadrant II (upper-left quadrant), characterized by low centrality and high density, shows the developed but isolated themes in a field. Quadrant III (lower-left quadrant), characterized by both low centrality and density, indicates the emerging or declining themes in a field. Finally, Quadrant IV (lower-right quadrant), characterized by high centrality and low density, indicates the basic and transversal themes in a field.

Figure 6 shows that compared to Period 1, Period 2 contains new motor themes: financial socialization and poverty. In addition, financial service literacy, considered as a basic them in Period 1, is not reported in Period 2. Likewise, there is a difference in niche themes between the two periods. Specifically, human capital is the niche theme in Period 1, while others (adolescent, SME, entrepreneurship, and performance) are prevalent in Period 2.

Figure 6: Thematic map in two periods

|  |
| --- |
| **Period 1: 1963-2015** |
|  |
| **Period 2: 2016-2021** |
|  |

However, there are some similarities between the periods. For example, financial education and financial behavior are two basic themes in Period 1 and Period 2. One also notices that age migrated from an emerging theme in Period 1 to a motor theme in Period 2.

Therefore, drawing on the above remarks, we can argue that there was a change or evolution between Period 1 and Period 2.

**3.2.3. Keyword occurrences**

Figure 7 and Figure 8, performed with VOSviewer, show the keyword occurrences in the FL research in two periods (1963–2015 and 2016–2021). Each node or circle symbolizes a keyword and the circle’s size shows its importance. The line thickness corresponds to the strength of links among keywords. The VOSviewer software divides these nodes into clusters, and each of them is represented by a unique color (Köseoglu et al., 2019). Table 6 and Table 7 illustrate the clusters and keywords of each cluster in the two periods.

Figure 7: Keyword occurrences in Period 1 (1963–2015)

Diagram, schematic

Description automatically generated

Table 6: Keyword occurrence clusters in Period 1 (1963–2015)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster 1** | | | **Cluster 2** | | | **Cluster 3** | | |
| **Keywords** | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** | **Keywords** | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** | **Keywords** | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** |
| Financial literacy | 310 | 309 | Finance | 44 | 45 | Financial capability | 47 | 62 |
| Financial education | 141 | 172 | Education | 42 | 55 | Saving | 44 | 66 |
| Financial behavior | 44 | 73 | Financial | 41 | 77 | Retirement planning | 19 | 23 |
| Financial knowledge | 38 | 51 | Personal finance | 27 | 37 | Financial inclusion | 15 | 16 |
| Financial management | 27 | 35 | Retirement | 17 | 31 | Bank | 14 | 24 |
| College student | 16 | 23 | Debt | 16 | 20 | Decision making | 13 | 9 |
| Gender | 16 | 19 | Financial service | 15 | 22 | Financial planning | 12 | 14 |
| Age | 15 | 18 | Literacy | 15 | 21 | Poverty | 11 | 17 |
| Credit card | 14 | 21 | Behavior | 14 | 30 | Youth | 11 | 29 |
| Pension | 12 | 18 | Finance education | 14 | 5 | Asset | 9 | 9 |
| Financial socialization | 11 | 21 | Household finance | 13 | 20 | Consumer credit | 9 | 11 |
| Financial wellbeing | 11 | 18 | Trust | 12 | 21 | Financial crisis | 9 | 12 |
| Innovation | 11 | 5 | Household | 11 | 17 |  |  |  |
| Financial decision making | 10 | 11 | Knowledge | 11 | 18 |  |  |  |
| Money attitude | 10 | 15 | Consumer behavior | 10 | 14 |  |  |  |
| Survey | 10 | 13 | Audit committee | 9 | 13 |  |  |  |
| Regulation | 9 | 8 | Economic | 9 | 23 |  |  |  |
| Saving behavior | 9 | 13 | High education | 9 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Student | 9 | 17 | Mortgage | 9 | 11 |  |  |  |
| University | 9 | 21 | Portfolio choice | 9 | 9 |  |  |  |

Figure 8: Keyword occurrences in Period 2 (2016–2021)

Diagram

Description automatically generated

Table 7: Keyword occurrence clusters in Period 2 (2016–2021)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster 1** | | | **Cluster 2** | | | | **Cluster 3** | | | |
| **Keywords** | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** | **Keywords** | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** | **Keywords** | | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** |
| Financial literacy | 1091 | 1052 | Financial education | 276 | 362 | Financial inclusion | | 143 | 181 |
| Saving | 72 | 118 | Financial behavior | 191 | 362 | Education | | 100 | 125 |
| Personal finance | 55 | 74 | Financial knowledge | 161 | 279 | Gender | | 67 | 92 |
| Household finance | 50 | 74 | Financial | 151 | 338 | Finance | | 56 | 77 |
| Retirement planning | 45 | 65 | Financial capability | 122 | 145 | Knowledge | | 38 | 88 |
| Financial advice | 41 | 71 | Literacy | 58 | 105 | University | | 35 | 76 |
| Retirement | 35 | 63 | Financial attitude | 57 | 151 | Financial service | | 34 | 37 |
| Investment | 34 | 51 | Financial wellbeing | 51 | 87 | SME | | 34 | 29 |
| Financial planning | 31 | 50 | Financial socialization | 37 | 64 | Age | | 31 | 41 |
| Risk | 26 | 37 | Poverty | 35 | 40 | Student | | 31 | 56 |
| Trust | 26 | 37 | Overconfidence | 34 | 55 | Attitude | | 30 | 53 |
| Pension | 25 | 44 | Young adult | 30 | 55 | Behavior | | 29 | 72 |
|  |  |  | Debt | 28 | 33 | Decision making | | 26 | 39 |
|  |  |  | Youth | 28 | 40 | Survey | | 26 | 33 |
|  |  |  | Financial satisfaction | 26 | 49 | Bank | | 24 | 24 |
|  |  |  | Wellbeing | 26 | 54 | Economic | | 24 | 34 |
|  |  |  | Financial decision | 25 | 38 | Entrepreneurship | | 24 | 23 |
|  |  |  | Indium | 25 | 45 | Microfinance | | 23 | 30 |

Comparison between the periods (see Figure 7, Figure 8, Table 6, and Table 7) show that 1) keywords are divided into three clusters in both periods; 2) FL’s node is more important in Period 2 in terms of occurrences (1,091 vs. 310) and total link strength (1,052 vs. 309); 3) FL and financial education were in cluster 1 in Period 1, but in Period 2 FL is in cluster 1 and financial education is the biggest keyword in cluster 2; 4) financial inclusion constitutes a new keyword in a cluster of Period 2 (occurrences = 143; total link strength = 181); and 5) some new keywords appear in Period 2 such as entrepreneurship and microfinance. Consequently, we can argue that even if the two periods have the same number of clusters, there are many differences between the two periods in terms of keyword occurrence results.

**3.3. Intellectual structure**

Figure 9 and Figure 10, performed with VOSviewer, show the author co-citation analysis (ACA) for the FL concept research in two periods (Figure 9: 1963–2015; Figure 10: 2016–2021). These figures represent how authors are connected to the network in each of the two periods. Each node or circle symbolizes an author, and the circle’s size shows the importance of the author.

In Period 1 (see Figure 9 and Table 7), ACA illustrates three author network clusters with dominant authors only in cluster 1 (green color). This latter contains interconnections between 19 authors, and the most prolific one is Lusardi, A. (502 occurrences and 7,611 total link strength), followed by Mitchell, O. S. (240 occurrences and 4,250 total link strength). The most dominant authors in cluster 2 (red color) and cluster 3 (color blue) are Garman, E. T. (148 occurrences and 2,942 total link strength) and Sherraden, M. (169 occurrences and 2,469 total link strength) respectively.

Figure 9. Author co-citation analysis in Period 1 (1963–2015)

Diagram

Description automatically generated

Table 7: Author co-citation analysis clusters in Period 1 (1963–2015)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster 1** | | | | **Cluster 2** | | | | **Cluster 3** | | | |
| **Authors** | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** | **Authors** | | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** | **Authors** | | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** |
| Lusardi, A. | 502 | 7611 | Garman, E.T. | | 148 | 2942 | Sherraden, M. | | 169 | 2469 |
| Mitchell, O.S. | 240 | 4250 | Grable, J.E. | | 122 | 2307 | Hogarth, J.M. | | 134 | 2634 |
| Kempson, E. | 84 | 775 | Xiao, J.J. | | 115 | 2611 | Mandell, L. | | 128 | 2251 |
| Atkinson, A. | 66 | 936 | Kim, J. | | 114 | 2677 | Bernheim, B.D. | | 108 | 2042 |
| Mitchell, O. | 66 | 856 | Hira, T.K. | | 111 | 2163 | Chen, H. | | 99 | 1600 |
| Kahneman, D. | 59 | 705 | Joo, S. | | 106 | 2049 | Schreiner, M. | | 83 | 1596 |
| Alessie, R. | 57 | 1140 | Danes, S.M. | | 95 | 1629 | Volpe, R.P. | | 78 | 1496 |
| Thaler, R.H. | 57 | 682 | Lyons, A.C. | | 95 | 2056 | Beverly, S.G. | | 67 | 1452 |
| Van Rooij, M. | 51 | 1046 | Lee, J. | | 77 | 1274 | Garrett, D.M. | | 67 | 1307 |
| Odean, T. | 50 | 290 | Devaney, S.A. | | 71 | 1514 | Hilgert, M.A. | | 62 | 1351 |
| Collard, S. | 49 | 588 | Bartholomae, S. | | 65 | 1257 | Zhan, M. | | 49 | 1128 |
| Laibson, D. | 49 | 829 | Shim, S. | | 54 | 1301 | Clancy, M. | | 45 | 1038 |
| Tufano, P. | 49 | 832 | O'neill, B. | | 52 | 879 | Beverly, S. | | 43 | 843 |
| Tversky, A. | 49 | 677 | Hanna, S.D. | | 51 | 1109 | Welch, C. | | 41 | 785 |
| Curto, V. | 44 | 869 | Serido, J. | | 51 | 1062 | Braunstein, S. | | 40 | 752 |
| Huston, S.J. | 44 | 818 | Hayhoe, C.R. | | 48 | 1060 | Hogarth, J. | | 40 | 643 |
| Jappelli, T. | 43 | 571 | Sorhaindo, B. | | 48 | 1276 | Maki, D.M. | | 37 | 785 |
| Cole, S. | 38 | 519 | Sherraden, M.S. | | 45 | 852 |  | |  |  |
| Leyshon, A. | 38 | 224 | Fox, J. | | 43 | 782 |  | |  |  |

Figure 10. Author co-citation analysis in Period 2 (2016–2021)

Diagram

Description automatically generated

Table 8: Author co-citation analysis clusters in Period 1 (2016–2021)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster 1** | | | **Cluster 2** | | | **Cluster 3** | | | |
| **Authors** | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** | **Authors** | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** | **Authors** | **Occurrences** | **Total link strength** |
| Lusardi, A. | 1581 | 25444 | Xiao, J.J. | 240 | 4999 | Klapper, L. | 157 | 2595 |
| Mitchell, O.S. | 766 | 14789 | Chen, H. | 135 | 2472 | Hair, J.F. | 145 | 2529 |
| Van Rooij, M. | 176 | 4168 | Mandell, L. | 133 | 2601 | Zia, B. | 145 | 2686 |
| Alessie, R. | 171 | 4075 | Huston, S.J. | 132 | 2482 | Atkinson, A. | 121 | 2231 |
| Mitchell, O. | 126 | 2011 | Grable, J.E. | 130 | 2126 | Demirguc-Kunt, A. | 121 | 1082 |
| Jappelli, T. | 124 | 3191 | Shim, S. | 125 | 2860 | Sarstedt, M. | 113 | 2229 |
| Curto, V. | 112 | 2283 | Hogarth, J.M. | 119 | 2675 | Ringle, C.M. | 111 | 2157 |
| Tufano, P. | 105 | 2353 | Serido, J. | 105 | 2248 | Sherraden, M.S. | 109 | 1335 |
| Yoong, J. | 83 | 1890 | Volpe, R.P. | 104 | 2045 | Sherraden, M. | 90 | 846 |
| Bucher-Koenen, T. | 71 | 2117 | Kim, J. | 101 | 1886 | Cole, S. | 84 | 1580 |
| Padula, M. | 69 | 1790 | Hira, T.K. | 96 | 2001 | Kahneman, D. | 80 | 1035 |
| Monticone, C. | 64 | 1752 | Ajzen, I. | 92 | 960 | Lynch, J.G. | 78 | 1506 |
| Guiso, L. | 63 | 1393 | Hilgert, M.A. | 89 | 2209 | Menkhoff, L. | 76 | 1431 |
|  |  |  | Sabri, M.F. | 83 | 1651 | Fernandes, D. | 75 | 1435 |
|  |  |  | Danes, S.M. | 78 | 1745 | Thaler, R.H. | 70 | 1013 |
|  |  |  | Beverly, S.G. | 69 | 1757 | Walstad, W.B. | 67 | 1673 |
|  |  |  | Garman, E.T. | 67 | 1531 | Madrian, B.C. | 63 | 1542 |
|  |  |  | Robb, C.A. | 67 | 1320 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Lyons, A.C. | 64 | 1547 |  |  |  |

In Period 2 (see Figure 10 and Table 8), ACA also illustrates three author network clusters with dominant authors only in cluster 1 (blue color). This latter contains interconnections between 13 authors, and the biggest nodes are also around Lusardi, A. (1,581 occurrences and 25,444 total link strength) and Mitchell, O. S. (766 occurrences and 14,789 total link strength). We notice that the number of occurrences and total link strength have both grown significantly in this period compared to Period 1. The most dominant authors in cluster 2 (red color) and cluster 3 (green color) are Xiao, J. J. (240 occurrences and 4,999 total link strength) and Klapper, L. (157 occurrences and 2,595 total link strength) respectively. Therefore, there is a change in cluster 2 and cluster 3 in Period 2 with respect to Period 1. In addition, the number of authors in cluster 1 decreased between the periods (from 19 in Period 1 to 13 in Period 2). In this regard, we notice that Cole, S. was in cluster 1 with Mitchell, O. S. in Period 1, but has moved to cluster 3 with Klapper, L in Period 2. Consequently, we can argue that the comparison between the ACA analyses in the two periods reveals that there are some similarities and differences.

**4. Discussion**

To assess the progression of FL literature, the present research evaluates the structure of knowledge by exploring the main authors, articles, journals, institutions, and countries that have most influenced the FL literature. We also explore the intellectual structure of the FL concept by performing co-citation analysis with regards to the authors and journals. Finally, we assess the conceptual structure of the FL concept by exploring the thematic evolution of this concept and the co-occurrence network of the authors’ keywords. Regarding the structure of knowledge, our findings show different interesting results. First, consistent with Bedi et al.’s (2019) result, our study finds that the first study in FL begins in 1963. In addition, Figure 1 shows that the FL literature really begins in 1995. This result is compatible with some scholars (e.g., McMurtrie, 1999) who highlight that the FL began to be popular in the 1990s. To be more specific, our results reveal that the FL literature has grown and declined since 1995, but has globally been increasing since 2012. Second, by comparing two periods, we show that the three most influential authors in the first period (1963–2015) are Lusardi, A., Mitchell, O., and Xiao, J. (see Table 3) respectively, but in the second period (2016–2021) Lusardi, A. moves to the second position and Xiao, J. J. has the first position. This last result is consistent with Goyal and Kumar’s (2021) research, in which they find the same influential authors. However, the most influential authors in Bedi et al.’s (2019) work were Lusardi, A., Mitchell, O. S., and Bennett, D. A. respectively. Third, the most influential affiliations in our research are the University of Wisconsin, Washington University, and Ohio State University respectively in the global period (1963–2021). Our result highlights that the dominance of the University of Wisconsin comes from Period 2, but it was in the third place in Period 1. This last result is consistent with the Goyal and Kumar (2021) study.

In regard to the conceptual structure, there is a significant change between the two periods (1963–2015 vs. 2016–2021). Indeed, the highest frequency words in Period 1 are financial education, financial capability, and financial behavior, but in Period 2 these are financial education, financial behavior, and financial knowledge. Furthermore, some new keywords appear in Period 2 namely financial inclusion and financial wellbeing. In addition, the thematic map (see Figure 6) illustrates that there are differences between Period 1 and Period 2 notably in new motor themes, niche themes, and emerging/declining themes. Finally, our results in the co-occurrence network show that despite there being three clusters in each period, the elements inside each cluster vary between these periods. These findings on the differences between Period 1 and Period 2 in terms of conceptual structure confirm the result of Bedi et al. (2019), who highlight that the FL research is still immature.

Finally, the comparison of the intellectual structure between the two periods reveals that there are some similarities and differences. The results show three clusters in each period, but the number of authors and their names differ between the two periods. This finding supports the key finding that the FL research is still not mature.

**5. Limitations and future research**

As with any research, this study includes some limitations. First, we retrieved papers from two databases (WoS and Scopus), and second, the papers were written in the English language. Therefore, future research may consider other databases such as Google Scholar and ProQuest, as well as other languages. Third, our research scope is only the bibliometric analysis of FL literature. Therefore, it will be better in the future research to combine this methodology with content analysis to have a broad picture of the FL research development. Finally, we focus only on the maturity of the FL literature; in future studies, it would be better for scholars to study the maturity of the literature regarding the relation between FL and other concepts such as financial education, financial inclusion, financial behavior, and financial capability.

**References**

Abad-Segura, E. & González-Zamar, M-D. (2019). Effects of financial education and financial literacy on creative entrepreneurship: A worldwide research. *Education Science*, 9, 238.

Abbie-Gayle, J. & Ioanna, S. (2019). A bibliometric analysis of knowledge development in smart tourism research. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 10(4), 600-623(24).

Aria, M. & Cuccurullo, C. (2017). Bibliometrix: An R-tool for comprehensive science mapping analysis. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(4), 959-975.

Aria, M. & Cuccurullo, C. (2020). Biblioshiny blibliometrix for no coders Retrieved from: <https://bibliometrix.org/biblioshiny/assets/player/KeynoteDHTMLPlayer.html#75>.

Bedi, H. S., Karn, A. K., Kaur, G. P., & Duggal, R. (2019). Financial literacy – A bibliometric analysis. *Our Heritage*, 67(10), 1042-1054.

Bhushan, P. & Medury, Y. (2013). Financial literacy and its determinants. *International Journal of Engineering*, 4(2), 155-160.

Courtial, J.P. & Callon, M. (1991). Indicators for the identification of strategic themes within a research programme. *Scientometrics*, 21, 447–457

Echchakoui, S. (2020). Why and how to merge Scopus and Web of Science during bibliometric analysis: the case of sales force literature from 1912 to 2019. Journal of Marketing Analytics, 8(3), 165-184.

Escalona, M. I., Lagar, P. & Pulgarín, A. (2010). Web of Science vs. Scopus: un estudio cuantitativo en Ingeniería Química. Anales de Documentación, 13, 159–175.

Fox, J., Bartholomae, S. & Lee, J. (2005). Building the case for financial education. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 39 (1), 195–214.

Gallego-Losada, R., Monterro-Navarro, A., RodriguezSanchez, J.L. & Gonzalez-Torres, T. (2021). Retirement planning and financial literacy, at the crossroads. A bibliometric analysis. *Finance Research Letters*, 44, 102109.

Goyal, K. & Kumar, S. (2021). Financial literacy: A systematic review and bibliometric analysis. *Int J Consum Stud*, 45, 80–105.

Goyal, K. & Kumar, S. (2020). Financial literacy: A systematic review and bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 45(1), 80-105.

Hastings, J.S., Madrian, B.C. & Skimmyhorn, W.L. (2013). Financial literacy, financial education, and economic outcomes. *Annual Review of Economics*, 5(1), 347–373.

He, Q. (1999). Knowledge discovery through co-word analysis, *Library Trends*, 48 (1), 133–159.

Huston, S.J. (2010). Measuring financial literacy. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 44(2), 296–316.

Ingale, K. K. & Paluri, R.A. (2020). Financial literacy and financial behaviour: a bibliometric analysis. *Review of Behavioral Finance*. [https://doi.org/10.1108/RBF-06- 2020-0141](https://doi.org/10.1108/RBF-06-%202020-0141)

Köseoglu, M. A., Sehitoglu, Y., Ross, G. & Parnell, J. A. (2016). The evolution of business ethics research in the realm of tourism and hospitality: A bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(8), 1598–1621.

Köseoglu, M.A, Mehraliyev, F. & Xiao, H. (2019). Intellectual connections in tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 79, 102760.

Lusardi, A., & Tufano, P. (2015). Debt literacy, financial experiences, and overindebtedness. *Journal of Pension Economics and Finance*, 14(4), 332–368.

Martínez-López, F. J., Merigó, J. M., Valenzuela, L., & Nicolás, C. (2018). Fifty years of the European journal of marketing: A bibliometric analysis. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(1– 2), 439–468.

Miller, M., Reichelstein, J., Salas, C., & Zia, B. (2014). Can you help someone become financially capable? A meta-analysis of the literature. Policy Research Working Paper Series 6745. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J. & Altman, D.G. (2009) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann. Intern. Med*, 151, 1–8.

Mongeon, P., & Paul-Hus, A. (2016). The journal coverage of Web of Science and Scopus: A comparative analysis. *Scientometrics*, 106, 213–228.

Montalto, C.P., Phillips, E.L., McDaniel, A., & Baker, A.R. (2019). College student financial wellness: Student loans and beyond. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 40(1), 3–21.

Mortazavi, S., Eslami, M. H., Hajikhani, A., & Väätänen, J. (2021). Mapping inclusive innovation: a bibliometric study and literature review. *J. Bus. Res*. 122, 736–750.

Remund, D. L. (2010). Financial literacy explicated: The case for a clearer definition in an increasingly complex economy. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 44(2), 276–295.

Ruiz-Alba, J.L., Guzman-Parra, V.F., Vila-Oblitas, J.R. & Morales-Mediano, J. (2021). Entrepreneurial intentions: A bibliometric analysis. J. Small Bus. Entrep., 28, 121–133.

Santini, F.D.O., Ladeira, W. J., Mette, F. M. B., & Ponchio, M. C. (2019). The antecedents and consequences of financial literacy: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 37(6), 1462–1479.

Steinert, J. I., Zenker, J., Filipiak, U., Movsisyan, A., Cluver, L. D., & Shenderovich, Y. (2018). Do saving promotion interventions increase household savings, consumption, and investments in Sub-Saharan Africa? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World Developmen*t, 104, 238–256.

Tomar, S., Kumar, S. & Sureka, R. (2021). Financial Planning for Retirement: Bibliometric Analysis and Future Research Directions. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 32( 2), 344-362.

Valenzuela, L., Merigó, J. M., Johnston, W., Nicolas, C., & Jaramillo, F. (2017). Thirty years of the Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketin*g, 32, 1–18.

Van Campenhout, G. (2015). Revaluing the role of parents as financial socialization agents in youth financial literacy programs. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 49(1), 186–222.

Van Eck, N. J., & Waltman, L. (2010). Software survey: VOSviewer, a computer program for bibliometric mapping. *Scientometrics*, 84(2), 523–538.

Zupic, I., & Carter, T. (2015). Bibliometric methods in management and organization. *Organizational Research Methods*, 18(3), 429–472.

1. https://www.latribune.ca/2021/11/16/une-majorite-de-canadiens-sous-estimeraient-leurs-connaissances-financieres-ae66bf81bef6dd0be71591a5121873f7 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)