Core Journals in Library and Information Science: Developing a Methodology for Ranking LIS Journals

Judith M. Nixon

In the library science field, there is no professionally accepted tiered list of journals in the United States to guide librarians, as there is in other academic disciplines. This situation creates a challenge for both new and experienced librarians who wish to make a serious contribution to librarianship by publishing articles. This article outlines a methodology used at the Libraries of Purdue University, which could be adapted by other university libraries, to create a tiered list of journals tailored to the institution. The article begins with a literature review that identifies a short list of top-level journals. This is followed by the methodology that uses expert opinion surveys, acceptance and circulation rates, impact factors, h-indexes, and journals with local faculty articles. Tables with the journals ranked into three tiers are included.

Background and Reasons for Compiling a Tiered List of LIS Journals

In library and information science (LIS) there is no professionally accepted tiered or ranked list of journals in the United States. This creates a dilemma for librarian-authors who wish to expand the literature in librarianship, write about successful programs, or report on research findings. Every librarian-author faces the question of where to submit the manuscript. The choice can have significant consequences on how many librarians will read it, how often the article will be cited, and the impact or influence it will have. This dilemma is especially critical for those in faculty status positions seeking promotion and tenure, as they are advised to have a steady flow of refereed articles in the *major journals in the field.*[1] The advice applies to all librarian-authors at all stages of the career. Submitting to peer-reviewed journals is a well-recognized step; however, with over 250 refereed LIS journals, identifying one is problematic. A tiered list of journals would provide guidance for both the faculty member preparing for promotion and the committees evaluating the portfolio.

At Purdue University, as at most universities, promotion and tenure decisions go through three committees. The first committee's membership is all associate and full professors in the library; the second and third committees have some nonlibrarian full professor members. A tiered list of journals would provide guidance for the second and third review committees, wherein most members are unfamiliar with the journal literature of

Judith M. Nixon is Professor in the Humanities, Social Science and Education Library at Purdue University; e-mail: jnixon@purdue.edu. © 2014 Judith M. Nixon, Attribution-NonCommercial (http://creativecommons. org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/) CC BY-NC

the library science field. As a matter of fact, the needs of the second and third promotion review committees provided the initial impetus at Purdue Libraries to compile the list.

A list of top-tiered journals would encourage librarians to match articles to the journals level. Beginning authors might avoid rejection from a top-tiered journal by submitting to a middle-level journals, as these journals are less competitive and often do not require research articles. Editors of these journals frequently have the time to work more closely with authors to develop a publishable article. Experienced librarian-authors writing full-fledged research articles could use the list to identify top-level journals and different journals than where they have published in the past. As the writer becomes familiar with the style and scope of specific journals and is encouraged by past successes with submissions, it is normal and natural to favor these. However, in some cases these journals tend to be mid-level journals. A ranked or tiered list would encourage librarians to submit to higher-ranked journals.

In Australia the professional association has developed a tiered list.[2] However, in the United States, no association has been willing to take on the responsibility of developing a methodology or compiling such a list. This motivated the library faculty at Purdue University Libraries to compile a tiered list of journals to be used internally as a guide for our faculty members and promotion review committees. This effort led to the idea of developing criteria to identify a list of tiered journals and to update it annually. The purpose of this article is to share our methodology and the resulting tiered list of journals with other librarians, especially those with faculty status. Probably no two university committees would agree on the list, so the final list given here is not as important as the methodology, which could be adapted for use elsewhere.

A preliminary tiered list of journals with 67 titles in tier one, including a few that are not peer-reviewed, and 15 titles in tier two was accepted by the Purdue University Library faculty and referred to the full professor subcommittee of the Purdue Libraries Primary Promotion and Tenure Committee. Sixty-seven titles in tier one seemed like an overwhelming number, especially since it included some non–peer-reviewed titles. There were serious questions about whether such a long list would be helpful to untenured faculty members. As one of the full professors, I accepted the challenge to see if some method could be developed to divide the list.

Literature Review

In the literature on this topic, eight articles stand out: an expert opinion study by David Kohl and Charles Davis,[3] two replications,[4] and five journal citation studies. Three citations studies were done in the 1990s: one by Mary Kim,[5] a second by John M. Budd,[6] and third by Belen Altuna Esteibar and F.W. Lancaster.[7] Two additional citation studies were published in 2007, bringing the research into the current decade: one by Kelly Blessinger and Michele Frasier[8] and a second by Barbara Via and Deborah Schmidle.[9] A review of the findings of these articles and a merged list of the top ten journals in each study produced a list of top-tier journals. In addition, the literature review identified the methods used that served as guidance for the creation of the criteria.

"Expert Opinion" or Perception Surveys
The David Kohl and Charles Davis article,[10] "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans of Library and Information Science Schools," has been heavily cited and replicated twice. This study asked the deans of American Library Association–accredited library schools (referred to as "deans" throughout the present article) and the directors of Association of Research Libraries (referred to as "directors") to rate 31 core journals on a scale of 1–5 (Likert scale). To do this study, Kohl and Davis had to provide a

list of LIS journals. Their list constituted a revision of Jesse Shera's "hard-core of library literature" published in his 1976 book *Introduction to Library Science*.[11] Kohl and Davis found a hierarchy and agreement between the deans' and directors' rankings on two-thirds of the journals.

When the top ten choices of both the directors and the deans were compared, six titles appeared on both lists. In alphabetical order, they are *College & Research Libraries, Information Technology and Libraries, Journal of the American Society for Information Science* (title changed to *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)*), *Library Quarterly, Library Resources and Technical Services,* and *Library Trends*. The directors added *American Libraries, Journal of Academic Librarianship, Library Journal* and *RQ* (title changed to *Reference & User Services Quarterly*). The deans included *Drexel Library Quarterly* (now ceased), *Journal of Education for Librarianship, Library and Information Science Research,* and *Special Libraries.*[12] A list of the top twelve titles selected by the directors and deans constituted a working list of top-ranking journals. (In this list *American Libraries* was not included as it is not peer-reviewed, and *Drexel Library Quarterly* was removed as it ceased in 1986). These titles, listed in alphabetical order, were then compared with the top titles in the other major articles.

Top Journals from the Kohl-Davis Study:

1. *College & Research Libraries*
2. *Information Technology and Libraries*
3. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*
4. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*
5. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* (title changed to *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)*)
6. *Library* and *Information Science Research*
7. *Library Journal*
8. *Library Quarterly*
9. *Library Resources and Technical Services*
10. *Library Trends*
11. *RQ* (title changed to *Reference & User Services Quarterly*)
12. *Special Libraries*

Two replications followed the Kohl-Davis study during the following twenty years. In 1995, Virgil Blake[13] replicated the 1985 study. When the top ten journals from the directors and the deans, 13 titles, were compared to the top ten choices in the 1985 study, 11 titles overlapped. The two new titles were *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Journal of Documentation*. Since the *Chronicle* is not a LIS journal, Blake only added one new title for consideration to the top journal list. (See table 1 for the rank of each title in the Blake study and all other studies.) In 2005, the Kohl-Davis study was replicated again, this time by Thomas Nisonger and Charles Davis. Combining the top ten choices of the deans and directors produced a list of 14 titles. Four new titles appeared; however, two of the new titles are not truly journals and so were omitted from consideration. The two Nisonger and Davis added were *Information Processing and Management* and *Library Collection, Acquisition, & Technical Services*. (See table 1.)

Although there were differences in the ranks assigned to the journals by each group and each group had some unique titles high on their list, a list of top journals was evident. Titles that appeared on all three lists include *College & Research Libraries, Information Technology and Libraries, Journal of Academic Librarianship, Journal of the American Society for Information Science* (title changed to *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)*), *Library & Information Science Research, Library Quarterly, Library Resources and Technical Services, Library Trends,* and *RQ* (title changed to *Reference & User Services Quarterly*). Titles that appeared on two of the lists include *Journal of Documentation, Journal of Education for Library & Information Science,* and *Library Journal.* This list only differed from the

TABLE 1
Journals Ranked as Top 10 Titles in the Expert Opinion Studies Discussed
Numbers in columns 2-7 are the rank for each title from in each study.
Row one has a brief author reference.
Brief citations to each study are in the table's footnotes

	Kohl-Davis[a] 1985 Directors	Kohl-Davis[b] 1985 Deans	Blake[c] 1995 Directors	Blake[d] 1995 Deans	Nisonger-Davis[e] 2005 Directors	Nisonger-Davis[f] 2005 Deans	Number of Times Journal is Listed as Top 10 Title
American Libraries	9						1
Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST)					8	3	2
ASIST Proceedings						9	1
Chronicle of Higher Education			10				1
Drexel Library Quarterly		7					1
College & Research Libraries	1	3	1	5	1		5
Information Processing and Management						7	7
Information Technology and Libraries	6	9	7		10		7
Journal of Education for Librarian and Information Science. Formerly (until 1984): Journal of Education for Librarianship		5		7			
Journal of Academic Librarianship	3		2	10	3	7	7
Journal of Documentation				6		5	5
Journal of the American Society for Information Science (title changed to [JASIST] American Society for Information Science and Technology. Journal)	7	2	5	1	7	1	1

TABLE 1
Journals Ranked as Top 10 Titles in the Expert Opinion Studies Discussed

Numbers in columns 2-7 are the rank for each title from in each study.
Row one has a brief author reference.
Brief citations to each study are in the table's footnotes

	Kohl-Davis[a] 1985 Directors	Kohl-Davis[b] 1985 Deans	Blake[c] 1995 Directors	Blake[d] 1995 Deans	Nisonger-Davis[e] 2005 Directors	Nisonger-Davis[f] 2005 Deans	Number of Times Journal is Listed as Top 10 Title
Library Coll. Acq. & Tech Services					9		3
Library & Information Science Research,		10		3		3	3
Library Journal	8	1	9				2
Library Quarterly	2	6	6	2	4	1	6
Library Resources and Technical Services	4	6	4	9	6		5
Library Trends	5	4	3	4	2	6	6
RQ (title changed to Reference & User Services Quarterly)	10		8	8	5	10	5
Special Libraries		8					1

a. Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of journals by ARL library directors and deans of library and information science schools," Table 1: 42–43.
b. Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of journals by ARL library directors and deans of library and information science schools," Table 1: 42–43.
c. Blake, "The perceived prestige of professional journals, 1995: A replication of the Kohl-Davis study," Table 2, 163.
d. Blake, "The perceived prestige of professional journals, 1995: A replication of the Kohl-Davis study," Table 3, 163-64.
e. Nisonger and Davis, "The Perception of Library and Information Science Journals by LIS Education Deans and ARL Library Directors: A Replication of the Kohl–Davis Study," Table 1, 346-49.
f. Nisonger and Davis, "The Perception of Library and Information Science Journals by LIS Education Deans and ARL Library Directors: A Replication of the Kohl–Davis Study," Table 1, 346-49.

Kohl-Davis list by changing two titles: *Special Libraries* was omitted and *Journal of Documentation* was added. (See table 1 for ranks of the top ten titles in each study.) In sum, the top journals identified in the three expert opinion surveys, in alphabetical order, were:

1. *College & Research Libraries*
2. *Information Technology and Libraries*
3. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*
4. *Journal of Documentation*
5. *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science*
6. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* (title changed to *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)*)
7. *Library & Information Science Research*
8. *Library Journal*
9. *Library Quarterly*
10. *Library Resources and Technical Services*
11. *Library Trends*
12. *RQ* (title changed to *Reference & User Services Quarterly*)

Citation Studies

Since all the studies discussed above are expert opinion rankings and, therefore, subjective, the question arose as to whether these ratings reflected the actual importance of the journals or just "clusters of high and low prestige."[14] To investigate this question, Mary Kim[15] did a citation analysis study in 1991 comparing more objective factors of citation-based measures with the rankings from Kohl-Davis. She expanded the 31-title list to include all English language citing and cited LIS source journals in *Journal Citation Reports®* and also added major journals published by the American Library Association. The result was 52 journals. If a title was not included in *Journal Citation Reports®*, the citations were hand-tallied. She found that "both deans and directors assigned higher rankings to those journals receiving more direct citations."[16] And that "the discipline citation measures identified a core of top journals that overlapped well with the core listings of the directors and deans for a similar time period."[17] Of the top ten titles identified in this study, nine were on our top twelve title list, and the only title not on this list was *American Libraries*, which had been identified in Kohl-Davis but is not peer-reviewed. Clearly, the titles that emerged from this citation study overlapped with the expert opinion studies. (See table 2 for titles and ranks of the citation studies.)

Two important citation studies followed shortly after Kim's study. In 1991 John M. Budd analyzed 328 articles indexed in the ERIC database with the major descriptor "Academic Libraries" between 1984–88.[18] He identified 40 library– or information science–related journals and listed the most frequently cited journals. Comparing the top ten in his list with top 12 titles identified by the expert opinion studies, seven titles overlap. Two of the three new titles identified in his study are not peer-reviewed: *College & Research Libraries News* and *American Libraries*. His study added one peer-reviewed title not mentioned in the other citation analysis articles, *Special Libraries*. However, this title was identified in the expert opinion articles as a top journal and so was not a new title for consideration. In 1993, another citation study was done by Belen Altuna Esteibar and F.W. Lancaster. They ranked journals by the number of "mentions they received in 131 course readings lists" at the GSLIS at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign and "by the number of times cited in doctoral dissertations and in faculty publications."[19] They then weighted the scores, giving more weight to faculty publications. The top ten journals in this weighted ranking overlapped closely with other citation studies and our list of top journals. A peer-reviewed title that did not appear before in the citation studies was *Information Processing and Management*. Another title that did not appear before was *Illinois Libraries*; however it is not a peer-reviewed title. (See table 2 for titles and ranks from the citation studies.)

In 2007, two other major citation studies were published. Barbara Via's and Deborah Schmidle's[20] goal was to measure return-on-investment of LIS journals using citation analysis. To do this, they measured "the frequency with which individual library journals are cited in the bibliographies of a core group of Library and Information Science journals that, arguably, comprise the premier journals in the Library and Information Science field."[21] The core journals were chosen from the top titles in both the deans' and directors' list in the Nisonger-Davis study. Through this method they identified 19 journals that were cited 100 times or more. The top ten journals (those referenced 245+ times) overlapped closely with our top 12 journals identified in the expert opinion studies. This study added *Information Processing and Management,* which had also been identified by the deans in the 2005 Nisonger-Davis study, and *Journal of Information Science,* which was not identified by any of the expert opinion studies, for consideration to the list of top journals**.** Also in 2007 Kelly Blessinger and Michele Frasier[22] did an analysis of ten years of library literature, from 1994 to 2004. Their study revealed areas of concentration, frequently published subjects, and characteristics of the top-cited authors and resources. *Journal Citation Reports*® was used to determine the 28 journals of high repute for the study. However, like the Via-Schmidle article, this study also was useful in the quest for the top journals, as one of the results was a list of titles with over 100 citations attributed to them. The top ten titles in this study all had over 350 citations. Like the Via-Schmidle and the Esteibar-Lancaster articles, they also identified *Information Processing and Management*. (See table 2 for titles and ranks of the top ten journals in the citation studies.)

Here is a merged list of the top journals (those listed in four or more of the expert opinion or the citation studies) in alphabetical order:

1. *College & Research Libraries*
2. *Information Processing and Management*
3. *Information Technology and Libraries*
4. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*
5. *Journal of Documentation*
6. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* (title changed to *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)*)
7. *Library & Information Science Research*
8. *Library Journal*
9. *Library Quarterly*
10. *Library Resources and Technical Services*
11. *Library Trends*
12. *RQ* (title changed to *Reference & User Services Quarterly*)

The first result of the literature review of the citation studies was that the expert opinion studies are accurate and useful in identifying top journals. Second, it provided an additional title for the top-tier journals, *Information Processing and Management,* which was listed in three of the citation studies. Only the *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science,* which was on the list of top journals identified in the expert opinion surveys, was not included here. Third, this literature review showed that the most frequent methods for compiling a list of top journals are to survey the experts and to use citation studies. In addition, an overall result of the literature search was recognition that there are journals in the field that are prestigious; a small number of journals are consistently listed on expert opinion surveys and rank high on citation studies.

Relying on published studies has the innate problem that they are not current. New journals are started; older journals cease, change their focus, or do not retain their standards. The goal of this project was to develop a methodology that can be used annually to identify the most important journals in the LIS field. This list of important journals should be longer than the list of top journals identified in

TABLE 2
Journals Ranked as Top 10 Titles in Citation Studies Discussed
Numbers in columns 2-6 are the rank for each title from in each study.
Row one has a brief author reference.
Brief citations to each study are in the table's footnotes.

	Kim[a] 1991	Budd[b] 1991	Esteibar – Lancaster[c] 1992	Via-Schmidle[d] 2007	Blessinger – Frasier[e] 2007	Number of Times Journal is Listed as Top 10 Title
American Libraries	9	7				2
College & Research Libraries	1	1	3	4	2	5
College & Research Libraries News (not peer reviewed)		9				1
Illinois Libraries			9			1
Information Processing and Management			5	2	10	3
Information Technology and Libraries	6					1
Journal of Academic Librarianship	3	3	10	5	4	5
Journal of Documentation			4	3	3	3
Journal of Information Science				9		1
Journal of the American Society for Information Science (title changed to [JASIST] American Society for Information Science and Technology. Journal)	7		1	1	1	4
Library & Information Science Research,				6	6	2
Library Journal	8	2	2	10	5	5
Library Quarterly	2	5	6	8	8	5
Library Resources and Technical Services	4	8	8			3
Library Trends	5	6	7	7	7	5

TABLE 2
Journals Ranked as Top 10 Titles in Citation Studies Discussed

Numbers in columns 2-6 are the rank for each title from in each study.
Row one has a brief author reference.
Brief citations to each study are in the table's footnotes.

	Kim[a] 1991	Budd[b] 1991	Esteibar – Lancaster[c] 1992	Via-Schmidle[d] 2007	Blessinger – Frasier[e] 2007	Number of Times Journal is Listed as Top 10 Title
RQ (title changed to *Reference & User Services Quarterly*)	10	4			9	3
Special Libraries		10				1

a. Kim, "Ranking of journals in library and information science: A comparison of perceptual and citation-based measures," Table 1, 28.
b. Budd, "The literature of academic libraries: An analysis," Table 5, 293.
c. Esteibar and Lancaster, "Ranking of journals in library and information science by research and teaching relatedness., Table 4, 7.
d. Via and Schmidle, "Investing Wisely: Citation Rankings as a Measure of Quality in Library and Information Science Journals," Table 1, 340–46.
e. Blessinger and Frasier, "Analysis of a decade in library literature: 1994–2004," Table 3, 163.

the literature review, and the method-ology would divide the journals into tiers. The next step was to develop criteria for a tiered list.

Developing Criteria for the Tiered List

The goal of this research project was to develop a list of top-level journals divided into tiers. The list was not intended to be proscriptive; rather, it would serve as a guide to help faculty members and promo-tion review committees identify the influential LIS journals. Tier one should include the most influen-tial journals, which we anticipated would be very similar to the titles identified in the expert opinion and citation studies listed above. These would be journals that library faculty members, especially more experienced researchers, would be encouraged to consider when sub-mitting research articles. Tier two should include recognized, but less prestigious, journals. The tiered list could not be a comprehensive list of all acceptable journals for promo-tion, as librarians at Purdue are also encouraged to publish in journals outside the LIS field to reach a more appropriate audience.

To develop the tiered list, a set of criteria was selected. The first crite-rion was peer review; both tier one and tier two would be peer-reviewed titles. There are a few journals, such as *Library Trends* and *Library Journal,* of high scholarly level that are not peer-reviewed. These journals, which invite authors to write on specified topics, are considered by our pro-motion committee as of the same value as peer-reviewed titles and so are included in the same category as peer-reviewed titles. In addition, as the literature review indicated, there are a few non–peer-reviewed titles that are highly recognized in the field and frequently cited. So a third

tier was added to include the important non–peer-reviewed titles, such as *College & Research Libraries News*.

After peer-reviewed status, the next criterion chosen was a high rank in a recent expert opinion survey. The Kohl-Davis and Nisonger-Davis articles stood out in the literature review. These articles were cited in nearly every reference list, and frequently the top journals in these studies have been used as the "core list" for other studies. The Purdue University Libraries Promotion & Tenure Committee, in fact, was referencing the Nisonger-Davis list in promotion documents before the Faculty Affairs Committee compiled the tiered list. Since the Nisonger-Davis article is the second replication, it is anticipated that it will be updated again within the next five years. Therefore, it was identified as a major source for selection.

Additional criteria included low acceptance rate, high circulation rate, journals that Purdue University Libraries' faculty members had published in more than two times in the last ten years, and two citation ranking sources: the Institute for Scientific Information's (ISI) impact factor and the h-index calculated from Google Scholar data. The advantages and disadvantages of each of these criteria are discussed below. To summarize:

Essential Criteria
1. peer-reviewed (or invited) titles in LIS field

Variable criteria (a tally was given for each of these criteria)
2. expert opinion (top rating by Deans' list in Nisonger-Davis 2005 study)
3. expert opinion (top rating by Directors' list in Nisonger-Davis 2005 study)
4. acceptance rate below 50 percent
5. circulation above 5,000
6. journals that Purdue University Libraries' faculty members have published in more than two times in the last ten years
7. journals with an ISI impact factor

8. journals with an h-index above 7, as calculated using Google Scholar data

Other possible criteria discussed, but not added, were Eigenfactor™ scores, journals indexed in the major databases, highly rated titles in the Via-Schmidle citation study, and open access journals. The Eigenfactor™ scores were not included because they are only available for journals indexed in ISI's Web of Science. Since all journals indexed by ISI already received one tally, this would give favor to those journals. Inclusion in the major indexing/abstracting tools has been used by libraries as a criterion for journal retention. However, nearly every journal on the peer-reviewed list of LIS journals is included in at least one of the indexing/abstracting tools in the field, so this criterion would not separate major from lower-level journals. A high rating in the Via-Schmidle study was not included because it is possible to gather more current citation data. Giving a tally to open access journals was seriously considered. However, research by Jingfeng Xia[23] using the h-index indicates that open access journals do not consistently score high. More research is needed on whether open access is a reliable criterion for quality.

Gathering Data on LIS Journals

The following steps were taken to build the spreadsheet with data matching the criteria. (See table 3 for titles and data.) Peer-reviewed LIS journals were identified by using *UlrichsWeb*, which listed 506 journals that met their definition of actively published, refereed, academic/scholarly journals published in English. These titles were imported into a spreadsheet for analysis. *UlrichsWeb* has a separate record for every format of a journal; merging identical titles reduced the total to 217 titles. During this import, the ISSN numbers were also gathered and used for merging other data; this avoided the problem of variations on titles between databases. An additional search was done in *UlrichsWeb* to identify the journals with a circulation of over 5,000.

TABLE 3:
Titles in Study in Alphabetical Order

Title	Refereed	Dean's[a]	Directors[a]	Acceptance Rate[b]	Circulation in 2011	ISI Impact Factor	# of Purdue Faculty Publications	h-index from Google Scholar Data	# of Tallies
African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science	Yes			n.a.		0.129		4	1
American Libraries	No	49	18	10%	> 5,000		1	7	3
Archival Science	Yes			30%					
Aslib Proceedings	Yes	21	16	40%		0.6		14	5
Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian	Yes			65%			5	5	1
Business Finance Bulletin	Yes			n.a.			4		1
Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science	Yes	22	33	17%		0		4	3
Collection Management	Yes	35	11	35.5%			10	8	5
College & Research Libraries	Yes	11	1	30%	> 5,000	0.683	4	17	7
College & Research Libraries News	No			Editor	> 5,000		5	10	3
College & Undergraduate Libraries	Yes			62%			4	8	2
Communications in Information Literacy	Yes			35%				6	1
D - Lib Magazine	No		22	20%				18	3
Electronic Library	Yes			65%		0.489	1	16	2
First Monday (Chicago)	Yes			17%			1	29	2

TABLE 3:
Titles in Study in Alphabetical Order

Title	Refereed	Dean's[a]	Directors[a]	Acceptance Rate[b]	Circulation in 2011	ISI Impact Factor	# of Purdue Faculty Publications	h-index from Google Scholar Data	# of Tallies
Government Information Quarterly	Yes	25	14	30%		1.878	2	30	5
Harvard Library Bulletin	Yes	39		n.a.				1	1
Health Information and Libraries Journal	Yes			n.a.		0.761		14	2
Indiana Libraries	No			99%			9	3	1
Information Development	Yes			n.a.		0.143		8	2
Information Outlook	Not Known	28	19	n.a.			1	6	2
Information Processing & Management	Yes	7		20%		1.673		34	4
Information Research	Yes	23		35%		0.822		16	4
Information Society	Yes	36		12.6%		1.24		17	4
Information Technology and Libraries	Yes	25	10	40%		0.528	1	12	5
Informing Science	Yes			6-10 % (from Cabell's)				10	2
Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects	Yes			11-20% (from Cabell's)				4	1
Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and	Yes			6-10% (from Cabell's)				9	2
Interlending & Document Supply	Yes	30		90%		0.308		8	3

TABLE 3:
Titles in Study in Alphabetical Order

Title	Refereed	Dean's[a]	Directors[a]	Acceptance Rate[b]	Circulation in 2011	ISI Impact Factor	# of Purdue Faculty Publications	h-index from Google Scholar Data	# of Tallies
International Information and Library Review	Yes			29% (from Cabell's)				9	2
International Journal of Information Management	Yes	38	39	50%		1.554		24	4
International Journal of Library and Information Science	Yes			21% (from Cabell's)				3	1
International Journal on Digital Libraries	Yes			22%			1	13	2
Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship	Yes			69%			8	8	2
Journal of Academic Librarianship	Yes	7	3	40%		0.87	2	22	5
Journal of Agricultural & Food Information	Yes			40%			3	4	2
Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship	Yes			40%			9	6	2
Journal of Digital Information	Yes			30%				12	2
Journal of Documentation	Yes	5	20	25-30%		1.447		20	5
Journal of Education for Library and Information Science	Yes	12	23	48%				10	4
Journal of Engineering Education	Yes			11%				23	2
Journal of Information Ethics	No	36		75%				3	1

TABLE 3:
Titles in Study in Alphabetical Order

Title	Refereed	Dean's[a]	Directors[a]	Acceptance Rate[b]	Circulation in 2011	ISI Impact Factor	# of Purdue Faculty Publications	h-index from Google Scholar Data	# of Tallies
Journal of Information Science	Yes	17	26	17%		1.406		24	5
Journal of Information Technology	Yes		35	20%		2.907		12	4
Journal of Librarianship and Information Science	Yes	29	28	61%		0.636		12	4
Journal of Scholarly Publishing	Yes	27	26	50%		0.521	5	7	4
Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology	Yes	1	7	13%		2.137	1	46	5
Journal of the Medical Library Association	Yes	14	15	43%		0.844	3	19	6
Journal of Web Librarianship	Yes			54%				6	1
Knowledge Quest	Yes			n.a.	> 5,000		1	8	2
Law Library Journal	Yes	30	30	n.a.		0.898		4	3
Libraries & the Cultural Record	Yes	13	23	23%		0	9	4	4
Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services	Yes	39	9	75%	> 5,000	0.529		8	6
Library Hi Tech	Yes			52%		0.413	4	15	4
Library & Information Science Research	Yes	3	20	45%		1.362		18	5
Library Journal	Yes	34	11	10-25%	>5,000	0.191	1	13	6

TABLE 3:
Titles in Study in Alphabetical Order

Title	Refereed	Dean's[a]	Directors[a]	Acceptance Rate[b]	Circulation in 2011	ISI Impact Factor	# of Purdue Faculty Publications	h-index from Google Scholar Data	# of Tallies
Library Management	Yes			53% (from Cabell's)				13	1
Library Quarterly	Yes	1	4	35%		0.651		10	5
Library Resources & Technical Services	Yes	15	6	40%	> 5,000	0.239		9	6
Library Trends	Yes	6	2	invited		0.667	4	12	5
Libres	Yes			13%				3	1
Libri	Yes	17	17	40%		0.365		7	5
Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science	Yes			n.a.		0.353		7	1
Online	No	40	29	50%	> 5,000	0.507		0	4
Online Information Review	Yes	33		30%		0.991	1	20	4
Pakistan Journal of Library and Information Science	Yes							3	1
Portal	Yes			60-65%		0.87	6	14	3
ASIST Proceedings	Not Known	9	33	n.a.					2
Program	Yes			66%		0.596		11	2
Public Libraries	No	23		n.a.	> 5,000			5	2
Public Library Journal	Yes			35%	> 5,000			2	2

TABLE 3:
Titles in Study in Alphabetical Order

Title	Refereed	Dean's[a]	Directors[a]	Acceptance Rate[b]	Circulation in 2011	ISI Impact Factor	# of Purdue Faculty Publications	h-index from Google Scholar Data	# of Tallies
Public Services Quarterly	Yes			36%-			1	5	1
Reference & User Services Quarterly	Yes	10	5	30%		0.338	4	12	6
Reference Librarian	Yes			60%			2	9	1
Reference Services Review	Yes	30	13	80%			5	13	4
Restaurator	Yes			80%		0.375		9	2
School Library Journal	No	20		n.a.	> 5,000			8	3
School Library Media Research	Yes			21-30% (from Cabell's)				5	1
Science & Technology Libraries	Yes			60%			8	6	1
Serials Librarian	Yes			67%			4	8	2
Serials Review	Yes			n.a.		0.707	1	13	2
Zeitschrift fuer Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie	Yes			n.a.		0.023		5	1

a. Nisonger and Davis, "The Perception of Library and Information Science Journals by LIS Education Deans and ARL Library Directors: A Replication of the Kohl–Davis Study," , 346–49.
b. Acceptance rates are from editors unless noted as from *Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities.*

The second criterion was inclusion in the most recent expert opinion study available, the Nisonger-Davis study. All journals that were rated as greater than 2.0 (ranked 1–40 of 71 ranked journals) by the directors received a tally as did all titles rated by the deans as greater than 2.0 (ranked 1–42 of 71 ranked journals). Since Nisonger-Davis' table 1 has two lists, deans and directors, a journal could get two tallies. These ranks were manually added to the spreadsheet. The advantages of using the Nisonger-Davis' expert opinion study are ease in compiling the data and its status as an authoritative article. The disadvantage is that it is not as current as preferred.

All titles with an acceptance rate below 50 percent received one tally. This was approximately the average acceptance rate. Acceptance rate was selected partially because it provided a data point that was completely separate from the expert opinion or citation data and because a journal that receives two or more times the number of submissions it can publish is able to select the best. Some research has confirmed this relationship. Haensly, Hodges, and Davenport found lower acceptance rates to be associated with higher citation counts, impact factors, and expert opinions (or survey-based rankings) and concluded that it could be used as a reasonable proxy for journal quality.[24] Acceptance rates were not readily available for all titles on the list, although *Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities,* in the section on Educational Technology & Library Science, had acceptance rates for 266 titles, of which about 130 were library-related journals. The Cabell rates were retrieved in August of 2010 and merged into the database by matching titles. To supplement the Cabell data, the author e-mailed journal editors asking their acceptance rate, and the response rate was quite high. If a journal had an acceptance rate below 50 percent, either in Cabell's or as reported by the editor, a tally was credited. Besides being difficult to obtain, the main disadvantage to using the acceptance rate is that there is limited research on how valid it is as an indicator of quality, causing some editors to be reluctant to provide this statistic. However, other journal editors, often those with high acceptance rates, reported working closely with authors to improve otherwise unacceptable articles.

Journals with a very high circulation rate, a rate of 5,000 or higher, were given one tally. Since every author's goal is to reach as wide a population as possible, giving one tally to high circulation titles was logical. It also provided a criterion that was completely different from the other criteria. Circulation data were found in *UlrichsWeb* and gathered with the import of the peer-reviewed journals initially. The major advantages of using circulation rate as an indicator are that they are logical and readily available. The major disadvantage is that there is no research indicating a relationship between circulation and quality.

The next criterion was to give each journal that had three or more articles published by Purdue Libraries faculty members during the last ten years a tally point. This provided the faculty with input into the process via their choice of publication venue. It is somewhat similar to the expert opinion criterion and is logical in that new faculty members would consider publishing where their more experienced peers published. The list of Purdue University Libraries journals was compiled from the annual list of publications in *Purdue Libraries Annual Report*,[25] an in-house publication that is posted on the Purdue Libraries web page. Tallies were added manually to the spreadsheet. The advantages of this criterion are that it provides recognition of journals favored by the faculty and is easy to compile. Its disadvantage is that the ranking of journals in this study favors publications chosen by Purdue Libraries faculty for publication venue. Other libraries using these metrics will need to compile and adjust their data accordingly.

All titles with an ISI impact factor received one tally. They were retrieved from Thomson Reuters' *Journal Citation Reports*® for the 73 journals included in their "Information Science & Library Science" subject category in the 2010 database. The impact factors were merged into the spreadsheet of peer-reviewed LIS titles by matching on the ISBN. The ISI journal impact factor is based on the average number of times the articles in a journal have been cited by newer articles. ISI calculates the impact factor and the 5-year impact factor. The basic impact factor is derived by dividing the number of citations in the census year by the number of articles published in the previous two years. For example, an impact factor of 1.0 means that, *on average*, the articles published one or two years ago have been cited one time.[26] The advantage of using the impact factors is that it is widely recognized, very easily retrieved, and updated annually. Many studies have used the impact factor as a reliable citation statistic; several of the citation studies discussed in the literature review used it. The major disadvantage of the impact factor is that the library field is poorly covered by ISI; therefore, there are many journals that do not have an impact factor.

To provide additional citation data, especially for journals not rated by Thomson Reuters' *Journal Citation Reports*®, the h-index was chosen. This calculation was developed by physicist Jorge Hirsch. He suggested that "a scientist has index *h* if *h* of his/her N_p papers have at least h citations each, and the other $(N_p − h)$ papers have no more than *h* citations each." The calculation can be applied to journals as well as to authors. Although the h-index is available from the *Web of Science*, that score is limited to journals indexed by ISI.[27] The h-index can also be calculated by using Harzing's *Publish or Perish* software, which uses the citations per article in Google Scholar. The Harzing's *Publish or Perish* software was downloaded,[28] and each journal that was identified by any of the other criteria was searched using the "journal impact" tab. The search was limited to 2007 to 2011 to avoid Google Scholar's maximum number of hits (1,000). In a few cases, this maximum was reached; the h-index for those titles could be slightly higher than the results indicate. In most cases, the journal name was searched in quotes, but titles with "and" or "&" were searched without quotes to be sure to obtain all articles published in the journal. During the *Publish or Perish* searches, the results were ranked by h-index, so all articles above the h-index level could be scanned. For example, a search of "Journal of Information Technology" retrieved articles published in "Journal of Information Technology & Tourism" and several other journals starting with "Journal of Information Technology." These were fairly easy to remove by scanning the publication and publisher field. The h-index was then automatically recalculated.

The h-indexes were compiled from *Publish or Perish* searches for all titles that had at least one tally. Forty of the 88 titles that had an h-index higher than seven were given one tally. (Appendix A has a list of all titles searched, including the search string, notes on the search strategy, date searched, and the h-index. Titles exceeding the 1,000 hit limitation were noted, as the h-index could be slightly higher than the results indicated.) The h-index range was 0 to 46. The Pearson correlation between impact factor and h-index is .723. This high correlation was expected and is an indication of the reliability of this index. Other research has also found correlation between these indexes in the LIS field. Advantages of adding the h-index to the review is its availability for nearly every journal. Disadvantages are that compiling the data takes about ten hours and that Google Scholar data can change from day to day.

Findings

The results of this tallying produced a working list of 90 titles. Five titles, which were out of scope for LIS, were removed; these were journals outside the LIS field where Purdue faculty had published,

such as *French Historical Studies*. Two ceased titles were removed also. One title was removed because it only accepts submissions from members. The result was a list of 82 titles. (See table 3 for all titles and data in the study.)

Of the 82 titles in this study, ten titles were not refereed; this left 72 titles to be sorted into the two tiers. Of the possible seven tallies, six journals received six or seven tallies each, identifying them as the top six journals: *College & Research Libraries, Journal of the Medical Library Association, Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services, Library Journal, Library Resources & Technical Services,* and *Reference & User Services Quarterly.* Twelve titles received five tallies. These top 18 titles constituted the most important titles, or tier one titles. Eleven of the 18 were among the top journals in the literature review. (See bolded titles in the list below.) Several of the titles not identified in the literature review are in subdisciplines such as government documents, collection development, or medical librarianship. This met a goal of our committee to have the most important subdiscipline journals on the tier one list. The only title in the combined title list of expert opinion/citation surveys' top titles excluded from this list was *Information Processing and Management.*

1. *Aslib Proceedings*
2. ***College & Research Libraries***
3. *Collection Management*
4. *Government Information Quarterly*
5. ***Information Technology and Libraries***
6. ***The Journal of Academic Librarianship***
7. ***Journal of Documentation***
8. *Journal of Information Science*
9. ***Journal of the American Society for Information Science*** (title changed to *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)*)
10. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*
11. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*
12. ***Library & Information Science Research***
13. ***Library Journal***
14. ***Library Quarterly***
15. ***Library Resources & Technical Services***
16. ***Library Trends***
17. *Libri*
18. ***RQ*** (title changed to *Reference & User Services Quarterly*)

Thirty-seven titles received between two and four tallies and were added as the tier two titles. Several of these titles represent sub-disciplines of LIS, such as archives, business, health, agricultural, or interlibrary loan. A few titles have an international scope. This variety strengthens the tier two list. Some of the titles are from the information sciences side of LIS, which also adds breadth to the list. Seventeen titles that only received one tally were not added to any of the tiers. The 37 tier two titles, in alphabetical order, were:

1. *Archival Science*
2. *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*
3. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*
4. *The Electronic Library: the international journal for the application of technology in information*
5. *First Monday (Chicago)*
6. *Health Information and Libraries Journal (Print)*
7. *Information Development*
8. *Information Processing & Management*
9. *Information Research*
10. *The Information Society: an international journal*
11. *Informing Science*
12. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*
13. *Interlending & Document Supply*
14. *International Information and Library Review*
15. *International Journal of Information Management*
16. *International Journal on Digital Libraries*

17. *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*
18. *Journal of Agricultural & Food Information*
19. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*
20. *Journal of Digital Information*
21. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*
22. *Journal of Engineering Education*
23. *Journal of Information Technology*
24. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*
25. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*
26. *Knowledge Quest*
27. *Law Library Journal*
28. *Libraries & the Cultural Record*
29. *Library Hi Tech*
30. *Online Information Review*
31. *Portal*
32. *Program: electronic library and information systems*
33. *Public Library Journal*
34. *Reference Services Review*
35. *Restaurator*
36. *The Serials Librarian*
37. *Serials Review*

Eight titles, all which received two or more tallies but were not peer-reviewed, constitute tier three:

1. *American Libraries*
2. *College & Research Libraries News*
3. *D-Lib Magazine: The Magazine of Digital Library Research*
4. *Information Outlook*
5. *Online: Exploring Technology & Resources for Information Professionals*
6. *Public Libraries*
7. *School Library Journal*

Conclusions

There was strong agreement between the titles on the tier one list and the top journals identified in the literature review. This gives credibility to the criteria used to compile the current list of the most influential journals in the field. Top LIS journals can be identified and ranked into tiers by compiling journals that are peer-reviewed and highly rated by the experts, have low acceptance rates and high circulation rates, are journals that local faculty publish in, and have strong citation ratings as indicated by an ISI impact factor and a high h-index using Google Scholar data.

Some caution is in order about these ratings. The results of this methodology can and will vary from year to year, and even more frequently. The h-indexes can change daily, the impact factors and acceptance rates also vary from year to year. So the tier that any journal is in could change. This is desirable because, as journals become more influential, they will rise in the rankings.

Practical Uses of the Results

Librarian-authors at tenure-track institutions can apply these methods annually and create a ranked list of LIS journals. Or the methodology can provide a framework for the faculty to discuss the pros and cons of each criterion and create selection criteria specifically for their library. The Purdue Libraries' tiered list does not match these findings exactly, but they were used in the final selection of titles. Librarian-authors, especially more experienced authors and those in tenured positions, could consider the tier one journals as the first choice for submissions. Librarians who are not publishing will find the ranked lists useful as a quick summary of the most influential journals in the field. The list could also be used by librarians who are asked to evaluate another librarian's contribution to the literature by comparing the publications with the tiered lists.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4" align="center">**APPENDIX A**
The H-Index for Titles in the Study from *Publish or Perish*ᵃ</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Query**</td><td>**Cites_Year**</td><td>**h_index**</td><td>**QueryDate**</td></tr>
<tr><td>*African Journal of Library, Archives* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>14.33</td><td>4</td><td>3/14/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*American Libraries* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>58.67</td><td>7</td><td>3/8/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Annual Review of Information Science* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>214.83</td><td>20</td><td>3/14/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Archival Science* from 2007 to 2011: all {miss hits removed]</td><td>33.17</td><td>8</td><td>3/15/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Aslib Proceedings* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>171.5</td><td>14</td><td>3/14/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>Proceedings annual meeting of the American Society for Information Science from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>3/15/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Behavioral Social Sciences Librarian* from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]</td><td>16.5</td><td>5</td><td>3/15/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Canadian Journal of Information* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>11</td><td>4</td><td>3/14/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Collection Management* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>49.17</td><td>8</td><td>3/15/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*College & Research Libraries* from 2007 to 2011: all [without quotes, miss hits removed]</td><td>287</td><td>17</td><td>3/14/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*College Undergraduate Libraries* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>45.5</td><td>8</td><td>3/14/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*College & Research Libraries News* from 2007 to 2011: all [without quotes]</td><td>79.67</td><td>10</td><td>3/14/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Communications in Information Literacy* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>18.67</td><td>6</td><td>3/15/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*D-Lib* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>252.67</td><td>18</td><td>3/15/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Educational Technology* from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]</td><td>313</td><td>14</td><td>3/15/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Electronic Library* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>314.5</td><td>18</td><td>3/19/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*First Monday* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>571.17</td><td>29</td><td>3/14/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Government Information Quarterly* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>600</td><td>30</td><td>3/16/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Harvard Library Bulletin* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>0.2</td><td>1</td><td>3/16/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Harvard Library Bulletin* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>0.2</td><td>1</td><td>3/19/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Health Information Libraries Journal* from 2007 to 2011: all [without quotes]</td><td>262.67</td><td>14</td><td>3/14/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Indiana Libraries* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>3.67</td><td>3</td><td>3/16/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Information Development*, NOT sci-tech from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>46</td><td>8</td><td>3/16/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Information Development* from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]</td><td>425.33</td><td>8</td><td>3/16/2012</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Information Outlook* from 2007 to 2011: all</td><td>31.33</td><td>6</td><td>3/14/2012</td></tr>
</table>

APPENDIX A The H-Index for Titles in the Study from *Publish or Perish*[a]			
Query	**Cites_Year**	**h_index**	**QueryDate**
Information Processing Management from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes, miss hits removed]	955.17	34	3/14/2012
Information Research from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]	224.17	16	3/16/2012
Information Society from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]	250.4	17	3/15/2012
Information Society from 2007 to 2011: all	245.27	17	3/19/2012
Information Technology Libraries from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes, miss hits removed]	87.83	12	3/14/2012
Interdisciplinary Journal of e-learning from 2007 to 2011: all	20.5	4	3/16/2012
Informing Science: International Journal of an Emerging Transdiscipline from 2007 to 2011: all	48.17	10	3/14/2012
Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge from 2007 to 2011: all	36.17	9	3/14/2012
Interlending Document Supply from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	74	8	3/14/2012
International Information Library Review from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	63.67	9	3/16/2012
International Journal of Information Management from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes, miss hits removed]	625.33	24	3/16/2012
International Journal of Information Management from 2007 to 2011: all	455.83	24	3/16/2012
International Journal of Library Information Science from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	6.25	3	3/16/2012
International Journal on Digital Libraries from 2007 to 2011: all	99.83	13	3/14/2012
Issues in Science Technology Librarianship from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	38.33	8	3/14/2012
Journal of Academic Librarianship from 2007 to 2011: all	366	22	3/15/2012
Journal of Agricultural & Food Information from 2007 to 2011: all	15.17	4	3/14/2012
Journal of Business Finance Librarianship from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	25.5	6	3/14/2012
Journal of Digital Information from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]	114.67	12	3/14/2012
Journal of Documentation from 2007 to 2011: all	304.17	20	3/14/2012
Journal of Education for Library Information Science from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	56.83	10	3/14/2012

APPENDIX A			
The H-Index for Titles in the Study from *Publish or Perish*[a]			
Query	**Cites_Year**	**h_index**	**QueryDate**
Journal of Engineering Education from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]	680	23	3/14/2012
Journal of Information Ethics from 2007 to 2011: all	6.67	3	3/22/2012
Journal of Information Science from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]	591.33	24	3/14/2012
Journal of Information Technology from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]	452.5	21	3/16/2012
Journal of Librarianship Information Science from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	79.5	12	3/14/2012
Journal of Scholarly Publishing from 2007 to 2011: all	36.17	7	3/14/2012
Journal of the American Society for Information Science from 2007 to 2011: all	1994.17	46	3/14/2012
Journal of the Medical Library Association from 2007 to 2011: all	254.33	19	3/16/2012
Journal of Web Librarianship from 2007 to 2011: all	36.83	6	3/16/2012
Knowledge Quest from 2007 to 2011: all	47.67	8	3/14/2012
Law Library Journal from 2007 to 2011: all	12.5	4	3/14/2012
Libraries the Cultural Record from 2007 to 2011: all [not quotes]	17.5	4	3/16/2012
Library and Information Science from 2007 to 2011: all [with quotes, then articles selected]	16.33	3	3/16/2012
Library Information Science Research from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]	236.83	18	3/14/2012
Library Collections, Acquisitions, Technical Services from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	42.33	8	3/14/2012
Library Hi Tech from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]	212.67	15	3/14/2012
Library Journal from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]	283.67	13	3/14/2012
Library Management from 2007 to 2011: all	120	13	3/14/2012
Library Quarterly, NOT stm from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]	92	10	3/14/2012
Library Resources Technical Services from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	57.67	9	3/14/2012
Library Trends from 2007 to 2011: all	133.33	12	3/14/2012
LibRes: Library and Information Science Research from 2007 to 2011: all	5.17	3	3/14/2012
Libri from 2007 to 2011: all	311.83	17	3/19/2012
Malaysian Journal of Library from 2007 to 2011: all	31.17	7	3/13/2012

APPENDIX A			
The H-Index for Titles in the Study from *Publish or Perish*ᵃ			
Query	**Cites_Year**	**h_index**	**QueryDate**
Online Information Review from 2007 to 2011: all	303	20	3/14/2012
Online: Exploring Technology from 2007 to 2011: allᵇ	0	0	3/15/2012
Pakistan Journal of Library from 2007 to 2011: all	2.83	3	3/15/2012
portal: libraries from 2007 to 2011: all	108.83	14	3/15/2012
Program: Electronic Library from 2007 to 2011: all	83.17	11	3/15/2012
Public Libraries from 2007 to 2011: all [miss hits removed]	51.17	5	3/15/2012
Public Library Journal from 2007 to 2011: all	1.83	2	3/16/2012
Public Services Quarterly from 2007 to 2011: all	25.83	5	3/15/2012
Reference Librarian from 2007 to 2011: all	58.83	9	3/15/2012
Reference Reviews from 2007 to 2011: all	7	2	3/15/2012
Reference Services Review from 2007 to 2011: all	137.33	13	3/15/2012
Reference User Services Quarterly from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	112.17	12	3/15/2012
Restaurator from 2007 to 2011: all	61.17	9	3/16/2012
SBL Forum from 2007 to 2011: all	3.83	3	3/15/2012
School Library Journal from 2007 to 2011: all	65.33	8	3/15/2012
School Library Media Research from 2007 to 2011: all	12.33	5	3/15/2012
Science Technology Libraries from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	33.33	6	3/15/2012
Serials Librarian from 2007 to 2011: all	84.5	8	3/15/2012
Serials Review from 2007 to 2011: all	105.67	13	3/15/2012
Utopian Studies from 2007 to 2011: all	8	3	3/15/2012
Zeitschrift Bibliothekswesen Bibliographie from 2007 to 2011: all [no quotes]	13.5	5	3/15/2012
ᵃHarzing's *Publish or Perish* software is available from http://www.harzing.com/pop.htm#download [accessed 14–19 March 2012]. ᵇA few journal titles were impossible to retrieve accurate results, such as *Online*, as many journals have "online" as part of their title.			

Notes

1. Pamela S. Bradigan and Carol A. Mularski, "Evaluation of Academic Librarians' Publications for Tenure and Initial Promotion," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 5 (1996): 360–65; Rickey D. Best and Jason Kneip, "Library School Programs and the Successful Training of Academic Librarians to Meet Promotion and Tenure Requirements in the Academy," *College & Research Libraries* 71, no. 2 (2010): 97–114.

2. Kerry Smith and Mike Middleton, "Australian Library & Information Studies (LIS) Researchers Ranking of LIS Journals," *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 40, no. 1 (2009): 1–21; Kerry Smith, "The Dawn of a New Era? Australian Library & Information Studies (LIS)

Researchers Further Ranking of LIS Journals," *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 42, no. 4 (2011): 320–41.

3. David F. Kohl and Charles H. Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans of Library and Information Science Schools," *College and Research Libraries* 46, no. 1 (1985): 40–47.

4. Virgil L.P. Blake, "The Perceived Prestige of Professional Journals, 1995: A Replication of the Kohl-Davis Study," *Education for Information* 14, no. 3 (1996): 157–79; Thomas E. Nisonger and Charles H. Davis, "The Perception of Library and Information Science Journals by LIS Education Deans and ARL Library Directors: A Replication of the Kohl-Davis Study," *College and Research Libraries* 66, no. 4 (2005): 341–77.

5. Mary T. Kim, "Ranking of Journals in Library and Information Science: A Comparison of Perceptual and Citation-Based Measures," *College and Research Libraries* 52, no. 1 (1991): 24–37.

6. John M. Budd, "The Literature of Academic Libraries: An Analysis," *College & Research Libraries* 52 (1991): 290–95.

7. Belen A. Esteibar and F.W. Lancaster, "Ranking of Journals in Library and Information Science by Research and Teaching Relatedness," *Serials Librarian* 23, no. 1 (1993): 1–10.

8. Kelly Blessinger and Michele Frasier, "Analysis of a Decade in Library Literature: 1994–2004," *College & Research Libraries* 68, no. 2 (2007): 155–69.

9. Barbara J. Via and Deborah J. Schmidle, "Investing Wisely: Citation Rankings as a Measure of Quality in Library and Information Science Journals," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 7, no. 3 (2007): 333–73.

10. Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans of Library and Information Science Schools," 40–47.

11. Jesse H. Shera, *Introduction to Library Science: Basic Elements of Library Service* (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1976).

12. Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans of Library and Information Science Schools," 42, Table 1.

13. Blake, "The Perceived Prestige of Professional Journals, 1995."

14. Kim, "Ranking of Journals in Library and Information Science," 24.

15. Ibid, 24–37.

16. Ibid., 30.

17. Ibid., 34.

18. Budd, "The Literature of Academic Libraries," 290–95.

19. Esteibar and Lancaster, "Ranking of Journals in Library and Information Science by Research and Teaching Relatedness," 1.

20. Via and Schmidle, "Investing Wisely," 333–73.

21. Ibid., 336.

22. Blessinger and Frasier, "Analysis of a Decade in Library Literature: 1994–2004," 155–69.

23. Jingfeng Xia, "Positioning Open Access Journals in a LIS Journal Ranking," *College & Research Libraries* 73, no. 2 (2012): 134–45.

24. Paul J. Haensly, Paul E. Hodges, and Shirley A. Davenport, "Acceptance Rates and Journal Quality: An Analysis of Journals in Economics and Finance," *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship* 14, no. 1 (2009): 2–31.

25. "Purdue University Libraries Annual Report," available online at www.lib.purdue.edu/admin/annualreports [accessed 28 May 2010].

26. "ISI's Journal Citation Reports help page," available online at http://admin-apps.webofknowledge.com.login.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/JCR/JCR [accessed 23 November 2011].

27. To obtain the *h*-index as calculated in the *Web of Science*, search for a journal name in the *Web of Science* in either *Science Citation Index* or *Social Science Citation Index* and then click on the "Create a report" icon. In these databases, the "*h*-index factor is based on the depth of your product subscription and your selected timespan. If your subscription depth is 10 years, then the *h*-index value is based on this depth even though a particular author may have published articles more than 10 years ago." From Web of Science Help, available online at http://images.webofknowledge.com.login.ezproxy.lib.purdue.edu/WOKRS541B2/help/WOS/hp_citation_report_hindex.html [accessed 23 November 2011].

28. Harzing's *Publish or Perish* software is available online at www.harzing.com/pop.htm#download [accessed 14 March 2012].