Research Output of Library Review (2000-2017): Scientometirc Analysis

Neha Verma

Library Assistant

Central Library

Banaras Hindu University

Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India

Email ID: 20nehaverma@gmail.com

Abstract - *The purpose of this scientometric study is to conduct an analysis of the research productivity of Library Review 2000-2017.It covers various aspects e.g. year wise publication of article, authorship pattern, most prolific authors, year wise publication trends, document types and most prolific institutes etc. It is clear from the finding that maximum number of research output 93(9.19%) in the year 2002. The findings shows that articles 706 (69.76%) dominated the other forms of documents in the Library review. It revealed that single author 654(64.62%) contribution is dominating the co-authorship pattern. It indicates that Joint, N. who has contributed 60 papers occupied first rank in the list of prolific authors. It is clear from the findings that major contributions are made by United Kingdom by contributing 365 articles and got first rank among 18 countries.*

Keywords: Scientometric, Quantitative techniques, Library Review, Citation Analysis

Introduction

Library Review (Libr Rev) is an academic journal which was established in 1927, this journal focuses on social sciences, specific to library and information sciences. The journal is published nine times a year by Emerald Group Publishing. In January 2018, 'Library Review' was renamed 'Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication' using the acronym 'GKMC'. It covers Information systems, Knowledge management, Collection building & management, Information behaviour & retrieval, Librarianship/library management, Library & information services, Records management & preservation, etc. It is meant for librarians, documentation and information professionals, researchers, students and others interested in the field (https://www.emeraldinsight.com/loi/lr).

Review of Literature

Varma and Singh (2017) claimed that from 2013 to 2016 articles publication rate have been increased and conference papers were the most widely used form of documents in which most of the literature on the subject 'big data' has been published. Suresh et al. (2015) reported that 97.33 % of the papers were published by multi author. It was revealed that the Growth rate is 0.41 in 2010 and which decreased up to 0.19 in 2014 and most of the articles contributed from India. Singh (2017) studied and shows that maximum number of contributions 97(21.51%) were published in the year 2011, 2013 & 2015. It was revealed from his study that single author 265(58.76%) contribution has dominated co-authorship pattern. Khan (2016) examined and reported that majority of the authors preferred journals as an information source for writing of scholarly communication. It was suggested by the author that the journal should try to get high quality papers from foreign authors too, which may be useful in enhancing its global impact and reputation. Verma & Singh (2017) observed the research output of international journal of digital library services (IJODLS) during 2011-

2016. It also indicates that co-authors contributions 119(48.57%) dominating the single authorship pattern. Thanuskodi (2010) examined the research output of social scientists on social science subjects. The study cover year wise, institution-wise, country-wise, authorship pattern, range of references cited of the articles etc.

On the other hand, Singh et al. (2017) carried analysis of 283 research articles of international journal of library and information studies (IJLIS) during the period 2012-2016. It was clear from the findings that only four different countries across the world have dominating this journal during the period of study. Velmurugan (2013) examined the research output of 203 article s appear in Annals of Library and Information Studies journal. It was found that the most of the contributions are co-authored 88 (43.35 %.). The degree of collaboration ranges from 057 to 0.82 and the average degree of collaboration is 0.64. The total average number of authors per paper is 1.87 and the average productivity per author is 0.53. On the other hand, Singh (2012) studied and shows that maximum numbers of contributions are single author with 124 papers (56.10%). It was also clear that Indian contributions in this journal are significantly less (1.87%). Hussain and Fatima (2011) explained that the majority of the articles were contributed by single authors. It was also clear that authors were librarians, faculty members and researchers associated with academic and research organization. Rajendran el al. (2011) scrutinized the 633 research articles published in Journal of Scientific and Industrial Research (2005-2009) and revealed that the highest number of research papers contributed by multiple authors during the study period. It was also clear from the study that the degree of collaboration was 0.92. Sanni and Zainab (2010) studied the scholarly communication published in Medical Journal of Malaysia during 2004-2008 and found 28(4.82%) of contributions were made by Malaysian authors with foreign collaboration. Serenko et al. (2009) described that an average manuscript was written by 1.73 authors. The USA, Canada and the UK were the three most productive countries, which is consistent with prior KM/IC productivity research.

Objectives

In this study the following objectives were formulated as:

- To analyze the growth trends of articles during 2000-2017;
- To identify the authorship pattern;
- To study the ranking of author;
- To discover country wise distribution in the journal.
- To study institute affiliation document;

Methodology

The data were obtained from Scopus database which is the largest abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed literature and related metrics, scientific journals, books and conference proceedings published by Elsevier. After collecting all the required bibliographic data of eighteen volumes 1012 contribution found in Library review. It was analyzed and represented in tabular form for reporting the study result. The present study is aimed to discuss about the analysis of the research output of 'Library Review' such as year wise contributions of articles, types of documents, authorship pattern, ranking of author, ranking of top most prolific institutes and country wise distribution of publications.

Results and Discussion

Year wise contribution of articles

Table 1 confirmed that maximum number of contributions 93(9.19%) were published in the year 2002, followed by 84(8.30%) publications in the year 2007. While minimum 33(3.26%) number of contribution were made in the year 2014. It is clear from the finding that maximum number of research output 93(9.19%) were made in the year 2002.

Table 1: Year wise publication

Year	Documents	%
2017	45	4.45
2016	37	3.66
2015	34	3.36
2014	33	3.26
2013	58	5.73
2012	51	5.04
2011	66	6.52
2010	62	6.13
2009	69	6.82
2008	73	7.21
2007	84	8.30
2006	61	6.03
2005	55	5.43
2004	51	5.04
2003	45	4.45
2002	93	9.19
2001	52	5.14
2000	43	4.25
Total	**1012**	**100.00**

Types of Document

Table 2 shows that the types of documents published in Library review are categorized into different types given below. Out of these all types, article 706 (69.76 percentage) followed by review 293 (28.95 percentage), editorial 13 (1.28 percentage). The findings shows that articles 706 (69.76%) dominated the other forms of documents in the Library review.

Table 2-Document Types

Type	Documents	%
Article	706	69.76
Review	293	28.95
Editorial	13	1.28
Total	1012	100.00

Authorship patterns

It is clear from the table 3 that, single authors 654(64.62%) have made major contribution to the Library review during the stated periods, followed by two authors 235(23.22%), three

authors 88(8.69%), four authors 26(2.58%) and more than four authors 9(0.89%). It is revealed that single author 654(64.62%) contribution is dominating the co- authorship pattern.

Table 3- Authorship Pattern

Year	Single	Two	Three	Four	Mega Author	Total
2017	13	16	10	5	1	45
2016	9	17	7	3	1	37
2015	11	12	10	0	1	34
2014	13	15	3	0	2	33
2013	38	14	5	1	0	58
2012	27	15	6	3	0	51
2011	36	19	7	3	1	66
2010	37	18	4	2	1	62
2009	51	14	4	0	0	69
2008	58	6	6	2	1	73
2007	65	16	2	1	0	84
2006	36	20	5	0	0	61
2005	46	7	2	0	0	55
2004	28	11	9	3	0	51
2003	27	14	4	0	0	45
2002	83	8	1	0	1	93
2001	42	8	1	1	0	52
2000	34	5	2	2	0	43
Total	654	235	88	26	9	1012
	64.62%	23.22%	8.69%	2.58%	0.89%	100.00

Ranking of Authors

Table 4 shows that the most prolific authors, who have contributed a great number of papers in the Library review. The authors are ranked according to the number of publications. It is clear from the table 4 that the most productive authors in the field of Library review, Joint, N. who has contributed 60 papers in the field and occupied first rank in the list, Followed by Hannabuss, S. occupied second rank in the list by contributing 52 articles. Mcmenemy, D. has contributed 26 papers, Duckett, B. And Glasgow, E. have contributed 18 paper each occupied third rank, Macgregor, G. has contributed 14 paper, occupied fo Mahmood, K. Has contributed 10 papers, Broady-Preston, J. and Shenton, A.K have contributed 09 paper each, Shiri, A. has contributed 8 papers, Feather Hendry, J.D., O'Beirne, R., Poulter, A. and Wallis, J. have contributed 7 papers each, Davarpanah, M.R., Dobreva, M., Jain, P., James, S., Jiao, Q.G., Onwuegbuzie, A.J. and Winzenried, A. have contributed 06 paper each, Chong, C.W., Omekwu, C.O., Rogerson, I. And U R Rehman, S. have contributed 05 paper each. It indicates that Stoker, D. who has contributed 30 papers in the field and occupied first rank in the list has dominated the rank list of prolific authors. Feather, J and Shenton, A.K. have contributed have contributed 10 paper each, Creaser, C. have contributed 9 paper each, Ellis, A., Foskett, D.J., McKnight, C., Moore, N., Morris, A. and Muir, A. have contributed 8., Aharony, N., Matthews, G., Steele, C., Wilson, T.D. have contributed 7 paper, Cronin, B., Line, M.B. have contributed 6 paper each, Benge, R., Bottle, R.T., Elkin, J., Hepworth, M., Maynard, S.and Pinto, M., Schofield, J.L., Stilwell, C., Vickery, B.C., Walton, G. have contributed 5 paper each. It indicates that Joint, N. who has contributed 60 papers in the field and occupied first rank in the list has dominated the rank list of prolific authors.

Table 4-Prolific Author

Author	Documents	Ranking
Joint, N.	60	1
Hannabuss, S.	52	2
Mcmenemy, D.	26	3
Duckett, B.	18	4
Glasgow, E.	18	4
Macgregor, G.	14	5
Mahmood, K.	10	6
Broady-Preston, J.	9	7
Shenton, A.K.	9	7
Shiri, A.	8	8
Hendry, J.D.	7	9
O'Beirne, R.	7	9
Poulter, A.	7	9
Wallis, J.	7	9
Davarpanah, M.R.	6	10
Dobreva, M.	6	10
Jain, P.	6	10
James, S.	6	10
Jiao, Q.G.	6	10
Onwuegbuzie, A.J.	6	10
Winzenried, A.	6	10
Chong, C.W.	5	11
Omekwu, C.O.	5	11
Rogerson, I.	5	11
U R Rehman, S.	5	11

Most Prolific Institute

It is observed from the Top ranked Institute that University of Strathclyde has contributed maximum number of 130 articles followed by Robert Gordon University has contributed 56 articles in the field and occupied second rank in the list. For avoiding long list we consider only 10 articles contribution. University of the Punjab Lahore has contribute 19 document and occupied third rank, University of Kuwait has contributed 16 article and occupied fourth rank, Technologiko Ekpaideutiko Idrima, Athinas has contribute 14 document and occupied fifth rank, University of Botswana has contribute 13 document and occupied six rank, University of Sheffield, Nanyang Technological University, International Islamic University Malaysia have contribute 7 document and occupied seventh rank, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad has contribute 11 document and occupied eight rank, University of Ghana, Liverpool John Moores University and Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga have contributes 10 document and occupied ninth rank.   It revealed that University of Strathclyde has dominated the Top ranked Institute list by contributing 130articles alone.

Table 5-Most Prolific Institute

Affiliation	Documents	Rank
University of Strathclyde	130	1
Robert Gordon University	56	2
University of the Punjab Lahore	19	3
University of Kuwait	16	4
Technologiko Ekpaideutiko Idrima, Athinas	14	5
University of Botswana	13	6
University of Sheffield	12	7
Nanyang Technological University	12	7
International Islamic University Malaysia	12	7
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad	11	8
University of Ghana	10	9
Liverpool John Moores University	10	9
Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga	10	9

Top most Productive Country

Table 6 presents the country wise distribution of contributions. It is found that there are 1012 contributions made by the authors from 18 different countries. Out of the total 1012 contributors, United Kingdom contributed the highest number of 365 articles and got top rank in the list of total contributions. United States has received second highest rank by contributing 108 articles. However, India has received third rank by contributing 57 articles followed by Nigeria, Malaysia and Australia who got 4, 5 and 6 ranks. It indicates that major contributions are made United Kingdom by contributing 365 articles and got first rank among 18 countries.

Table 6- Top most Productive Country

Country	Documents	Ranking
United Kingdom	365	1
United States	108	2
India	57	3
Nigeria	48	4
Undefined	48	4
Malaysia	37	5
Australia	31	6
Iran	30	7
Pakistan	30	7
Greece	25	8
Canada	19	9
Kuwait	19	9
New Zealand	17	10
Botswana	15	11
Singapore	15	11
Ghana	13	12
Spain	13	12
Tanzania	13	12
South Africa	12	13
Bangladesh	10	14
Kenya	10	14

Major findings

- It is clear from the finding that maximum number of research output 93(9.19%) were made in the year 2002.
- The findings shows that articles 706 (69.76%) dominated the other forms of documents in the Library review.
- It revealed that single author 654(64.62%) contribution is dominating the co-authorship pattern.
- It indicates that Joint, N. who has contributed 60 papers in the field and occupied first rank in the list has dominated the rank list of prolific authors.
- It revealed that University of Strathclyde has dominated the Top ranked Institute list by contributing 130 articles alone.
- It indicates that major contributions are made by United Kingdom by contributing 365 articles and got first rank among 18 countries.

Conclusion

The study was conducted on the data collected from Scopus database during 2000-2017. This research study was conducted by applying scientometric tools and techniques. After the collection of data from Scopus database, it was analyzed and results were presented in the form of tables for better understanding. Library review is a reputed peer reviewed indexed journal in the field of library and information science completely dedicated to the library and information science and its development of various aspects. It revealed that single author 654(64.62%) contribution is dominating the co-authorship pattern. It indicates that Joint, N. who has contributed 60 papers and scored first rank in the list of prolific authors. Major contributions are made by United Kingdom by contributing 365 articles and scored first rank among 18 countries. Analysis of eighteen volumes from 1 to 6 shows that, it publishes high quality articles leading with review and editorial by the advanced researchers in the field of LIS. In this direction Library review has set due goal for reflection the quality of research articles from all over the world.

References

1. Alfred Said Sife, Edda Tandi Lwoga, (2014) Publication productivity and scholarly impact of academic librarians in Tanzania: A scientometric analysis, *New Library World*, Vol. 115 Issue: 11/12, pp.527-541
2. Hussain, Akhtar and Fatima, Nishat (2011). A bibliometric analysis of the 'Chinese Librarianship: an International Electronic Journal, (2006-2010). *Chinese Librarianship: an International Electronic Journal*, 31.
3. Khan, Imran (2016) A scientometric analysis of DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology (2010-2014), *Library Hi Tech News*, Vol. 33(7), pp.8-12, https://doi.org/10.1108/LHTN- 03-2016-0014
4. Library review: Website: https://www.emeraldinsight.com/loi/lr (Accessed on 2018)
5. Sanni, S. A and Zainab, A. N. (2010). Google Scholar as a source for citation and impact analysis for non-ISI indexed medical journal. *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, 15 (3), pp.35-51.
6. Sanni, S. A and Zainab, A. N. (2010). Google Scholar as a source for citation and impact analysis for non-ISI indexed medical journal. *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, 15 (3), 2010; pp.35-51.

7. Serenko Alexander, Nick Bontis and Joshua Grant (2009). A scientometric analysis of the Proceedings of the McMaster World Congress on the Management of Intellectual Capital and Innovation for the 1996-2008 period, *Journal of Intellectual Capital,* Vol. 10.

8. Singh, J. K. (2012). A bibliometric analysis of LIBRI Journal (2001-2009), *Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services*, 2(1), 55-60.

9. Singh, J. K. (2012). A bibliometric analysis of LIBRI Journal (2001-2009), *Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services*, 2(1), 55-60.

10. Singh, J. K. (2014). *Research Journal of Library Sciences*, 1(2). 7-12. 7.

11. Singh, K. (2017). Scholarly Communication in Evidence Based Library and InformationPractice from 2011-2015: A Bibliometric study. *International Journal of Next Generation Library and Technologies*, Vol. 3(4), p. 1-14.

12. Singh, K., Nayak, S. and Varma, A. K. (2017). A Scientometric Analysis of Partnership: the Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research (2010-2016).*International Journal of Library and Information Studies*, Vol 7(3), pp. 81-88.

13. Singh, K., Nayak, Satyajit and Varma, A. K. (2017). A Scientometric Analysis of Partnership: the Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research (2010-2016). *International Journal of Library and Information Studies*, Vol 7(3), pp. 81-88.

14. Singh, K., Varma, A. K. and Pradhan, A. (2017). Scientometric Analysis of International Journal of Library and Information Studies (IJLIS). *Knowledge Librarian: An International Peer Reviewed Bilingual E-Journal of Library and Information Science*, Vol. 4(6), p. 63-72.

15. Suresh, C., Hema, R. And Sankarasubramaniam, N. (2015). A Scientometric analysis of the Indian Journal of Horticulture (2010-2014). *Asia Pacific Journal of Research*, 1(34), pp.86- 97.

16. Thanuskodi, S. (2010). Journal of social sciences: A bibliometric study. *Journal of Social Science,* 24(2), 77-80.

17. Varma, A. K. and Singh, K. (2017) Scientometric Analysis of literature on big data research output in India based on Scopus database. *International Journal of Library and Information Studies*, Vol.7 (4), p. 1-7.

18. Velmurugan, C. (2013). Bibliometric analysis with special reference to authorship pattern and collaborative research output of Annals of Library and Information studies for the year 2007- 2012. *International Journal of Digital Library Services*, 3(3), 13-21.

19. Velmurugan, C. (2013). Scientometric analysis: Annals of Library and Information Studies Publications Output During 2007-2012*, International Journal of Library and Information Studies*, Vol.3 (3) Jul-Sep, 2013.

20. Velmurugan, C. and Radhakrishnan, N. (2015). Webology journal: a scientometric profile. *International Journal of Information Dissemination and Technology*, 5(2), 137-142.

21. Verma, N. and Singh, K. (2017). Research Publication to International Journal of Digital Library Services: A Scientometric Analysis. *Knowledge Librarian: An International Peer Reviewed Bilingual E-Journal of Library and Information Science*, Vol. 4(6), p. 108-114.