

2013

Library and Information Science Journal Prestige as Assessed by Library and Information Science Faculty

Laura Manzari

Long Island University, laura.manzari@liu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.liu.edu/post_libfacpubs



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Manzari, Laura, "Library and Information Science Journal Prestige as Assessed by Library and Information Science Faculty" (2013).
Post Library Faculty Publications. Paper 5.
http://digitalcommons.liu.edu/post_libfacpubs/5

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Library at Digital Commons @ LIU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Post Library Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ LIU. For more information, please contact natalia.tomlin@liu.edu.

Library and Information Science Journal Prestige as Assessed by Library and Information Science Faculty

Laura Manzari

ABSTRACT

This prestige study surveyed full-time faculty of American Library Association (ALA)-accredited programs in library and information studies regarding library and information science (LIS) journals. Faculty were asked to rate a list of eighty-nine LIS journals on a scale from 1 to 5 based on each journal's importance to their research and teaching. Mean and mode calculations were used to rank results. Additionally, LIS faculty were asked to list the five most prestigious journals to be published in for tenure and promotion purposes at their institution. Several journals were rated highly by each method. LIS faculty ratings of LIS journals are useful for assessing journal quality not only for decisions regarding collection management but for tenure and promotion as well.

What are the most prestigious journals in library and information science (LIS)? This is an important question not only for collection management but also for tenure and promotion decisions. An approach that has been used to rank LIS journals is the prestige study or survey, which ranks the subjective judgment of experts (Nisonger 1999). It has been noted that "surveys appear to be the dominant methodology used to assess the rankings of top journals" (McCarthy 2000, 125).

Literature Review

In 1985 David F. Kohl and Charles H. Davis surveyed Association of Research Library (ARL) directors and library school deans regarding perceived prestige of library journals, resulting in a journal ranking for each group. Respondents were asked to rate a list of thirty-one journals on a scale of 1 to 5 on how important that journal was for promotion and tenure at their institution. Respondents were also asked to list the five most prestigious journals for promotion and tenure in no particular order. Kohl and Davis concluded that a perceived hierarchy of journal prestige existed. This study has been the basis for many additional prestige studies of LIS journals.

The Kohl and Davis study was replicated in 1992 by Virgil Blake, who cited the age of the study and the increase in the number of journals published as the reasons for the new study (1995). ARL library directors and American Library Association (ALA)-accredited library and information science schools each had a unique hierarchy of perceived journal prestige. Blake suggested that perhaps a series of specialty-oriented hierarchies could be developed and periodically updated.

In 2005 Thomas E. Nisonger and Charles H. Davis replicated the Kohl and Davis study, finding continuity in journal perception, but more so by ARL directors than library school deans. They confirmed the existence of a hierarchy of prestige for LIS journals, though they noted that the hierarchy differed somewhat between directors and deans.

Using the Kohl and Davis methodology, Renee Tjoumas and Blake (1992) surveyed faculty specializing in public and school librarianship. Each group of these specialists had its own hierarchy of journal prestige that differed from those of the deans and directors in the Kohl and Davis survey. Blake (1994) surveyed school library media coordinators and found that these practitioners had a different prestige list of library science journals than library science faculty with a specialization in school media centers.

Renee Tjoumas (1994) asked if faculty specializing in public librarianship publish in journals they consider prestigious or in those highly ranked by deans in the Kohl and Davis survey. This survey determined that faculty specializing in public librarianship significantly published in journals they considered prestigious and not in the journals rated as prestigious by deans in the Kohl and Davis ranking. Blake and Tjoumas (1995, 113), in a synthesis of their faculty studies, expressed concern that “professors specializing in public and school librarianship do not seem to appear in periodicals that are considered prestigious by deans nor read by practitioners.” The Kohl and Davis perception ranking was evaluated by Mary T. Kim (1991, 34), who concluded that “the prestige rankings did represent norms for the LIS field at the time of the study.”

In addition to this research based on the Kohl and Davis survey, several other recent studies have used expert judgments to rank LIS or MIS (management and information systems) journals using narrow geographic populations. Nigerian academic librarians ranked LIS journals in a study that combined evaluation with visibility (Nkereuwem 1997). German and Austrian librarians were asked to rank LIS journals (Schloegl and Stock 2004). Eighteen Taiwan MIS experts were surveyed as part of a journal ranking study (Chen and Chen 2011). Australian LIS researchers were surveyed to create a LIS journal ranking by Kerry Smith and Mike Middleton (2009).

Quantitative citation-based measures constitute another approach for ranking LIS journals. The journal impact factor is one such method that has been used, but it has been the subject of much debate. For example, Anita Coleman (2007, 1148) stated that “although many conflate a journal’s impact factor with the journal’s quality, it is, in fact, a rather limited quantitative mea-

sure.” Smith and Middleton (2009, 3) argued that the “Web of Science’s (formerly ISI) journal influence approach of journal acceptance for measures of research quality and impact might not work for LIS.”

More recently the h-index proposed by Jorge Hirsch has gained attention (2005). Originally proposed to measure the output of an individual, it has been applied to journals to supplement the impact factor (Braun, Glanzel, and Schubert 2006). Judit Bar-Ilan (2010) used the h-index to rank LIS journals along with the journal impact factor. The correlations between the two methods were high, but there were considerable differences. Neither ranking was preferred, but it was suggested that a survey ranking could help settle this question. Thus, despite the use of quantitative bibliometric measures, there is still a need for perception rankings.

While specific groups of LIS faculty have been surveyed regarding journal prestige, there has not been a perception study surveying all LIS faculty of ALA-accredited programs to assess LIS journals. This journal evaluation by peers would seem to be an important component of the decision by LIS faculty regarding where to publish their research.

Methodology

Full-time faculty of ALA-accredited programs in library and information studies were asked to rate a list of journals on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high) based on each journal’s importance to their research and teaching. Respondents were instructed that if they did not have enough familiarity with a journal, they should select “not familiar.”

The titles were based on the seventy-one titles used in the Nisonger and Davis study, which, in turn, were based on the Kohl and Davis study. This list has been called “the best indicator of high-quality journals currently published in the library and information science field” (Via and Schmidle 2007, 336). Use of this list also allowed for comparison with the Nisonger and Davis mean journal ratings by LIS deans.

The titles used in the Nisonger and Davis study were checked against *Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory*, and only those that were still active were included. Nisonger and Davis asked respondents to suggest additional titles that were not included in their survey. The eleven journals that were suggested most frequently by deans and directors were added to Nisonger and Davis’s original list. Also included were the top twenty journals from the “information science and library science” category of the 2009 Journal Citation Reports (JCR) based on impact factor to make sure those were not being missed by the Nisonger and Davis list. Although the JCR list could have been used in its entirety instead of the Nisonger and Davis list, it skews toward information science journals. Use of the top twenty journals by impact factor along with the updated Nisonger-Davis list was an attempt to create as close to an unbiased list of journals as possible. This resulted in a list of eighty-nine journals for rating, an increase from the Nisonger and Davis study.

Respondents were also asked to list, in any order, the five most prestigious journals to be published in for promotion and tenure purposes at their institution. This wording was used

to correspond with Nisonger and Davis's "top five method" question. Respondents were instructed that they did not have to use journals from the survey list. A final open-ended question asked for any comments about the prestige of library and information science journals.

The questionnaire was sent to 827 full-time faculty members of fifty-eight ALA-accredited master's programs in library and information studies during the spring 2011 semester. Faculty names and contact information were taken from the website directories of all ALA-accredited programs located in the United States, Canada, and Puerto Rico. People listed as adjunct faculty, lecturers, or faculty emeriti were not included. Deans and directors were included in the survey only when they were also listed as teaching faculty. After the initial e-mail, a follow-up e-mail was sent several weeks later to those who had not responded. SurveyMonkey was used to e-mail each faculty member a unique link to the survey. The e-mail and a survey cover letter explained the purpose of the study and the population to be surveyed. Contact information was provided in case there were any questions.

Results

A total of 232 faculty responded to the online survey. This response rate of 27 percent is lower than the overall response rate in the Nisonger and Davis study of 52.8 percent, which used a smaller pool of deans and directors. However, it is higher than or similar to response rates in other journal perception studies, such as 15 percent in Schloegl and Stock (2004), 17 percent in Herron and Hall (2004), 18 percent in Theoharakis and Skordia (2003), and 29 percent in Serenko and Bontis (2009).

Although the survey did not ask respondents any demographic questions, some responses included identifying information. Responses came from at least forty-eight different schools from the fifty-eight ALA-accredited schools, representing a wide range of programs. At least fifty-nine responses were from faculty at iSchools and at least seventy-eight from traditional LIS schools. Also, from those responses that indicated faculty rank, thirty-five were from full professors, thirty-four from associate professors, and twenty-nine from assistant professors.

Mean and Mode Rating of Journals

Kohl and Davis and Nisonger and Davis created a mean rating by directors and deans for each journal. An argument can be made that a mean rating should not be created from a Likert scale, which measures at an ordinal level (Jamieson 2004; Connaway and Powell 2010, 155). Therefore, in addition to calculating a mean rating for purposes of comparison with the Nisonger and Davis study (see table 1), a mode calculation of the rating chosen most frequently was also determined as a measure of central tendency (see table 2).

The top five journals by mean rating were *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (JASIST; 4.04), *Library Quarterly* (3.45), *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* (ARIST; 3.30), *Journal of Documentation* (3.12), and *Library Trends* (3.11).

Table 1. Journals by Mean Average (Descending)

Title	Mean Average
<i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)</i>	4.04
<i>Library Quarterly</i>	3.45
<i>Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST)</i>	3.30
<i>Journal of Documentation</i>	3.12
<i>Library Trends</i>	3.11
<i>Library and Information Science Research</i>	2.93
<i>Information Processing and Management</i>	2.76
<i>Journal of Education for Library and Information Science</i>	2.71
<i>College and Research Libraries</i>	2.68
<i>First Monday</i>	2.45
<i>D-Lib Magazine</i>	2.41
<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	2.36
<i>Information Research</i>	2.29
<i>Reference and User Services Quarterly</i>	2.22
<i>Library Journal</i>	2.13
<i>Journal of Information Science</i>	1.92
<i>American Libraries</i>	1.91
<i>Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science</i>	1.90
<i>Library Resources and Technical Services</i>	1.87
<i>Libraries and the Cultural Record</i>	1.84
<i>Libri</i>	1.80
<i>Cataloging and Classification Quarterly</i>	1.78
<i>Library Hi Tech</i>	1.77
<i>Aslib Proceedings</i>	1.67
<i>Public Libraries</i>	1.67
<i>Knowledge Organization</i>	1.63
<i>School Library Media Research</i>	1.62
<i>Information Technology and Libraries</i>	1.61
<i>School Library Journal</i>	1.55
<i>Information Society</i>	1.50
<i>Journal of Library Administration</i>	1.46
<i>Educause Review</i>	1.45
<i>American Archivist</i>	1.44
<i>Information Society</i>	1.42
<i>Government Information Quarterly</i>	1.41
<i>Journal of Information Ethics</i>	1.41
<i>Reference Services Review</i>	1.40
<i>Collection Management</i>	1.38
<i>Portal: Libraries and the Academy</i>	1.37
<i>Information Retrieval</i>	1.36
<i>Information and Management</i>	1.34
<i>MIS Quarterly</i>	1.31
<i>Journal of Librarianship and Information Science</i>	1.27
<i>Journal of the Medical Library Association</i>	1.27
<i>Library Collections, Acquisitions and Technical Services</i>	1.26

Table 1. (Continued)

Title	Mean Average
<i>Online Information Review</i>	1.25
<i>Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication</i>	1.24
<i>Information Outlook</i>	1.22
<i>Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association</i>	1.21
<i>Library and Information Science</i>	1.20
<i>Libres</i>	1.19
<i>Serials Librarian</i>	1.19
<i>Internet Research</i>	1.15
<i>Online</i>	1.14
<i>Scientometrics</i>	1.13
<i>Electronic Library</i>	1.11
<i>Journal of Informetrics</i>	1.09
<i>Journal of Information Technology</i>	1.08
<i>Archivaria</i>	1.01
<i>Archival Science</i>	.99
<i>Serials Review</i>	.97
<i>Journal of Scholarly Publishing</i>	.94
<i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i>	.92
<i>International Information and Library Review</i>	.90
<i>Information Systems Research</i>	.85
<i>Health Information and Libraries Journal</i>	.84
<i>Law Library Journal</i>	.82
<i>International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning</i>	.80
<i>Information Systems</i>	.79
<i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>	.79
<i>Information Systems Journal</i>	.75
<i>International Journal of Information Management</i>	.74
<i>Cybermetrics</i>	.73
<i>Learned Publishing</i>	.73
<i>Journal of Health Communication</i>	.71
<i>Harvard Library Bulletin</i>	.70
<i>Scientist</i>	.70
<i>Telecommunications Policy</i>	.63
<i>Social Science Information</i>	.61
<i>Econtent</i>	.60
<i>Social Science Computer Review</i>	.53
<i>Program: Electronic Library and Information Systems</i>	.50
<i>Interlending and Document Supply</i>	.48
<i>International Journal of Geographical Information Science</i>	.48
<i>Restaurator</i>	.41
<i>International Journal of Legal Information</i>	.37
<i>Microform and Imaging Review</i>	.37
<i>Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie</i>	.34
<i>Information Wissenschaft and Praxis</i>	.32

Table 2. Journals by Mode Central Tendency

Journal Title	Mode
<i>Information Processing and Management</i>	5
<i>Journal of Documentation</i>	5
<i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)</i>	5
<i>Library and Information Science Research</i>	5
<i>Library Quarterly</i>	5
<i>Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST)</i>	4
<i>First Monday</i>	4, 3, 2
<i>Library Trends</i>	4
<i>College and Research Libraries</i>	3
<i>D-Lib Magazine</i>	3
<i>Information Research</i>	3
<i>Information Society</i>	3
<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	3
<i>Reference and User Services Quarterly</i>	3
<i>American Libraries</i>	2
<i>Aslib Proceedings</i>	2
<i>Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science</i>	2
<i>Electronic Library</i>	2
<i>Information and Management</i>	2
<i>Information Outlook</i>	2
<i>Information Society</i>	2
<i>Information Technology and Libraries</i>	2
<i>Journal of Education for Library and Information Science</i>	2
<i>Journal of Information Science</i>	2
<i>Journal of Librarianship and Information Science</i>	2
<i>Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services</i>	2
<i>Library Hi Tech</i>	2
<i>Library Resources and Technical Services</i>	2
<i>American Archivist</i>	1
<i>Archival Science</i>	1
<i>Archivaria</i>	1
<i>Cataloging and Classification Quarterly</i>	1
<i>Collection Management</i>	1
<i>Cybermetrics</i>	1
<i>Econtent</i>	1
<i>Educause Review</i>	1
<i>Government Information Quarterly</i>	1
<i>Harvard Library Bulletin</i>	1
<i>Health Information and Libraries Journal</i>	1
<i>Information Retrieval</i>	1
<i>Information Systems</i>	1
<i>Information Systems Journal</i>	1
<i>Information Systems Research</i>	1
<i>Information Wissenschaft and Praxis</i>	1
<i>Interlending and Document Supply</i>	1
<i>International Information and Library Review</i>	1

Table 2. (Continued)

Journal Title	Mode
<i>International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning</i>	1
<i>International Journal of Geographical Information Science</i>	1
<i>International Journal of Information Management</i>	1
<i>International Journal of Legal Information</i>	1
<i>Internet Research</i>	1
<i>Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication</i>	1
<i>Journal of Health Communication</i>	1
<i>Journal of Information Ethics</i>	1
<i>Journal of Information Technology</i>	1
<i>Journal of Informetrics</i>	1
<i>Journal of Library Administration</i>	1
<i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i>	1
<i>Journal of Scholarly Publishing</i>	1
<i>Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association</i>	1
<i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>	1
<i>Journal of the Medical Library Association</i>	1
<i>Knowledge Organization</i>	1
<i>Law Library Journal</i>	1
<i>Learned Publishing</i>	1
<i>Libraries and the Cultural Record</i>	1
<i>Library and Information Science</i>	1
<i>Library Journal</i>	1
<i>Libres</i>	1
<i>Libri</i>	1
<i>Microform and Imaging Review</i>	1
<i>MIS Quarterly</i>	1
<i>Online</i>	1
<i>Online Information Review</i>	1
<i>Portal: Libraries and the Academy</i>	1
<i>Program: Electronic Library and Information Systems</i>	1
<i>Public Libraries</i>	1
<i>Reference Services Review</i>	1
<i>Restaurator</i>	1
<i>School Library Journal</i>	1
<i>School Library Media Research</i>	1
<i>Scientist</i>	1
<i>Scientometrics</i>	1
<i>Serials Librarian</i>	1
<i>Serials Review</i>	1
<i>Social Science Computer Review</i>	1
<i>Social Science Information</i>	1
<i>Telecommunications Policy</i>	1
<i>Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie</i>	1

Note.—First Monday had an equally high number of responses to ratings 2, 3, and 4.

The mode calculation of most frequently occurring values resulted in five journals being top-rated as a 5. In alphabetical order, those were *Information Processing and Management*, *Journal of Documentation*, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)*, *Library and Information Science Research*, and *Library Quarterly*.

Internal Consensus

Both Kohl and Davis and Nisonger and Davis examined the consensus among respondents by summing the highest number of responses in two adjacent ratings and dividing by the total number of respondents. Kohl and Davis called this a heuristic approach, which they suggested had more “intuitive clarity” than the use of standard deviation, and they considered any score of 50 percent or higher as demonstrating internal consensus. Nisonger and Davis measured internal consensus twice, once with blank responses counted as zero and once where those responses were disregarded.

Internal consensus among faculty is shown in tables 3 and 4. Table 3 includes blank responses and “not familiar” responses as zero. Using 50.0 percent to demonstrate internal consensus, LIS faculty achieved consensus on seventy-five out of eighty-nine titles or 84 percent. Table 4 considers only the responses of faculty who rated each journal from 1 to 5. Disregarding “not familiar” and blank responses, consensus was achieved on seventy-seven titles or 87 percent.

Top Five Method

When asked to list the five most prestigious journals to be published in for tenure and promotion at their institution, 145 respondents listed 100 titles (see table 5). This top five, or forced choice, question is another method of prioritizing journals.

An advantage of this system is that respondents were free to choose any journals they saw fit, thereby eliminating any bias that might be present in a set list of journals. It also accommodated the multidisciplinary nature of the field by not limiting responses to a list of traditional LIS journals.

The top five responses were *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (126 responses), *Library Quarterly* (seventy-six responses), *Information Processing and Management* (fifty-three responses), *Library and Information Science Research* (forty-five responses), and *Journal of Documentation* (forty-four responses). Fourteen journals were listed by ten or more respondents. Forty-five titles were listed more than once. Forty-six of the titles suggested were not on the list of journals provided in the rating question. Nisonger and Davis maintained that a high number of journals listed in the top five method supported the idea that the field is “increasingly diverse, interdisciplinary, and even multidisciplinary” in nature (Nisonger and Davis 2005, 375).

Open-Ended Responses

Seventy-two people provided comments when asked about LIS journal prestige. Many respondents made similar observations that journal prestige is dependent on faculty members' particular areas of research and that LIS is diverse and interdisciplinary.

This diverse nature of the field was demonstrated by comments from those who were unhappy with the list of LIS journals they were given to rank. Several respondents mentioned that they were from iSchools and that their research was in areas not covered by traditional LIS journals. Alternatively, several respondents complained that the list of journals was too focused on information science and archives and did not include enough journals in school librarianship or public librarianship.

The dichotomy between iSchools and traditional LIS schools was brought up in many of the comments. One person suggested that iSchools had interdisciplinary clusters of research such as human-computer interaction, systems analysis, and imaging science. Another responded that iSchools cover a large distribution of knowledge that only slightly overlaps with LIS. There were also comments that because the field is so interdisciplinary, it might be difficult to get a prestige ranking across the various faculty disciplines.

In addition to the comments regarding the different research needs of faculty in iSchools and those in traditional LIS programs, there were remarks about the distinction between scholarly and professional practice journals. Several respondents noted that many LIS journals are more practical in nature than scholarly. A few lamented that publishing in those journals was not more respected for tenure and promotion purposes.

The list of journals was compiled from the Nisonger and Davis study and Journal Citation Reports in an attempt to avoid bias; yet some respondents objected to the composition of the list. Some mentioned that it did not include enough French-language journals or that the list had an American bias. One respondent said the list did not have enough representation from journals dealing with children's and young adults' literature and was therefore a biased list. The *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* was included because it was in the Nisonger and Davis selection of journals and, though ceasing publication, was still current at the time of the survey. Several respondents noted that it will be ceasing publication, and one person commented that it is not a journal.

One of the comments was that "JCR needs to take MIS journals out from LIS journals." Another was that LIS journals tend to have lower impact factors than information science, MIS, or systems journals. Along the same lines, one respondent said that impact factors were not appropriate for LIS.

A complaint was voiced that many LIS journals have the same editors or are from a small group of schools and so have a similar focus. Another mentioned that the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* was not welcoming to LIS research. Finally, a few peo-

Table 3. Internal Consensus with “Not Familiar” and Blank Counted as Zero

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals	Percentage of Total
<i>Microform and Imaging Review</i>	60 (0, 1)	95.8
<i>Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie</i>	157 (0, 1)	94.0
<i>International Journal of Legal Information</i>	156 (0, 1)	93.4
<i>Restaurator</i>	154 (0, 1)	92.2
<i>Information Wissenschaft and Praxis</i>	152 (0, 1)	91.0
<i>International Journal of Geographical Information Science</i>	149 (0, 1)	89.2
<i>Program: Electronic Library and Information Systems</i>	148 (0, 1)	88.6
<i>Interlending and Document Supply</i>	147 (0, 1)	88.0
<i>Social Science Computer Review</i>	147 (0, 1)	88.0
<i>Social Science Information</i>	146 (0, 1)	87.4
<i>Journal of Health Communication</i>	143 (0, 1)	85.6
<i>Telecommunications Policy</i>	143 (0, 1)	85.6
<i>Law Library Journal</i>	141 (0, 1)	84.4
<i>Econtent</i>	139 (0, 1)	83.2
<i>Harvard Library Bulletin</i>	139 (0, 1)	83.2
<i>Scientist</i>	139 (0, 1)	83.2
<i>Health Information and Libraries Journal</i>	136 (0, 1)	81.4
<i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>	136 (0, 1)	81.4
<i>International Journal of Information Management</i>	135 (0, 1)	80.8
<i>Cybermetrics</i>	133 (0, 1)	79.6
<i>International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning</i>	133 (0, 1)	79.6
<i>Information Systems</i>	132 (0, 1)	79.0
<i>Archivaria</i>	130 (0, 1)	77.8
<i>Information Systems Research</i>	130 (0, 1)	77.8
<i>Information Systems Journal</i>	129 (0, 1)	77.2
<i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i>	127 (0, 1)	76.0
<i>Scientometrics</i>	126 (0, 1)	75.4
<i>Archival Science</i>	125 (0, 1)	74.9
<i>Journal of Informetrics</i>	125 (0, 1)	74.9
<i>International Information and Library Review</i>	124 (0, 1)	74.3
<i>Journal of Scholarly Publishing</i>	123 (0, 1)	73.7
<i>Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association</i>	123 (0, 1)	73.7
<i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)</i>	121 (4, 5)	72.5
<i>Serials Librarian</i>	119 (0, 1)	71.3
<i>Journal of the Medical Library Association</i>	117 (0, 1)	70.1
<i>Journal of Information Technology</i>	116 (0, 1)	69.5
<i>MIS Quarterly</i>	115 (0, 1)	68.9
<i>Library and Information Science</i>	114 (0, 1)	68.3
<i>Online</i>	114 (0, 1)	68.3
<i>Internet Research</i>	113 (0, 1)	67.7
<i>Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication</i>	112 (0, 1)	67.1
<i>Libres</i>	111 (0, 1)	66.5
<i>Electronic Library</i>	110 (0, 1)	65.9
<i>Government Information Quarterly</i>	110 (0, 1)	65.9
<i>Online Information Review</i>	110 (0, 1)	65.9

Table 3. (Continued)

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals	Percentage of Total
<i>American Archivist</i>	109 (0, 1)	65.3
<i>Information Retrieval</i>	108 (0, 1)	64.7
<i>Portal: Libraries and the Academy</i>	108 (0, 1)	64.7
<i>Reference Services Review</i>	107 (0, 1)	64.1
<i>Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services</i>	106 (0, 1)	63.5
<i>School Library Journal</i>	106 (0, 1)	63.5
<i>School Library Media Research</i>	106 (0, 1)	63.5
<i>Information and Management</i>	105 (0, 1)	62.9
<i>Collection Management</i>	104 (0, 1)	62.3
<i>Information Outlook</i>	104 (0, 1)	62.3
<i>Journal of Librarianship and Information Science</i>	104 (0, 1)	62.3
<i>Information Society</i>	101 (0, 1)	60.5
<i>Journal of Information Ethics</i>	99 (0, 1)	59.3
<i>First Monday</i>	99 (2, 3 and 3, 4 tied)	59.2
<i>Journal of Library Administration</i>	98 (0, 1)	58.7
<i>Knowledge Organization</i>	97 (0, 1)	58.1
<i>Public Libraries</i>	97 (0, 1)	58.1
<i>Educause Review</i>	96 (0, 1)	57.5
<i>American Libraries</i>	95 (1, 2)	56.9
<i>Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST)</i>	92 (4, 5)	55.1
<i>Libraries and the Cultural Record</i>	91 (0, 1)	54.5
<i>Cataloging and Classification Quarterly</i>	89 (0, 1)	53.3
<i>Journal of Documentation</i>	89 (4, 5)	53.3
<i>Library Journal</i>	88 (0, 1)	52.7
<i>Library Quarterly</i>	88 (4, 5)	52.7
<i>Libri</i>	86 (0, 1)	51.5
<i>Library Hi Tech</i>	84 (0, 1)	50.3
<i>Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science</i>	83 (0, 1)	49.7
<i>Information Technology and Libraries</i>	83 (0, 1)	49.7
<i>Library Resources and Technical Services</i>	83 (0, 1)	49.7
<i>Journal of Information Science</i>	82 (0, 1)	49.1
<i>Aslib Proceedings</i>	81 (0, 1)	48.5
<i>Library Trends</i>	80 (3, 4)	47.9
<i>Journal of Education for Library and Information Science</i>	79 (3, 4)	47.3
<i>Library and Information Science Research</i>	73 (0, 1)	43.7
<i>D-Lib Magazine</i>	70 (3, 4)	41.9
<i>Reference and User Services Quarterly</i>	68 (0, 1)	40.7
<i>College and Research Libraries</i>	67 (2, 3)	40.1
<i>Information Research</i>	67 (0, 1)	40.1
<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	64 (2, 3)	38.3
<i>Information Processing and Management</i>	62 (4, 5)	37.1

Note.—Top Adjacent Totals: the number of responses for the two adjacent ratings (0–5) receiving the highest number of responses. Percentage of Total: the number of responses to the two most frequently chosen adjacent ratings as a percentage of the total responses. *First Monday* had an equally high number of responses to the ratings 2 and 3, as well as to the adjacent ratings 3 and 4, and therefore both adjacent ratings are shown.

Table 4. Internal Consensus Table with “Not Familiar” and Blank Responses Not Considered

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals	Percentage of Total
<i>Microform and Imaging Review</i>	44 (1, 2)	93.6
<i>International Journal of Legal Information</i>	36 (1, 2)	90.0
<i>Harvard Library Bulletin</i>	64 (1, 2)	88.9
<i>Information Wissenschaft und Praxis</i>	27 (1, 2)	87.1
<i>Social Science Computer Review</i>	40 (1, 2)	83.3
<i>Restaurator</i>	31 (1, 2)	79.5
<i>Journal of Education for Library and Information Science</i>	79 (2, 3)	78.7
<i>Information Outlook</i>	76 (1, 2)	78.4
<i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)</i>	121 (4, 5)	77.6
<i>Scientist</i>	46 (1, 2)	76.7
<i>Journal of Health Communication</i>	45 (1, 2)	76.3
<i>International Journal of Information Management</i>	47 (1, 2)	75.8
<i>Serials Librarian</i>	73 (1, 2)	75.3
<i>Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie</i>	24 (1, 2)	75.0
<i>Health Information and Libraries Journal</i>	52 (1, 2)	74.3
<i>Law Library Journal</i>	54 (1, 2)	74.0
<i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i>	55 (1, 2)	72.4
<i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>	44 (1, 2)	72.1
<i>Econtent</i>	36 (1, 2)	72.0
<i>Information Systems Journal</i>	44 (1, 2)	71.0
<i>Telecommunications Policy</i>	38 (1, 2)	70.4
<i>Online</i>	63 (1, 2)	70.0
<i>Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science</i>	83 (2, 3)	69.7
<i>Information Systems</i>	44 (1, 2)	68.8
<i>Information Systems Research</i>	44 (1, 2)	68.8
<i>Program: Electronic Library and Information Systems</i>	28 (1, 2)	68.3
<i>School Library Journal</i>	76 (1, 2)	67.9
<i>American Libraries</i>	95 (1, 2)	66.9
<i>Electronic Library</i>	54 (1, 2)	66.7
<i>Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services</i>	60 (1, 2)	66.7
<i>Archival Science</i>	40 (1, 2)	66.0
<i>Journal of Librarianship and Information Science</i>	61 (1, 2)	65.6
<i>Internet Research</i>	54 (1, 2)	65.1
<i>Journal of the Medical Library Association</i>	61 (1, 2)	64.9
<i>Journal of Documentation</i>	89 (4, 5)	64.5
<i>Library Hi Tech</i>	81 (1, 2)	64.3
<i>Cybermetrics</i>	34 (1, 2)	64.2
<i>Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association</i>	52 (1, 2)	64.2
<i>Journal of Library Administration</i>	66 (1, 2)	64.1
<i>Information Technology and Libraries</i>	67 (2, 3)	63.8
<i>Journal of Scholarly Publishing</i>	45 (1, 2)	63.4
<i>Online Information Review</i>	57 (1, 2)	63.3
<i>Journal of Information Technology</i>	49 (1, 2)	62.8
<i>Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST)</i>	92 (4, 5)	62.6
<i>Educause Review</i>	65 (1, 2)	62.5

Table 4. (Continued)

Journal Title	Top Adjacent Totals	Percentage of Total
<i>Journal of Informetrics</i>	48 (1, 2)	62.3
<i>Information and Management</i>	56 (1, 2)	62.2
<i>School Library Media Research</i>	67 (1, 2)	62.0
<i>Reference Services Review</i>	57 (1, 2)	61.3
<i>Public Libraries</i>	72 (1, 2)	61.0
<i>Library Journal</i>	88 (1, 2)	60.7
<i>Collection Management</i>	58 (1, 2)	59.8
<i>MIS Quarterly</i>	52 (1, 2)	59.8
<i>Aslib Proceedings</i>	66 (1, 2)	59.5
<i>Libres</i>	49 (1, 2)	59.0
<i>Libri</i>	72 (1, 2)	59.0
<i>Library and Information Science Research</i>	73 (4, 5)	58.9
<i>D-Lib Magazine</i>	70 (3, 4)	58.8
<i>Government Information Quarterly</i>	57 (1, 2)	58.2
<i>Library Quarterly</i>	88 (4, 5)	57.9
<i>Cataloging and Classification Quarterly</i>	65 (1, 2)	57.0
<i>Library and Information Science</i>	46 (1, 2)	56.1
<i>Journal of Information Ethics</i>	53 (1, 2)	55.8
<i>Information Retrieval</i>	48 (1, 2)	55.2
<i>Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication</i>	44 (1, 2)	55.0
<i>Archivaria</i>	36 (1, 2)	54.5
<i>Library Trends</i>	80 (3, 4)	54.4
<i>Scientometrics</i>	37 (1, 2)	53.6
<i>Information Society</i>	46 (2, 3)	51.7
<i>Knowledge Organization</i>	50 (1, 2)	51.0
<i>First Monday</i>	66 (3, 4 and 4, 5 tied)	50.4
<i>American Archivist</i>	42 (1, 2)	50.0
<i>Journal of Information Science</i>	56 (1, 2)	50.0
<i>Information Processing and Management</i>	62 (4, 5)	49.6
<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	64 (2, 3)	48.9
<i>College and Research Libraries</i>	67 (2, 3)	48.6
<i>Library Resources and Technical Services</i>	53 (1, 2)	48.6
<i>Portal: Libraries and the Academy</i>	38 (3, 4)	47.0
<i>Reference and User Services Quarterly</i>	60 (2, 3)	46.9
<i>Libraries and the Cultural Record</i>	49 (1, 2)	46.7
<i>Information Research</i>	55 (3, 4)	46.6
<i>Interlending and Document Supply</i>	42 (1, 2)	46.2
<i>International Journal of Geographical Information Science</i>	37 (1, 2)	44.6
<i>International Information and Library Review</i>	56 (1, 2)	43.8
<i>International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning</i>	37 (1, 2)	38.5

Note.—Top Adjacent Totals: the number of responses for the two adjacent ratings (0–5) receiving the highest number of responses. Percentage of Total: the number of responses to the two most frequently chosen adjacent ratings as a percentage of the total responses. *First Monday* had an equally high number of responses to the ratings 3 and 4, as well as to the adjacent ratings 4 and 5, and therefore both adjacent ratings are shown.

Table 5. Journals Listed among the Top Five Most Prestigious

Journal Title	Number of Times Listed
<i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)</i>	126
<i>Library Quarterly</i>	76
<i>Information Processing and Management</i>	52
<i>Journal of Documentation</i>	49
<i>Library and Information Science Research</i>	45
<i>Library Trends</i>	26
<i>Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST)</i>	21
<i>Journal of Education for Library and Information Science</i>	21
<i>College and Research Libraries</i>	17
<i>Libraries and the Cultural Record</i>	14
<i>American Archivist</i>	13
<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	11
<i>Journal of Information Science</i>	11
<i>School Library Media Research</i>	9
<i>Archival Science</i>	8
<i>Information Retrieval</i>	8
<i>Reference and User Services Quarterly</i>	8
<i>MIS Quarterly</i>	7
<i>Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science</i>	6
<i>Information Research</i>	6
<i>ACM SIG on Information Retrieval Conferences</i>	5
<i>Archivaria</i>	5
<i>Government Information Quarterly</i>	5
<i>Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association</i>	5
<i>Scientometrics</i>	5
<i>ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems</i>	4
<i>Portal: Libraries and the Academy</i>	4
<i>Science</i>	4
<i>Communications of the ACM</i>	3
<i>Journal of the Medical Library Association</i>	3
<i>Knowledge Organization</i>	3
<i>Nature</i>	3
<i>ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction</i>	2
<i>Bookbird</i>	2
<i>Cataloging and Classification Quarterly</i>	2
<i>Children's Literature</i>	2
<i>First Monday</i>	2
<i>Information Society</i>	2
<i>Joint Conference on Digital Libraries Proceedings</i>	2
<i>Journal of Librarianship and Information Science</i>	2
<i>Library Journal</i>	2
<i>Library Resources and Technical Services</i>	2
<i>Public Library Quarterly</i>	2
<i>ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work</i>	1
<i>ACM Transactions on Asian Language Information Processing</i>	1

Table 5. (Continued)

Journal Title	Number of Times Listed
<i>Archives and Manuscripts</i>	1
<i>Artificial Intelligence</i>	1
<i>Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems</i>	1
<i>Child Development</i>	1
<i>Children's Literature in Education</i>	1
<i>Children's Literature Quarterly</i>	1
<i>Collection Management</i>	1
<i>Documentaliste</i>	1
<i>Documentation et Bibliothèques</i>	1
<i>Early Childhood Research Quarterly</i>	1
<i>Health Communication</i>	1
<i>Human Factors</i>	1
<i>IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics</i>	1
<i>IFLA Journal</i>	1
<i>Information Research</i>	1
<i>Information Systems Research</i>	1
<i>Information Technology and People</i>	1
<i>Information, Communication and Society</i>	1
<i>International Journal of Geographical Information Science</i>	1
<i>International Journal of Information Management</i>	1
<i>Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy</i>	1
<i>Journal of Archival Organization</i>	1
<i>Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication</i>	1
<i>Journal of Information Ethics</i>	1
<i>Journal of Information Technology and Politics</i>	1
<i>Journal of Library Administration</i>	1
<i>Journal of Literacy Research</i>	1
<i>Journal of the ACM</i>	1
<i>Knowledge Quest</i>	1
<i>Library Hi Tech</i>	1
<i>Library Resources and Technical Services</i>	1
<i>Libri</i>	1
<i>New Media and Society</i>	1
<i>Online</i>	1
<i>Online Information Review</i>	1
<i>Organization Science</i>	1
<i>Organization Studies</i>	1
<i>PloS ONE</i>	1
<i>Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology</i>	1
<i>Progressive Librarian</i>	1
<i>Public Libraries</i>	1
<i>Reading Research Quarterly</i>	1
<i>Reading Teacher</i>	1
<i>Reference Services Review</i>	1
<i>School Libraries Worldwide</i>	1
<i>Science and Technology Libraries</i>	1
<i>Science, Technology, and Human Values</i>	1

Table 5. (Continued)

Journal Title	Number of Times Listed
<i>Searcher</i>	1
<i>Serials Librarian</i>	1
<i>Serials Review</i>	1
<i>Voice of Youth Advocates</i>	1
<i>Young Adult Library Services</i>	1
<i>Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie</i>	1

ple said they declined to answer the question about the top five most prestigious journals for tenure and promotion either because their institution did not have an official policy regarding this or they were not familiar with the policy at their institution. One faculty member responded: "Glad you are doing this survey, since citation factors get old to many of us and the citation ratings are the results of blanket judgments rather than more individualized or specialist ratings."

Conclusions

In this study, three journals were in the top five in the mean and mode rankings, as well as in the top five responses to the open-ended question about the most prestigious journals for tenure and promotion. These were *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *Library Quarterly*, and *Journal of Documentation*.

The top five journals using the mode calculation were also the same five journals most frequently listed by faculty when asked to name the top five most prestigious journals. These five were, in alphabetical order, *Information Processing and Management*, *Journal of Documentation*, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *Library and Information Science Research*, and *Library Quarterly*.

The three journals with the highest mean rating by faculty in this study are also the same top three journals top-rated by LIS deans in the Nisonger and Davis study: *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *Library Quarterly*, and *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*.

Seven of the journals in the top ten mean ratings by faculty are also in the top ten of the mean deans' rating in the Nisonger and Davis study. This convergence of opinion between faculty and deans seems to affirm the existence of an elite high-prestige group of LIS journals.

Notwithstanding the overall perception of ALA-accredited faculty as a group, opinions of journal prestige may vary according to individual subject expertise. For example, archivists or school library specialists may each perceive journals related to their field as more relevant for their use. Separate journal prestige rankings could be created for each specialization. It may also

be that faculty from iSchools and traditional LIS schools would have different rankings of journal perception.

As stated in the results, the selection of forty-six journals in response to the top five question that were not on the list provided for ranking indicates how highly interdisciplinary the field is. Despite the multidisciplinary nature of LIS, when faculty responded to the open-ended question asking them to list the five most prestigious journals to be published in for promotion and tenure purposes at their institution, the top nine journals mentioned most often were also rated among the top nine from the fixed list of LIS journals by mean average. Once again, this would seem to indicate a consensus of opinion regarding a top-tier group of high-prestige LIS journals.

Journal prestige as assessed by LIS faculty can be a useful component of evaluating journal quality among other measures, including acceptance rates and bibliometric indicators such as journal impact factor or journal h-index. Journal rankings continue to serve as guides to researchers by targeting appropriate journals for publication. Authors would certainly want to seek publication in journals deemed commensurate with the quality of their research. Publishing in journals highly rated by peers can engender respect from colleagues. Journal rankings are also used in academic institutions as an indicator of journal quality when judging faculty publications during tenure and promotion decisions. In addition, they are used for collection management by libraries seeking to acquire the top journals; this is so especially in difficult economic times when serials budgets need to be spent wisely. An advantage of prestige studies over other bibliometric rankings is that the journals are ranked by those with subject expertise. The results of this study should provide a better understanding of scholarly communication in library and information science.

References

- Bar-Ilan, Judit. 2010. "Rankings of Information and Library Science Journals by JIF and by h-Type Indices." *Journal of Informetrics* 4 (2): 1141–47.
- Blake, Virgil L. P. 1994. "Faculty Productivity, Journal Prestige, and School Library Media Faculty." *School Library Media Quarterly* 22 (3): 153–58.
- Blake, Virgil L. P. 1995. "The Perceived Prestige of Professional Journals, 1995: A Replication of the Kohl-Davis Study." *Education for Information* 14 (3): 157–79.
- Blake, Virgil L. P., and Renee Tjoumas. 1995. "Through the Looking Glass Darkly: Research Agendas and Faculty Attitudes Regarding Periodical Prestige." *Education for Information* 13 (2): 103–15.
- Braun, Tibor, Wolfgang Glanzel, and Andras Schubert. 2006. "A Hirsch-Type Index for Journals." *Scientometrics* 69 (1): 169–73.
- Chen, Yen-Liang, and Xiang-Han Chen. 2011. "An Evolutionary PageRank Approach for Journal Ranking with Expert Judgements." *Journal of Information Science* 37 (3): 254–72.
- Coleman, Anita. 2007. "Assessing the Value of a Journal beyond the Impact Factor." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 58 (8): 1148–61.
- Connaway, Lynn Silipigni, and Ronald R. Powell. 2010. *Basic Research Methods for Librarians*, 5th ed. Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.

- Herron, Terri L., and Thomas W. Hall. 2004. "Faculty Perceptions of Journals: Quality and Publishing Feasibility." *Journal of Accounting Education* 22 (3): 175–210.
- Hirsch, Jorge E. 2005. "An Index to Quantify an Individual's Scientific Research Output." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 102 (46): 16569–72.
- Jamieson, Susan. 2004. "Likert Scales: How to (Ab)use Them." *Medical Education* 38 (12): 1212–18.
- Kim, Mary T. 1991. "Ranking of Journals in Library and Information Science: A Comparison of Perceptual and Citation-Based Measures." *College and Research Libraries* 52 (1): 24–37.
- Kohl, David F., and Charles H. Davis. 1985. "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans of Library and Information Science Schools." *College and Research Libraries* 46 (1): 40–47.
- McCarthy, Cheryl A. 2000. "Journals of the Century in Library and Information Science." *Serials Librarian* 39 (2): 121–31.
- Nisonger, Thomas E. 1999. "JASIS and Library and Information Science Journal Rankings: A Review and Analysis of the Last Half-Century." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 50 (11): 1004–19.
- Nisonger, Thomas E., and Charles H. Davis. 2005. "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 (4): 341–77.
- Nkereuwem, E. E. 1997. "Accrediting Knowledge: The Ranking of Library and Information Science Journals." *Asian Libraries* 6 (1–2): 71–76.
- Schloegl, Christian, and Wolfgang G. Stock. 2004. "Impact and Relevance of LIS Journals: A Scientometric Analysis of International and German-Language LIS Journals—Citation Analysis versus Reader Survey." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 55 (13): 1155–68.
- Serenko, Alexander, and Nick Bontis. 2009. "Global Ranking of Knowledge Management and Intellectual Capital in Academic Journals." *Journal of Knowledge Management* 13 (1): 4–15.
- Smith, Kerry, and Mike Middleton. 2009. "Australian Library and Information Studies (LIS) Researchers Ranking of LIS Journals." *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* 40 (1): 1–21.
- Theoharakis, Vasilis, and Mary Skordia. 2003. "How Do Statisticians Perceive Statistics Journals?" *American Statistician* 57 (2): 115–23.
- Tjomas, Renee. 1994. "Research Productivity and Perceived Prestige of Professional Journals: An Examination of Faculty Specializing in Public Librarianship." *Serials Librarian* 25 (1–2): 65–81.
- Tjomas, Renee, and Virgil L. P. Blake. 1992. "Faculty Perceptions of the Professional Journal Literature: Quo Vadis?" *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 33 (3): 173–94.
- Via, Barbara J., and Deborah J. Schmidle. 2007. "Investing Wisely: Citation Rankings as a Measure of Quality in Library and Information Science Journals." *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 7 (3): 333–73.

Laura Manzari: associate professor, Long Island University, Post. She is the library and information science librarian at the campus and the library liaison with the Palmer School of Library and Information Science. She holds a JD from the School of Law at St. John's University, an MLS from the Graduate School of Library and Information Studies at Queens College, and a BA from Queens College. Her publications include articles and book chapters on library instruction, library productivity, and website design. E-mail: manzari@liu.edu.

Copyright of Library Quarterly is the property of University of Chicago Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.