2014

Evaluating scholarly book publishers—a case study in the field of journalism.

Tina M. Neville
neville@mail.usf.edu

Deborah Boran Henry
henry@mail.usf.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/fac_publications

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

Recommended Citation

Neville, T.M., & Henry, D.B. (2014). Evaluating scholarly book publishers--a case study in the field of journalism. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40, 379-387. doi: 10.1016/j.acalib.2014.05.005

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the USF Faculty Publications at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF St. Petersburg campus Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

2014

Evaluating scholarly book publishers—a case study in the field of journalism.

Tina M. Neville
neville@mail.usf.edu

Deborah Boran Henry
henry@mail.usf.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digital.usfsp.edu/fac_publications

Recommended Citation

Neville, T.M., & Henry, D.B. (2014). Evaluating scholarly book publishers--a case study in the field of journalism. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40, 379-387. doi: 10.1016/j.acalib.2014.05.005

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital USFSP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital USFSP.

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, vol. 40, issue 3-4, 2014, DOI: 10.1016/j.acalib.2014.05.005

Title

Evaluating Scholarly Book Publishers—A Case Study in the Field of Journalism.

Authors

Tina M. Neville and Deborah B. Henry

Abstract

By adapting multiple metrics used for journal article evaluation and replicating recent publisher metrics, the authors tested methods for evaluating scholarly book publishers. Using monographs published in journalism between 2007 and 2011 as a test case, results indicate these methods may be useful to other scholarly disciplines.

Keywords

Book publishing; publishers; metrics; faculty tenure and promotion; journalism

Introduction

The quality of research publications is of key importance for faculty attempting to justify an application for promotion and tenure. The quality criterion is of equal value to librarians as they make selections for their library collections. Impact factors, citation analyses, peer review status, and acceptance factors, have traditionally been used as relatively objective, though often controversial, methods of determining the quality of

scholarly journals. A reasonably objective means of establishing quality may be more difficult for scholarly books than it has been for journals, as researchers struggle to find ways to make rankings. Although the sciences often rely heavily on research published in journals, the social sciences also use monographs as a primary method for disseminating research. This leads to an ongoing desire to develop better ways to establish impact and quality of book publishers (Gabbidon, Higgins & Martin, 2010; Laband, 1990; University of Kentucky, 2009; Wiberley, 2004).

Scholarly book reviews are not available for every published book. Although cited references for monographs are becoming more common via *Google Scholar* and other sources, at this point these metrics may be difficult to assemble for many book publications. While it can be argued that publishing reputation may change over time and not every book by a particular publisher is of equal quality, some attempt at comparison remains useful for academia. A relatively impartial ranking of impact by publisher could be a helpful addition to the research evaluation process. As with journal article metrics, multiple measures for establishing quality would provide the most complete picture of monograph value and influence.

To assist in the development of book metrics, the authors decided to select a single academic discipline that might serve as a test. A sample of book publications from this field was used to compare the tools suggested in previous studies aimed at ranking publishers or journals. Journalism suited this study since monographs in this discipline have not been analyzed in any depth and the subject is fairly focused yet large enough to allow for reasonable sample sizes. A review of the literature discussing research conducted by faculty in the field of journalism and mass communication reveals that, in

addition to articles published in scholarly journals, value is also placed on book publications. The results of a survey conducted in 1984 listed the publication of a scholarly book as the most valuable form of research activity, followed by refereed journal articles (Fedler & Smith). Schweitzer (1989) reported that the academic administrators of journalism programs ranked writing a scholarly book first over several creative research activities. In a study by Leigh and Anderson (1992), approximately one third of journalism faculty going for promotion to associate professor, authored or co-authored books and 37% of those applying for promotion to full professor had published at least one book. In a 2010-2011 self-study, the University of Florida College of Journalism and Communications reported that book production had increased by 52% and book chapter production by 22% over the previous accreditation period (University of Florida, 2011). The University of Kentucky School of Journalism and Telecommunications lists scholarly book publication first in a ranked list of research expectations. Book chapters were ranked third of all activities considered (University of Kentucky, 2009). In an attempt to answer some of these concerns, this study will address the following research questions:

1. Can tools used to evaluate individual scholarly book titles also be used to effectively analyze scholarly book publishers?
2. Can formulas used to compare journal quality be adapted to compare scholarly book publisher quality?
3. Do multiple methods provide similar rankings for scholarly book publishers?

Literature Review

Attempts have been made to determine the quality of publishers in certain disciplines, particularly political science (Garand & Giles, 2011; Goodson, Dillman & Hira, 1999; Lewis, 2000), economics (Laband, 1990; Torres-Salinas & Moed, 2009), and criminology (Gabbidon, Higgins & Martin, 2010). These studies have employed various methods including surveys and the creation of new metrics.

Calhoun and Bracken (1983) performed a study on cross-disciplinary publisher quality when they analyzed the *Choice Outstanding Academic Book* lists to determine the publishers who occurred most frequently on the list. They calculated a ratio between the total number of books produced by an individual publisher in a given year and the number of those books that appeared on the *Choice* list. Comparing five years of ratios, the authors concluded that the ratio remained reasonably constant, thus providing a useful measure of academic publisher quality. In 1992, Goedeken replicated the study to determine if there had been any changes to the top ranked publishers since the 1983 study was published. While confirming that many of the established publishers' rankings had remained relatively constant over time, the new study discovered some fluctuations with different publishers joining the *Choice* lists and others being removed. In particular, Goedeken noted that university presses were more frequently represented in the more recent *Choice* lists (Goedeken, 1993).

Several studies evaluated individual book titles that were considered to be of high quality based on having won national or disciplinary awards or having been determined as "best books" in a discipline. In addition to straight-forward rankings of the publishers of these high impact books, researchers have also come up with some creative ways of using award winning books to assess publisher quality. In complementary studies of

books in the humanities and the social sciences, Wiberley created a list of prize-winning books published during the 1990s. He calculated the average number of OCLC catalog holdings for each book and used these findings as one means of comparing publishers (Wiberley, 2002, 2004).

While cited references have been employed in studies aimed at analyzing book impact, these studies are usually focused on a specific book title rather than the evaluation of a publisher or publishers. Researchers used cited references in *Google Books*, *Google Scholar*, and *Scopus* to determine if any or all of these resources provided enough data to reasonably analyze cited references for books. They noted that *Google Books* and *Google Scholar*, in particular, may provide enough citations to make these resources a potential source of evaluation in some disciplines (Kousha, Thelwall & Rezaie, 2011). Gabbidon and Collins (2012) looked at the number of *Google Scholar* citations for books, which were previously identified as “most significant” in the field of criminology. Laband created a list of books published in economics in 1980 and then located cited references to those books for the five years following publication. Adapting a formula created by Liebowitz and Palmer for journals, Laband used these cited reference counts to analyze publisher impact (Laband 1990; Liebowitz & Palmer, 1984). Selecting a sample of references from articles in high-impact journals and conference proceedings relevant to information systems, Kleijnen & Van Groenendaal (2000) counted the times that a book publisher was cited in the sample set to generate a list of top ranked publishers. Recently, researchers in Spain have attempted to construct a “Book Publishers Citation Report” using citations from Thomson Reuters’ *Book Citation Index*. They analyzed citations from 2006-2011 for nineteen disciplines in the

Humanities and Social Sciences as a first step in creating a resource that might be analogous to ISI's *Journal Citation Reports* (Torres-Salinas, Robinson-García & López-Cózar, 2012).

Library catalog holdings have also been used as a tool for assessing publisher prestige. White et al. (2009) coined the term “libcitations” during a project aimed at developing a book equivalent to the impact factor calculation for journals. Using the premise that a librarian's decision to acquire a book for his or her collection may, in some ways, correspond to a scholar choosing to cite an article, they created formulas for calculating how one book title might compare to others in the same Library of Congress classification area. Using library catalogs from different national and international institutions, Torres-Salinas and Moed (2009) created formulas for a publishers' “Diffusion Rate” and a “Catalog Inclusion Rate.” Like White and his colleagues, Torres-Salinas and Moed contend that the inclusion of a title in an academic library catalog is one way of measuring its value.

A number of researchers have used qualitative surveys to gain insights on publisher reputations. Garand and Giles surveyed political scientists in 2005 to establish what publishers' books they read most often and to which publisher they would most likely submit a manuscript. They also attempted to evaluate publisher impact by adapting Garand's earlier formula for journal impact: “Impact = Quality + (Familiarity * Quality)” (Garand & Giles, 2011, p.379). In the mid-1990's, Metz and Stemmer (1996) asked academic librarians to rank a selected group of publishers. The authors found that the rankings were quite consistent regardless of institution type or collection development experience. Lewis (2000) applied a method originally used in a survey of political

scientists (Goodson, Dillman, & Hira, 1999) to examine the preferences of librarians who specialize in the development and management of political science collections. These two studies provide an opportunity to compare the opinions of practicing academicians toward subject-specialist librarians.

Several formulas have gained acceptance for comparing journal or author impact. The h-index considers both the number of articles published by an author and the number of times those articles have been cited (Hirsch, 2005). Although the h-index is more commonly used to measure the productivity of individual authors it has also been tested on journal titles, academic programs, and institutions (Braun, Glänzel, & Schubert, 2006; Hodge & Lacasse, 2011; Prathap, 2006; Nosek et al., 2010). Bradford's Law describes the geometric dispersion of scholarly literature into groups (zones), where a small, core group of producers is responsible for a significantly greater amount of literature. Pulgarín and Gil-Leiva (2004) studied references from journals published between 1956 and 2000 to illustrate Bradford's Law as it relates to the literature on automatic indexing. While some researchers have questioned the statistical usefulness of Bradford's Law, it is often used by librarians to identify core titles (Black, 2004).

Methods

To create the data set of titles for analysis, the authors selected scholarly book titles, published between 2007 and 2011. This time frame was considered to be recent enough to be relevant but having been published long enough to allow libraries to

purchase the title and for scholars to begin citing the content. A five-year span provided a large enough sample to work with while still keeping the totals manageable.

The *WorldCat* database was used to locate the initial list of titles since it is the largest catalog of library holdings available and has the advantage of being international in coverage (OCLC, 2013). The expert search mode was used to search the main Library of Congress call number (lc:) areas for journalism: PN4699-PN5650. The search was then limited to publication dates 2007 to 2011, English language, books, and Internet resources. Fiction and juvenile materials were removed from the results. Records retrieved were downloaded into *RefWorks* then imported to an *Excel* spreadsheet for analysis.

The initial list was downloaded in July 2012 and consisted of 4839 titles. International Standard Book Numbers (ISBNs) were then used to combine all records for a particular title into one entry in the data set. Since the goal was to analyze academic titles produced by university presses or commercial publishers, a decision was made to remove records for: self-published works, original dissertations and theses, reference materials (style guides, directories, yearbooks, dictionaries, etc.), organizational reports, specialized issues of journal titles, government documents, graphic novels, items that were excerpted directly from web sites, books that were less than 50 pages in length, and reprints or facsimiles of items originally published prior to 2007. Biographies of prominent journalists are quite prevalent in this call number area; however, since the authors were concentrating on books about the *practice* of journalism, these materials were also excluded from the data set. The list of titles at this point numbered 1051.

As the primary audience for this study is librarians and faculty at academic institutions, the next step was to limit the final list to those titles considered to be “scholarly.” The authors used the Baker & Taylor, YBP (Yankee Book Peddler) Library Services *GOBI*³ (Global Online Bibliographic Information) database to make that determination. The book seller markets the database, containing 10 million titles, to academic, research and special libraries. A category is assigned to every title called “YBP Select.” The “Research-Recommended,” and “Research-Essential” categories were deemed by the authors to be most relevant to researchers at academic institutions. Once the data set was limited to these *GOBI*³ categories, the final resulting list included 232 unique titles. These 232 titles were searched again in the *WorldCat* database to locate the total number of *WorldCat* holdings for each title. Rather than duplicating the Library of Congress (LC) call number search, each book was searched by title and limited to the appropriate date range. This retrieved *WorldCat* records that did not have an LC call number assigned and, therefore, was a more comprehensive picture of the true holdings. The authors have noted that *WorldCat* holdings change fairly regularly so, in order to keep the data as consistent as possible, all titles were searched during eight days in April 2013. Holdings were taken for any *WorldCat* record for that title whose copyright date fell within the 2007-2011 time frame regardless of format—e-books, books on tape, and large print editions were all included. In some cases, books with the same title listed copyright dates in 2006 or in 2012. In those cases, the publisher’s web site was checked for the specific date of release to see if the *WorldCat* records were created just prior or just after a release date. Holdings were included in the data set for these records if the release date was within the range of years 2007 and 2011. A similar system was used for

titles that were released in more than one edition—only the editions that had a copyright date within the five-year time frame were included. For example, if the first edition was published in 2000 and the second edition was released in 2008, only the holdings for the later edition were included in the data set.

The next step in the preparation of the data set was to search *Google Scholar* to locate the number of times each title had been cited. As with the *WorldCat* search, the authors tried to keep the citation data as consistent as possible by completing the *Google Scholar* search within a limited time frame. All citation counts were completed between June 3 and June 6, 2013. Searching *Google Scholar* presented some unique challenges since citations may be incomplete and links may lead to additional citations, particularly for book chapters or excerpts. Although some citations may have been missed, the authors decided that, for the sake of time and consistency, the main title in quotes and the author's last name would be searched, and the total number of citations for the main entry would be counted. In addition, each title was also added to the *Google Scholar* advanced search “return articles published in” box to locate citations to any of the book chapters. The chapter totals were added to the main entry totals for the final *Google Scholar* citation counts. Each “cited by” reference list was scanned and any book reviews, bibliographies, subject lists, class web sites, and price lists were removed from the citation totals. In addition, if the title was listed in an institutional repository but wasn't linked to the full-text or if it was listed in the “further reading section” but wasn't actually mentioned in the citing work's text, it was excluded from the final citation total.

The final step in the creation of the initial scholarly data set was to normalize publisher names to create a consistent naming system for the publishers so that they could

be grouped and compared. To locate the exact publisher name, the *Books in Print* directory of publishers was used. When multiple publishers were listed with similar names, the ISBN prefix was used to determine which publisher was the correct one cited in the *WorldCat* record. Although mergers and acquisitions are likely to change the names over time, this article uses the publisher names as they were listed in *Books in Print* in June-July 2013. After the name consolidation, there were 83 different publishers in the data set.

Once the data set was completed, the authors began the publisher analysis by tabulating and ranking the publishers by the number of titles published, the number of *WorldCat* holdings, and the number of *Google Scholar* citations. In addition to describing the data, the authors tested four methods to identify their usefulness in evaluating scholarly publishers: libcitation analysis, catalog inclusion analyses, h-index ranking, and Bradford's Law.

According to White et al. (2009), the libcitation of a book (L_i) equals the number of libraries who hold the book (i). To test if the measurement could be modified and applied to analyze a publisher (p), the holdings of each book produced by all 83 publishers were collected from the *WorldCat* database. The original libcitation formulas were then modified as follows:

$$L_p = \sum (L_i) \text{ for all books } (i) \text{ for a publisher } (p)$$

$$M_p = \sum (L_p) / n_p$$

$$CNLS_p = L_p / M_p$$

L_p represents the libcitation score for a publisher, $CNLS_p$ stands for Class Normalization Libcitation Score for a publisher, n_p equals the total number of publishers, and M_p is the

mean libcitation count. The mean libcitation count and the CNLS were then calculated for each publisher.

A specialized data set was created to use in a replication of the Torres-Salinas and Moed (2009) Library Catalog Analysis (LCA) method. To determine appropriate institutions to include in the analysis, the authors decided to use libraries at the 107 schools in the United States (excluding Puerto Rico), that were listed as accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC) during the summer of 2013. Each title in the data set was searched in the library catalog of each university. Print and/or online titles were counted as ownership of the title unless they clearly indicated that they were online purchase-on-demand. It is possible that some of the libraries do not include individual e-book titles in their catalogs--in those cases; an online version may have been owned but was not included in the databases. Only titles that could be identified as being held on the main campus of the institution (main library, a branch library on the main campus, or storage on the main campus) were included in the data set. Multiple copies of the same book were only counted once. Replicating Torres-Salinas and Moed's work, the following calculations were performed on the data:

CI = Catalog inclusions

CIR = Catalog inclusion rate

RCIR = Relative catalog inclusion rate

where CI is the number of libraries owning a particular title, and the CIR is the total number of libraries owning all books by a particular publisher divided by the number of titles that publisher has in the data set. For instance, the University of Chicago Press has four titles in the data set. The aggregated holdings for those four titles is 323 so the CIR

for the University of Chicago Press is $323 / 4 = 80.8$. The RCIR is the ratio of the aggregated sum of catalog inclusion rates (CIR) divided by the CIR of all holdings for all titles by all publishers (for this study = $11910 \text{ holdings} / 232 \text{ titles} = 51.34$). The Relative Catalog Inclusion Rate (RCIR) compares titles by normalizing the numbers regardless of how many titles the publisher has in the data set (Torres-Salinas & Moed, 2009, p.13). The CIR for each individual book title was calculated to determine which publishers have titles in the top 25 list of catalog inclusions. The RCIR was also calculated to illustrate the performance of each publisher after the CIR's for each title were aggregated.

The authors were also interested in testing whether the h-index analysis might be applicable to publishers. *Web of Science* (Thomson Reuters, 2013) defines the h-index as “the number of articles greater than h that have at least h citations. For example, an h-index of 20 means that there are 20 items that have 20 citations or more.” To test this information on publishers, the number of *Google Scholar* citations for each title was recorded and the list was sorted in descending order with the highest number of citations listed first. The list was examined to find the point on the list where the number of citations was greater than or equal to the total number of titles in the list. This became the h-index for the publisher. The h-indexes of all publishers in the data set were determined and ranked.

For the purposes of determining if there is a core group of publishers, the authors consulted Andrés's, *Measuring Academic Research* (2009), for specifics on how to calculate Bradford's Law. By substituting publisher data for journal data, calculations were conducted based on the following information:

T = total number of publishers

Y^m = number of titles for the most productive publisher

P = number of zones

$e^Y=1.781$ (constant)

k = Bradford's constant where: $k = (e^Y * Y^m)^{1/P}$

r_0 = Core publishers where: $r_0 = T * (k-1) / (k^P - 1)$

r_1 = Zone 2 publishers where: $r_1 = r_0 * k$

r_2 = Zone 3 publishers where: $r_2 = r_0 * k^2$ etc.

Given that different research studies have used varying numbers of zones in their calculations of Bradford's Law, the authors calculated the distributions for three, four, and five zones.

Results

In analyzing the basic descriptive data (Table 1), it was somewhat surprising to see the large number of publishers that appear in a five-year snapshot of scholarly journalism monographs. The 232 titles in the data set were published by 83 different publishers, yielding an average of only 2.8 titles per publisher. In fact, 58% (48 of 83) of the publishers had only one title each in the data set. The average of *WorldCat* holdings per title was 361; however, the range in holdings illustrates the wide variation in this area. This may indicate that some titles were more popular across readership levels and; therefore, useful to libraries serving the general public and lower level undergraduates as well as graduate students and faculty.

Table 1. Descriptive data for scholarly books published 2007-2011

Number of titles in the data set	232
Number of different publishers in the data set	83

Average number of titles per publisher	2.8
Total <i>WorldCat</i> holdings in the entire data set	83685
Average number of <i>WorldCat</i> holdings per publisher	1008
Average number of <i>WorldCat</i> holdings per title	361
Total <i>Google Scholar</i> citations in the entire data set	7158
Average number of <i>Google Scholar</i> citations per publisher	86
Average number of <i>Google Scholar</i> citations per title	31
<i>WorldCat</i> holdings range	17-1748
<i>Google Scholar</i> citation range	0-649

Routledge published the most titles and likewise led in the number of library holdings, according to the *WorldCat* database (Tables 2 and 3). It is not surprising to see Oxford University Press and Palgrave Macmillan alongside Routledge near the top of the total *WorldCat* holdings list, since these publishers all had a larger percentage of the total publications. However, the fourth ranked University of Chicago may be a testament to their reputation as a scholarly publisher, since they only had four titles included in the overall data set.

Table 2. Publisher rankings by number of titles (top 10) for books published 2007-2011

Rank	Publishers	Number of titles
1	Routledge	32
2	Palgrave Macmillan Limited	18
3	Peter Lang Publishing Incorporated	14
4	Oxford University Press	12
5	Cambridge University Press	11
6	Ashgate Publishing Limited	9
7	Hampton Press Incorporated	7
7	University of Illinois Press	7
9	Intellect Limited	5

10	Cambridge Scholars Publisher	4
	Continuum International Publishing Group Limited	4
	I B Tauris & Company Limited	4
	Pickering & Chatto Publishers Limited	4
	University of Chicago Press	4

When analyzing the average number of *WorldCat* holdings per title (Table 4), an almost entirely different set of leading publishers emerges from the total holdings list (Table 3). Only two publishers appear on both lists, University of Chicago and Louisiana State University Press. This is partly due to the fact that some publishers produced more than one book during this period with less popular books skewing the average downward. This is evident when comparing the range of holdings per title (Table 3). A few publishers of multiple books had at least one book that, if considered alone, would have made the top list of average holdings per title. For example, Routledge's *Changing Faces of Journalism* had 898 *WorldCat* holdings. Oxford University Press' *Scandal & Civility* had 939 holdings and IB Taurus had one book, *Fashioning the City Paris*, with 884. Although the University of Chicago Press appears in both lists, one of its three publications, *When the Press Fails*, is held by 1621 institutions.

Table 3. Publisher rankings by total number of *WorldCat* holdings (top 10) for books published 2007-2011

Rank	Publishers	Total WorldCat holdings	Holdings per Title (range)
1	Routledge	9743	154 – 898
2	Oxford University Press	5403	147 - 939
3	Palgrave Macmillan Limited	4254	145 – 372

4	University of Chicago Press	4175	831 - 1621
5	Ashgate Publishing Limited	3734	146 – 690
6	Cambridge University Press	3694	17 – 653
7	Peter Lang Publishing Incorporated	2949	60 – 402
8	University of Illinois Press	2889	279 – 542
9	I B Tauris & Company Limited	2743	476 – 884
10	Louisiana State University Press	2520	738 - 942

Three different independent or smaller commercial publishers, Counterpoint Press, Verso Books, and Praeger appear in the analysis of average holdings per title; however, university presses dominate this list, perhaps indicating a preference on the part of those who select for or sell books to libraries (Table 4).

Examining cited references to journal articles has become an increasingly common way to validate the importance of scholarship. *Google Scholar* and similar monograph citation databases allow researchers to begin applying similar evaluations to books and book chapters.

Table 4. Publisher rankings by average number of *WorldCat* holdings per title (top 10) for books published 2007-2011

Rank	Publishers	Total <i>Worldcat</i> holdings (all titles in data set)	Number of titles in data set	Average <i>WorldCat</i> holdings per title
1	University of California Press	1748	1	1748
2	Counterpoint Press	1095	1	1095
3	University of Chicago Press	4175	4	1044
4	Verso Books	981	1	981

5	Indiana University Press	963	1	963
6	Rutgers University Press	907	1	907
7	Praeger Publishers	885	1	885
8	Louisiana State University Press	2520	3	840
9	New York University Press	820	1	820
10	University of Missouri Press	1501	2	751

When analyzing total citations (Table 5) and average number of citations per title (Table 6), there is more consistency between the publishers appearing on both of these lists than in the tables describing *WorldCat* holdings. In spite of the fact that the titles under analysis are relatively recent publications, the average title for all publications had 31 cited references. Variation in ranking, however, appears to be more influenced by the number of books published by an individual company than by a difference in which publishers are being cited. For example, Routledge ranks first for the total number of cited references but drops to ninth place when the citations are averaged. However, Routledge's *Handbook of Journalism Studies* garnered 649 citations, more than any other book included in this study (see Table 5 for range of citations per title).

Table 5. Publisher rankings by total number of citations (top 10) for books published 2007-2011

Ranking	Publishers	Total citations	Citations per title (range)
1	Routledge	2229	0 – 649
2	Wiley-Blackwell	547	25 – 360
3	University of Chicago Press	454	4 – 348
4	Peter Lang Publishing Incorporated	425	0 – 188

5	University of Missouri Press	305	10 – 295
	Stanford University Press	305	305
7	Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Incorporated	294	294
8	Sage Publications Incorporated	293	41 – 174
9	Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Incorporated	274	274
10	Palgrave Macmillan Limited	263	0 – 56

Somewhat surprisingly, the majority of the titles in the average citations list for this study (Table 6) were not published by university presses. Although the non-university presses may have greater marketing that leads to more sales, this seems to contradict a recent study of *Book Citation Index* where university presses garnered higher citation rates (Torres-Salinas, Robinson-García, Cabezas-Clavijo, & Jiménez-Contreras, 2013).

Table 6. Publisher rankings by average number of citations per title (top 10) for books published 2007-2011

Ranking	Publisher	Total citations (all titles in data set)	Number of titles in data set	Average citations per title
1	Stanford University Press	305	1	305
2	Lawrence Erlbaum Associates	294	1	294
3	Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Incorporated	274	1	274
4	Wiley-Blackwell	547	3	182
5	University of Missouri Press	305	2	153
6	University of Chicago Press	454	4	114
7	Sage Publications Incorporated	293	3	98
8	Princeton University Press	79	1	79

9	Routledge	2229	32	70
10	The New Press	38	1	37

White et al. (2009) created a new metric for books called a libcitation count, which is a total of the number of libraries that hold a particular title. In this study, to see if this metric might also apply to publishers, the *WorldCat* holdings for each title in the data set were totaled by publisher and then used to calculate the Class Normalized Libcitation Score (CNLS) for each publisher. As the name suggests, the CNLS compares the holdings for the book or publisher under analysis to the average holdings count for all items in the data set. White et al. considered books with the highest CNLS score to have the largest impact and considered a reasonable publication goal was to appear in the top one to five percent of the rankings (White et al., 2009, p.1089). Using this method, Routledge, Oxford University Press, Palgrave Macmillan, and the University of Chicago Press rank the highest in the data set (Table 7).

Table 7. Libcitation analysis calculating the publisher's Class Normalized Libcitation Score (CNLS) based on *WorldCat* holdings for books published 2007-2011

Publisher	Total <i>WorldCat</i> holding for the publisher	CNLS ¹	% Rank in class
Routledge	9743	9.67	1%
Oxford University Press	5403	5.36	2%
Palgrave Macmillan Limited	4254	4.22	4%
University of Chicago Press	4175	4.14	5%

¹ $CNLS_p = L_p / M_p$ where L_p is the total holdings for the publisher and M_p is the mean of the *WorldCat* holdings for the entire data set ($83685 / 83 = 1008$). Method adapted from White, Boell, Yu, Davis, Wilson, and Cole, 2009.

The authors thought it would also useful to see how the libcitation method would work using *Google Scholar* cited references in place of library catalog holdings. The results varied slightly with Wiley-Blackwell and Peter Lang replacing Oxford University Press and Palgrave Macmillan at the top (Table 8). Routledge and University of Chicago Press remain highly ranked, regardless of whether *WorldCat* holdings or *Google Scholar* citations are used in the calculations.

Table 8. Libcitation analysis calculating the publisher's Class Normalized Libcitation Score (CNLS) based on *Google Scholar* citations for books published 2007-2011

Publisher	Total <i>Google Scholar</i> cites for the publisher	CNLS ¹	% Rank in class
Routledge	2229	25.92	1%
Wiley-Blackwell	547	6.36	2%
University of Chicago Press	454	5.28	4%
Peter Lang Publishing Incorporated	425	4.94	5%

¹ $CNLS_p = L_p / M_p$ where L_p is the total citations for the publisher and M_p is the mean of the *Google Scholar* citations for the entire data set ($7158 / 83 = 86$). Method adapted from White, Boell, Yu, Davis, Wilson, and Cole, 2009.

The next type of analysis (Table 9) employed the method described by Torres-Salinas and Moed (2009), which uses searches of individual library catalogs for specific titles. They described a new metric called the Catalog Inclusion (CI), which analyzes the number of times a particular book appears in a given set of library catalogs. When looking at individual book titles, the publisher with the highest ranked title was the

University of California Press. Their popular title was held by 87% (93 of 107) of the home libraries of ACEJMC-accredited journalism programs. Perhaps more interesting, is comparing the publishers that show up more than once in the highest ranked titles. The University of Illinois Press has six titles in the top 27 (22%). Oxford University Press and the University of Chicago Press each have three titles in the list (11%). These three publishers account for nearly half of the titles in the top 27 monographs and may be of particular interest to faculty and library selectors at ACEJMC institutions.

Table 9: Top 25 book titles by Catalog Inclusions for books published 2007-2011*

Rank	Publisher	Book title	Publication year	Catalog Inclusions
1	University of California Press	American carnival: journalism under siege in an age of new media	2007	93
2	University of Chicago Press	When the press fails: political power and the news media from Iraq to Katrina	2007	92
3	Oxford University Press	Scandal & civility: journalism and the birth of American democracy	2009	89
4	University of Chicago Press	News at work: imitation in an age of information abundance	2010	86
5	I.B. Tauris & Company Limited	New Arab journalist: mission and identity in a time of turmoil	2011	84

5	Indiana University Press	Tabloid journalism in South Africa true story!	2010	84
7	Louisiana State University Press	Negotiating in the press: American journalism and diplomacy, 1918-1919	2010	83
7	University of Illinois Press	On the condition of anonymity: unnamed sources and the battle for journalism	2011	83
9	University of North Carolina Press	Out on assignment: newspaper women and the making of modern public space	2011	81
10	New York University Press	Girl zines: making media, doing feminism	2009	80
11	University of Missouri Press	Journalism, 1908: birth of a profession	2008	78
11	Verso Books	News for all the people: the epic story of race and the American media	2011	78
13	Routledge	Changing faces of journalism: tabloidization, technology and truthiness	2009	77
13	University of Illinois Press	Everything was better in America: print culture in the Great Depression	2008	77
15	University of Chicago Press	Flash press: sporting male weeklies in 1840s New York	2008	76

15	University of Illinois Press	Normative theories of the media: journalism in democratic societies	2009	76
15	University of Missouri Press	Vanishing newspaper: saving journalism in the information age	2009 2nd ed.	76
18	Lawrence Erlbaum Associates	American journalist in the 21st century: U.S. news people at the dawn of a new millennium	2007	75
18	Louisiana State University Press	Battling Nell the life of southern journalist Cornelia Battle Lewis, 1893-1956	2009	75
18	University of Illinois Press	Becoming the second city: Chicago's mass news media, 1833-1898	2010	75
18	University of Illinois Press	Chronicling trauma: journalists and writers on violence and loss	2011	75
18	University of Illinois Press	Paradoxes of prosperity: wealth-seeking versus Christian values in pre-Civil War America	2009	75
18	Oxford University Press	Smoking typewriters: the Sixties underground press and the rise of alternative media in America	2011	75
24	University of North Carolina Press	Body in the reservoir: murder & sensationalism in the South	2008	74

25	Oxford University Press	Journalism ethics: a philosophical approach	2010	73
25	Stanford University Press	Latino threat: constructing immigrants, citizens, and the nation	2008	73
25	Princeton University Press	War stories: the causes and consequences of public views of war	2010	73

*method as described in Torres-Salinas & Moed 2009. Total catalogs searched = 107.
27 books included since three titles are tied for 25th place.

The Torres-Salinas & Moed method can also be aggregated to describe publishers. The Relative Catalog Inclusion Rate (RCIR) compares titles by normalizing the numbers regardless of how many titles the publisher has in the data set. An RCIR above one means that the publisher's rate of inclusion is higher than the average inclusions in the data set (Torres-Salinas & Moed, 2009, p.13). Using the RCIR figures, the University of California Press was the top ranked publisher for this method and all publishers in the top 25 list were above the average in the number of catalog inclusions (Table 10).

Table 10: Top 25 publishers by Relative Catalog Inclusion Rate* for books published 2007-2011

Rank	Publisher	# Titles	# Catalog Inclusion (CI)	Catalog Inclusion Rate (CIR)	Relative Catalog Inclusion Rate (RCIR)
1	University of California Press	1	93	93	1.81
2	Indiana University Press	1	84	84	1.64
3	University of Chicago Press	4	323	80.8	1.57

4	New York University Press	1	79	79	1.54
5	Verso Books	1	78	78	1.52
6	University of North Carolina Press	2	155	77.5	1.51
7	Louisiana State University Press	3	228	76	1.48
7	University of Missouri Press	2	152	76	1.48
9	University of Illinois Press	7	526	75.1	1.46
9	Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Incorporated	1	75	75	1.46
11	Princeton University Press	1	73	73	1.42
12	Counterpoint Press	1	72	72	1.40
12	Rutgers University Press	1	72	72	1.40
12	Stanford University Press	1	72	72	1.40
15	University of Minnesota Press	1	69	69	1.34
16	I B Tauris & Company Limited	4	274	68.5	1.33
17	University of Texas Press	1	68	68	1.32
18	Praeger Publishers	1	66	66	1.29
19	Ithaca Press	2	130	65	1.27
19	LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC	1	65	65	1.27
19	McGill-Queen's University Press	1	65	65	1.27
22	Intellect Limited	5	311	62.2	1.21
22	Michigan State University Press	1	62	62	1.21
22	Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Incorporated	1	62	62	1.21
25	Taylor & Francis Group	1	60	60	1.17

*method as described in Torres-Salinas & Moed 2009

Since Hirsh introduced his h-index calculation in 2005, it has been gaining increasing acceptance as one metric for assessing an author's research impact. The authors of this study wondered if a similar mechanism could be used to evaluate

publisher's impact using *Google Scholar* cited references for books and book chapters. A great deal has been, and continues to be, written about the h-index and, although not perfect, it continues to gain acceptance and praise as a useful measure (Bornmann & Daniel, 2009; Ruscio, Seaman, D'Oriano, Stremlo & Mahalchik, 2012). Because the h-index compensates for single highly cited items, publishers such as Stanford University Press, Lawrence Erlbaum, and Rowman & Littlefield, which each have one highly cited title and ranked at the top of the list of average citations per title, move down in the h-index ranking (Table 11). Instead, publishers such as Hampton Press and Intellect Limited move up in the rankings, which may indicate greater impact of scholarship for this discipline. Routledge, Palgrave Macmillan, Ashgate, and Cambridge University Press are ranked at the top of the h-index list. This is partly because of the larger number of titles they have in the data set but also indicates that those titles are being used and cited.

Table 11. *Google Scholar* h-index for the highest ranking publishers for books published 2007-2011

Rank	Publisher Name	Number of titles	h-index
1	Routledge	32	16
2	Palgrave Macmillan Limited	18	8
3	Ashgate Publishing Limited	9	6
3	Cambridge University Press	11	6
3	Hampton Press Incorporated	7	6
3	Peter Lang Publishing Incorporated	14	6
7	Intellect Limited	5	4
7	Oxford University Press	12	4

Bradford's Law is used to determine the number of items in a core zone, i.e., the number of journals that produce the most articles or the number of journals that lead to the greatest number of citations. In this study, Bradford's Law is applied to determine the number of publishers that produce the most titles. The least amount of variation around the mean was found with $P = 3$ and resulted in four publishers in the core for this data set: Routledge, Palgrave Macmillan, Peter Lang, and Oxford University Press (Table 12).

Table 12. Bradford's Law based on the number of titles published

Zone	Number of publishers	Number of titles/zone
Core	4	76
Zone 1	16	77
Zone 2	63	79

Table 13 summarizes the overall results of the various rankings. No single publisher ranked first across all methods. Librarians or faculty wishing to emphasize scholarly citations might find the publishers ranking highest in average *Google Scholar* cites or the h-index calculation to be the most helpful. For those concerned with profitability, the higher rankings for *WorldCat* holdings or for the RCIR method might be useful. In this data set, Routledge ranked number one in the most categories (6 of 9). Among the university presses, the University of Chicago Press appears most often in the top four across the nine categories. Of the 17 unique publishers appearing in the top four rankings, 59% (10 of 17) are non-university publishers and 41% (7 of 17) are university presses.

In order to test different methods, the authors purposely selected a discipline that would produce a relatively small data set. While this worked well for the intent of the study, the smaller numbers may have provided an unfair advantage to some of the publishers and not given enough credit to others. Single titles that had high sales or citations might have skewed the data. As with any study of this type, a larger number of titles and a greater time frame for analysis might have produced different results and might have allowed for true statistical testing of significance. In addition, the decision to use the Library of Congress call number system in *WorldCat* as the initial criterion for selection might have missed some key titles, since not all libraries use the Library of Congress system and, even when they do, they do not always include the call number in their *WorldCat* record. Also, by using the *GOBI*³ system to cull the original list to items that might be considered scholarly, there were undoubtedly a number of additional scholarly titles that were missed, since not all monographs are included in the *GOBI*³ database and, for those that were included, there might be differences of opinion on what is considered to be research-oriented. Selecting the initial titles by using award-winning books in the discipline or by conducting a subject search in *WorldCat* or similar large book catalogs would be additional ways to create or supplement the data set.

Conclusion

Using a variety of approaches, it becomes difficult to pinpoint one or two publishers as the “most scholarly” for the discipline. Depending on whether the researcher defines use as sales (catalog holdings, lib citations, etc.) or cited references can

make a difference in which publishers come out at the top of the rankings. Certainly the top four publishers in the Bradford core (Routledge, Palgrave Macmillan, Peter Lang, and Oxford University Press) show up in many of the rankings. However, producing a large number of titles in a discipline is not the only thing that may be important for researchers. The University of Illinois Press had seven titles in the data set, yet six of those titles (86%) appear in the top 25 titles for Catalog Inclusion, indicating a high acceptance by libraries with an emphasis in the field of journalism. Reputation obviously plays a role, but perhaps not as strongly as one might think. Oxford and Cambridge University Presses have long been touted as elite scholarly publishers (Calhoun & Bracken, 1983, p.257; Goedeken, 1993, p.267) and they do perform well in these rankings. Routledge and Palgrave Macmillan, however, are certainly competitive in this study.

The results provide some interesting observations about publishers in the discipline of journalism. While the definition of quality research remains subjective, the methods presented here may be used to develop additional approaches for analyzing scholarly publishers beyond anecdotal evidence and opinion. It is hoped that this information may also provide helpful material for scholars publishing in this field and for librarians purchasing for these collections. Like the impact factor for journals, tenure-track faculty continue to seek ways to validate the scholarly influence of their publishing choices. Established rankings of book publishers may provide additional support for book and book chapter evaluation. Studies of this type may supplement book reviews and assist collection development librarians in acquisition decisions in their liaison areas. By including details on the methods used, the authors hope that similar analyses will be performed in other disciplines. Recent studies by Torres-Salinas and others are exploring

Thomson Reuters' *Book Citation Index* as another means of publisher analysis and could be an interesting extension of this study (Torres-Salinas, Robinson-Garcia, & Lopez-Cozar, 2012; Torres-Salinas, Robinson-Garcia, Cabezas-Clavijo & Jimenez-Contreras, 2013). Additional studies are encouraged to see if there is consistency in these measurements when applied to other disciplines, by using larger data sets, or by using different methods to create the initial data set.

Table 13: Summary of Results for books published 2007-2011

Rank	Total number of Titles (Table 2)	Highest <i>WorldCat</i> Holdings (Table 3)	Average <i>WorldCat</i> Holdings (Table 4)	Highest <i>Google Scholar</i> Cites (Table 5)	Average <i>Google Scholar</i> Cites (Table 6)	Libcitation using <i>WorldCat</i> holdings (Table 7)	Libcitation using <i>Google Scholar</i> citations (Table 8)	Relative Catalog Inclusion Rate (RCIR) (Table 10)	h-index (Table 11)
1	Routledge	Routledge	University of California Press	Routledge	Stanford University Press	Routledge	Routledge	University of California Press	Routledge
2	Palgrave Macmillan	Oxford University Press	Counterpoint Press	Wiley-Blackwell	Lawrence Erlbaum	Oxford University Press	Wiley-Blackwell	Indiana University Press	Palgrave Macmillan
3	Peter Lang	Palgrave Macmillan	University of Chicago Press	University of Chicago Press	Rowman & Littlefield	Palgrave Macmillan	University of Chicago Press	University of Chicago Press	Ashgate Publishing * Cambridge University Press * Hampton Press* Peter Lang*
4	Oxford University Press	University of Chicago Press	Verso Books	Peter Lang	Wiley-Blackwell	University of Chicago Press	Peter Lang	New York University Press	
5	Cambridge University Press	Ashgate Publishing	Indiana University Press	University of Missouri Press* Stanford University Press*	University of Missouri Press			Verso Books	
6	Ashgate Publishing	Cambridge University Press	Rutgers University Press		University of Chicago Press			University of North Carolina Press	
7	Hampton Press	Peter Lang	Praeger Publishers	Lawrence Erlbaum	Sage Publications			Louisiana State University Press*	Intellect*

								University of Missouri Press *	Oxford University Press *
8	University of Illinois Press	University of Illinois Press	Louisiana State University Press	Sage Publications	Princeton University Press				
9	Intellect Limited	I B Tauris	New York University Press	Rowman & Littlefield	Routledge			University of Illinois Press*	
10	Cambridge Scholars* Continuum* I B Tauris * Pickering & Chatto* University of Chicago Press *	Louisiana State University Press	University of Missouri Press	Palgrave Macmillan	New Press			Lawrence Erlbaum *	

*tie

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Carol Hixson, Library Dean, University of South Florida St. Petersburg, Bruce Neville, Reference Librarian, Texas A & M University, Caroline Reed, New College of Florida, and the anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful comments and suggestions for improvement of the original manuscript.

References

- Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications. (2013).
ACEJMC accreditation status 2012 - 2013. Retrieved November 22, 2013, from
<http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/STUDENT/PROGLIST.SHTML#INT>
- Andrés, A. (2009). *Measuring academic research: How to undertake a bibliometric study*.
Oxford: Chandos Publishing.
- Black, P. E. (2004). Bradford's Law. In V. Pieterse and P.E. Black, (Eds.). *Dictionary of algorithms and data structures*. Retrieved from
<http://www.nist.gov/dads/HTML/bradfordsLaw.html>
- Bornmann, L., & Daniel, H. (2009). The state of h index research. is the h index the ideal way to measure research performance? *EMBO Reports*, 10(1), 2-6.
- Braun, T., Glänzel, W., & Schubert, A. (2006). A hirsch-type index for journals.
Scientometrics, 69(1), 169-173.
- Calhoun, J., & Bracken, J. K. (1983). An index of publisher quality for the academic library. *College & Research Libraries*, 44, 257-259.

- Fedler, F., & Smith, R. F. (1984). *Survey reveals journalism administrators prefer traditional types of "research."* (ED 245 239). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (67th, Gainesville, FL, 5-8 August 1984).
- Gabbidon, S. L., Higgins, G., & Martin, F. (2010). Press rankings in criminology/criminal justice: A preliminary assessment of book publisher quality. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 21(3), 229-244. doi: 10.1080/10511253.2010.487832
- Gabbidon, S.L. & Collins, R. (2012). Using Google Scholar to determine the most cited criminology and criminal justice-related books. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(1), 33-45. doi:10.1007/s12103-011-9130-6
- Garand, J. C., & Giles, M. W. (2011). Ranking scholarly publishers in political science: An alternative approach. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44, 375-383. doi: 10.1017/S1049096511000229
- Goedeken, E. A. (1993). An index to publisher quality revisited: A partial replication. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory*, 17, 263-268. doi:10.1016/0364-6408(93)90070-M
- Goodson, L. P., Dillman, B., & Hira, A. (1999). Ranking the presses: Political scientists' evaluations of publisher quality. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 32(2), 257-262.

- Hirsch, J. 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, 16569-16572. doi:10.2307/4152261
- Hodge, D. R., & Lacasse, J. R. (2011). Ranking disciplinary journals with the Google Scholar h-index: A new tool for constructing cases for tenure, promotion, and other professional decisions. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 47(3), 579-596.
- Kleijnen, J. P. C., & Van Groenendaal, W. (2000). Measuring the quality of publications: New methodology and case study. *Information Processing and Management*, 36(4), 551-570.
- Kousha, K., Thelwall, M. & Rezaie, S. (2011). Assessing the citation impact of books: The role of Google Books, Google Scholar, and Scopus. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62, 2147-2164. doi: 10.1002/asi.21608
- Laband, D. N. (1990). Measuring the relative impact of economics book publishers and economics journals. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 28(2), 655-660.
- Leigh, F. A., & Anderson, D. A. (1992). A balance of study and teaching in tenure and promotion cases. *Journalism Educator*, 47(1), 74-79.
- Lewis, J. S. (2000). An assessment of publisher quality by political science librarians. *College & Research Libraries*, 61(4), 313-323.

- Liebowitz, S. J., & Palmer, J. P. (1984). Assessing the relative impacts of economic journals. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 22(1), 77-88.
- Metz, P., & Stemmer, J. (1996). A reputational study of academic publishers. *College & Research Libraries*, 57(3), 234-247.
- Nosek, B. A., Graham, J., Lindner, N. M., Kesebir, S., Hawkins, C. B., Hahn, C., . . . Tenney, E. R. (2010). Cumulative and career-stage citation impact of social-personality psychology programs and their members. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(10), 1283-1300. doi:10.1177/0146167210378111
- OCLC WorldCat. (2013). What is WorldCat? Retrieved November 22, 2013, from <http://www.worldcat.org/whatis/>
- Prathap, G. (2006). Hirsch-type indices for ranking institutions' scientific research output. *Current Science*, 91(11), 1439.
- Pulgarín, A., & Gil-Leiva, I. (2004). Bibliometric analysis of the automatic indexing literature: 1956–2000. *Information Processing & Management*, 40, 365-377. doi:10.1016/S0306-4573(02)00101-2
- Ruscio, J., Seaman, F., D'Oriano, C., Stremlo, E., & Mahalchik, K. (2012). Measuring scholarly impact using modern citation-based indices. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*, 10(3), 123-146. doi: 10.1080/15366367.2012.711147

Schweitzer, J. C. (1989). Faculty research expectation varies among universities.

Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 44(2), 45-49. doi:

10.1177/107769588904400209

Thomson Reuters. (2013). Citation metrics. Retrieved November 22, 2013, from

<http://www.researcherid.com/resources/html/dsy5741-TRS.html>

Torres-Salinas, D., & Moed, H. F. (2009). Library Catalog Analysis as a tool in studies of social sciences and humanities: An exploratory study of published book titles in economics. *Journal of Informetrics*, 3(1), 9-26. doi: 10.1016/j.joi.2008.10.002

Torres-Salinas, D., Robinson-García, N., Cabezas-Clavijo, Á., & Jiménez-Contreras, E. (2013). Analyzing the citation characteristics of books: Edited books, book series and publisher types in the book citation index. *Scientometrics*, 1-15. doi:10.1007/s11192-013-1168-4

Torres-Salinas, D., Robinson-García, N., & López-Cózar, E. D. (2012). Towards a “Book Publishers Citation Reports.” First approach using the “Book Citation Index.” *Revista Espanola De Documentacion Cientifica*, 35(4), 615-620. doi:10.3989/redc.2012.4.1010

University of Florida. College of Journalism and Communications. (2011). *ACEJMC self-study report 2010-11. Part II. Standard 5. Scholarship, research, creative and professional activity*. Retrieved November 22, 2013, from http://my.jou.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/ACEJMC-Self-Study-Report-2010-11-Part-II-Standard-5.-Scholarship_-Research-Creative-and-Professional-Activity1.pdf

University of Kentucky. School of Journalism and Telecommunications. (2009). *Research expectations for regular-title assistant professors*. Retrieved November 22, 2013, from

http://www.asjmc.org/contemporary/tenure/University%20of%20Kentucky_Regula_r.pdf

White, H. D., Boell, S. K., Yu, H., Davis, M., Wilson, C. S., & Cole, F. T. H. (2009). Libcitations: A measure for comparative assessment of book publications in the humanities and social sciences. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60, 1083-1096. doi: 10.1002/asi.21045

Wiberley, S. E. (2002). The humanities: Who won the '90s in scholarly book publishing. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 2(3), 357-374.

Wiberley, S. E., Jr. (2004). The social sciences: Who won the '90s in scholarly book publishing. *College & Research Libraries*, 65(6), 505-523.