

A Scientometric Analysis of Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research (2010-2016)

Dr. Kunwar Singh

Assistant Professor
Department of Library & Information Science
Banaras Hindu University
Varanasi-221005
e-mail:singhdlibhu2015@gmail.com

Satyajit Nayak

MPhil Scholar
Utkal University
Vani Vihar, Bhubaneswar

Akhilesh Kumar Varma

Junior Research Fellow
Department of Library & Information Science
Banaras Hindu University
Varanasi-221005

Abstract - *This paper examines the articles published in the Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research 2010-2016. The present analysis covers the areas like article distribution pattern, authorship pattern, types of bibliographic form used and geographical distribution of authors etc. At the time of data analysis 274 articles were published during the period 2010-2016. Individual contribution of authors to the journal has been tabulated as per articles contributed, highlighted in their standing order. After analysing 2706 references, on average references have been assigned to each article. Researchers from 9 different countries across the world have contributed research articles to the journal during the period of study.*

Keywords: Scientometric, Quantitative techniques, Canadian Journal of Library and information Practice and research

Introduction

Scientometrics is one of the most important measures for the assessment of scientific productions. There are many definitions for the term 'Scientometrics' in the literature; Scientometrics is the quantitative study of the disciplines of science based on published literature and communication (Velmurugan & Radhakrishnan, 2015, p.187). At present the scientometrics study is one of the truly interdisciplinary research fields extended to almost all scientific fields. Scientometrics applications are used to measure scientific activities, mainly by producing statistics on scientific publications indexed in databases (Singh, 2014, p.7). The field of library and information science (LIS) has developed several quantitative methods to study the various aspects of subjects. The metrics of LIS are continuously increasing, starting from librmetrics, bibliometrics, scientometrics, informatics, webometrics, netometrics to cybernetics (Khan, 2016, p.9). The study intends to explore the blueprints of scholarly communication of Partnership: the Canadian journal of library and information practice and research from 2010-2016 and determine to exposure the quality of contributions of this journal towards library and information science literature.

About the Journal

Partnership is the journal of “Partnership”, Canada's national network of provincial and territorial library associations. Partnership promotes the exchange of ideas about libraries, librarianship, and information science among practitioners across all library sectors. It is a Canadian, open access journal publishing double-blind peer-reviewed research and editorially-reviewed articles and opinion pieces. Therefore, a scintometric study of this scholarly journal will add a value to the LIS literature (Partnership JL).

Review of Related Literature

Velmurugan (2013) examined the research output of 203 articles appearing in *Annals of Library and Information Studies* journal for a period 2007-2012. It was found that the most of the contributions are by two authored i.e., 88 (43.35 %). The degree of collaboration ranges from 0.57 to 0.82 and the average degree of collaboration is 0.64. The total average number of authors per paper is 1.87 and the average productivity per author is 0.53. On the other hand, Singh (2012) studied the ‘Libri Journal’ during the period 2001 to 2009. Study analyses 221 papers published during this period. It shows that maximum numbers of contributions are single author with 124 papers (56.10%). It is also clear that Indian contributions in this journal are significantly less (1.87%). Hussain & Fatima (2011) exposed that the majority of the articles were contributed by single authors. It also clear that authors were librarians, faculty members and researchers associated with academic and research organization. Thanuskodi (2010) considered the research output of social scientists on social science subjects. The study cover year-wise, institution-wise, country-wise, authorship pattern, range of references cited of the articles etc. Sanni & Zainab (2010) studied the contributions published in *Medical Journal of Malaysia* during 2004-2008 and found 28(4.82%) of contributions were made by Malaysian authors with foreign collaboration. Kumar et al. (2009) analysed the growth and development of bibliometric and scientometric research in physics and engineering field as per INSPEC Database during 1999-2008. It shows that authorship and collaboration trend was towards multi-authored paper. In similar studies, Vijay & Raghavan (2007) examined the journal of food science and technology published during 2000-2004 and revealed that above 93% of contributions were multiple authors. Guan & Ma (2007) observed the China’s Semiconductor Literature and found mega authored papers records that show higher value for co-authorship index. Patra et al. (2006) explored the growth pattern, core journals and authors' distribution in the field of bibliometric using data from *Library and Information Science Abstract (LISA)* and found that the growth of literature does not show any definite pattern. Kannappanavar et al. (2004) analyzed the publishing trends of Indian Chemical Scientists during 1996-2000, which shown average number of authors per paper has increased from 7.52 to 8.39.

Objectives

In this study the following objectives were formulated as:

- To analyse the chronological growth of articles during 2010-2016;
- To examine the types of contribution;
- To identify the authorship pattern;
- To study the ranking of author;
- To examine the geographic distribution of output;
- To discover the most frequently cited forms of documents in the journal.
- To study the length of articles;

Methodology

Scientometric analysis of seven volumes of Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research from volume 5 to 11 covering 14 issues containing 274 contributions was performed. All the bibliographic details were collected from the journal website and recorded in tabulated form for the purpose of in detail analysis. Based on the analysis of the recorded data, findings have been presented. All the bibliographic details related to volumes, issues, authors, contributions, year of publication, pagination, etc., were collected for the purpose of performing scientometric analysis as detailed given in below table 1.

Results and Discussion

Table-1: Year Wise Distribution of Contributions

Year	Volume No.	No. of Issues	No. of contribution	%
2010	5	2	33	12.04
2011	6	2	52	18.98
2012	7	2	41	14.96
2013	8	2	50	18.25
2014	9	2	35	12.77
2015	10	2	31	11.32
2016	11	2	32	11.68
Total			274	100.00

Year wise contribution of articles

Table 1 shows that maximum number of contributions 52(18.98%) were published in the year 2011, followed by 50(18.25%) publications in the year 2013 whereas minimum 31(11.32 %) number were published in the year 2015. Table 2 provides more specific details about distribution of contributors.

Table-2: Distribution of contributions

Issue	Volume No.							Total
	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
1	18	26	26	26	16	16	16	144
2	15	26	15	24	19	15	16	130
Total	33	52	41	50	35	31	32	274

Types of contributions

It is clear from the tables 3 that the types of contributions published in Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research are categorized into several types given below. Out of these all types, innovation in practice 51(18.61%) followed by professional development 49(17.88%), viewpoints 45(16.42%), editorial comments 32(11.68%) and conference spotlight 31(11.31%). However, theory & research 22(8.03%), book review 18(6.57%), editorial comments 14(5.11%) and profiles 12(4.38%).

Types of contributions

It is clear from the tables 3 that the types of contributions published in Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research are categorized into several types given below. Out of these all types, innovation in practice 51(18.61%) followed by professional development 49(17.88%), viewpoints 45(16.42%), editorial comments 32(11.68%) and conference spotlight 31(11.31%). However, theory & research 22(8.03%), book review 18(6.57%), editorial comments 14(5.11%) and profiles 12(4.38%).

Table-3: Types of Contributions

Sl. No.	Types of Article	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total	%
1	Editorial Comments	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	14	5.11
2	Innovation in practice	3	5	8	5	3	4	4	32	11.7
3	Theory & Research	6	10	9	7	6	8	5	51	18.6
4	Conference spotlight	2	2	5	2	3	4	4	22	8.03
5	Professional Development	1	6	4	4	6	5	5	31	11.3
6	Book Review	3	11	5	16	3	4	7	49	17.9
7	View Points	1	3	1	5	3	3	2	18	6.57
8	Profiles	8	11	7	8	8	1	2	45	16.4
9	News and Announcement	7	2	-	1	1	-	1	12	4.38
Total		33	52	41	50	35	31	32	274	100

Authorship patterns

It is clear from the table 4 that, single authors 187(71.92%) have made major contribution to the Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research during the stated periods, followed by two authors 41(15.77%), three authors 23(8.85%), Four authors 7(2.69%) and more than five authors 2(0.77%). However, the contribution of more than five authors 2(0.77%) is relatively minimum. This analysis indicates that single authors' contribution is more predominant than the joint authors.

Table-4: Authorship Pattern

Year	Vol. No	Issue No	No of authors contribution					Total
			Single	Two	Three	Four	>five	
2010	5	2	37	6	7	1	-	51
2011	6	2	27	4	4	-	-	35
2012	7	2	28	9	2	1	-	40
2013	8	2	29	8	1	-	1	39
2014	9	2	27	4	2	1	-	34
2015	10	2	18	7	4	1	-	30
2016	11	2	21	3	3	3	1	31
Total			187 (71.92%)	41 (15.77%)	23 (8.85%)	7 (2.69%)	2 (0.77%)	260 (100.00%)

Ranking of Authors

Table 5 presents rank list of authors who have contributed three articles in the different issues of Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research during

the period of this study. Only up to three contributions have been taken in this table to stay away from long list. The authors having same amount of contributions have been considered in the same rank. The ranking of authors have significant in scientometric study. It is revealed that the David Fox has positioned top rank in the list by contributing 10 articles, followed by Jennifer Richard scored second rank in the list by contributing 6 articles and Michael Dudley and Ian Murray Fraser scored third in the list by contributing 5 articles each. On the other hand Barbara Kelly, Mary Kandiuk and Michael Quinn Dudley has scored fourth rank by contributing 4 articles each whereas, Linwood DeLong, Maha Kumaran, Nicole Eva and Thumeka Mgwigwi have scored fifth rank by contributing 3 articles each.

Table-5: Ranking of Authors

Name of the Author	Contributions	Rank
David Fox	10	1
Jennifer Richard	6	2
Michael Dudley	5	3
Ian Murray Fraser	5	3
Barbara Kelly	4	4
Mary Kandiuk	4	4
Michael Quinn Dudley	4	4
Linwood DeLong	3	5
Maha Kumaran	3	5
Nicole Eva,	3	5
Thumeka Mgwigwi	3	5

Geographical distribution of contributors (country-wise)

Table 6 reveals that the geographical distribution of contributors country-wise. It is found that there are 264 contributions made by the authors from 7 different countries. Out of the total 264 contributors, Canada contributed the highest number of articles 251(95.07%) of total contributions. USA has received second highest position contributed 6(2.27%) articles. However, Australia and Tanzania contributed 2(0.76%) each followed by Germany, France and Spain contributed 1(0.38%) each. Only six countries namely USA, Australia, Tanzania, Germany, France and Spain have a record of individual contributions ranging from 1-6 articles. Furthermore, it reveals that only one top ranked country Canada has contributed altogether (95.07%). It is also indicates that 95 percent of contributions are made by only one country and the remaining 5 percent of contributions are from 6 countries. The overall analysis indicates that Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research has set policy for considerations of the quality articles.

Table-6: Geographical distribution (Country-wise)

Country	No. of Contributions	%
Canada	251	95.07
USA	6	2.27
Australia	2	0.76
Tanzania	2	0.76
Germany	1	0.38
France	1	0.38
Spain	1	0.38
Total	264	100.00

Bibliographical distribution of citations

It is one of the important aspects of scientometric study is to evaluate the bibliographical distribution of citations. In this study, the major bibliographical forms taken into consideration such as books, journals, websites, seminar/conference proceedings,

theses/dissertations and reports. Further, tables 7 & 8 reveals that the bibliographical forms wise distribution of citations and the year wise distribution of citations respectively. It is clear from the study that a majority of citations are taken from journals 1405(51.92%) followed by, reports 514(18.99%), websites 359(13.27%) and books 344(12.71%). Whereas, seminar/conference proceedings 70(2.59%) and theses 14(0.52%). As a result, it is clear that journal citations have played a key role in writing of scholarly piece of work in Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research.

Table-7: Distribution of Citations

Year	Volume No.	Issue No	Types of citations/references						Total
			BK	JL	WS	CP	TH/D	RP	
2010	5	1	24	92	2	7	-	77	202
		2	7	33	5	4	-	16	65
2011	6	1	35	158	54	5	3	35	290
		2	11	65	16	2	-	8	102
2012	7	1	43	165	53	5	2	23	291
		2	16	62	36	2	-	25	141
2013	8	1	33	124	22	-	-	9	188
		2	49	125	44	3	1	41	263
2014	9	1	14	68	11	6	-	25	124
		2	19	76	35	2	-	33	165
2015	10	1	31	120	24	10	-	37	222
		2	36	170	43	6	5	74	334
2016	11	1	11	59	6	-	-	15	91
		2	15	88	8	18	3	96	228
Total			344 (12.71%)	1405 (51.92%)	359 (13.27%)	70 (2.59%)	14 (0.52%)	514 (18.99%)	2706 (100.00%)

Table-8: Distribution of citations

Year	Volume No.	Types of citations/references							Total	%
		BK	JL	WS	CP	D/TH	RP			
2010	5	31	125	7	11	-	93	267	9.86	
2011	6	46	223	70	7	3	43	392	14.48	
2012	7	59	227	89	7	2	48	432	15.96	
2013	8	82	249	66	3	1	50	452	16.70	
2014	9	33	144	46	8	-	58	289	10.68	
2015	10	67	290	67	16	5	111	556	20.54	
2016	11	26	147	14	18	3	111	319	11.78	
Total		344	1405	359	70	14	514	2706	100.00	

Length of articles

Table 9 reveals that the average length of articles published in Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research is 19.571 pages. It further reflects that the publishing year 2011 accommodated the highest average length of 11 pages per article while, the lowest average length of 5 pages per article was noticed in the year 2010. Considering the average length of articles published in Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research, it is assumed that the journal provides the contributors an ample scope for exercising their thought contents comprehensively and exhaustively to justify their research findings as per their wish.

Table-9: Length of contributions

Year	Volume No.	Issue No	Length of contributions (No. of pages)					Total
			1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	>20	
2010	5	1	9	-	2	-	4	15
		2	7	1	1	1	2	12
2011	6	1	17	1	1	3	5	27
		2	18	6	3	1	-	28
2012	7	1	15	1	6	3	2	27
		2	6	1	6	-	2	15
2013	8	1	16	1	3	4	2	26
		2	13	6	1	1	3	24
2014	9	1	9	2	2	2	2	17
		2	10	3	4	2	-	19
2015	10	1	6	4	1	2	4	17
		2	4	3	1	3	4	15
2016	11	1	7	7	-	1	1	16
		2	6	4	-	1	5	16
Total			139 (50.73%)	40 (14.60%)	31 (11.31%)	24 (8.76%)	36 (13.14%)	274 (100.00%)

Summary of findings

- It shows that maximum number of contributions 52(18.98%) were published in the year 2011 whereas, minimum 31(11.32 %) number were published in the year 2015.
- Out of these all types, innovation in practice 51(18.61%) followed by professional development 49(17.88%), viewpoints 45(16.42%), editorial comments 32(11.68%) and conference spotlight 31(11.31%). However, theory & research 22(8.03%), book review 18(6.57%), editorial comments 14(5.11%) and profiles 12(4.38%).
- This analysis indicates that single authors' contribution 187(71.92%) is more predominant than the joint authors.
- The ranking of authors have significant in scientometric study. It is revealed that the David Fox has positioned top rank in the list by contributing 10 articles, followed by Jennifer Richard scored second rank in the list by contributing 6 articles and Michael Dudley and Ian Murray Fraser scored third in the list by contributing 5 articles each.
- Out of the total 264 contributors, Canada contributed the highest number of articles 251(95.07%) of total contributions. USA has received second highest position contributed 6(2.27%) articles.
- It is clear that journal citations have played a key role in writing of scholarly piece of work in Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research.
- It further reflects that the publishing year 2011 accommodated the highest average length of 11 pages per article while, the lowest average length of 5 pages per article was noticed in the year 2010.

Conclusion

Partnership: The Canadian journal of library and information practice and research is a reputed international referred journal in the field of library and information science exclusively devoted to the library and information science and its development of various aspects. Analysis of seven volumes of the journal shows that it publishes high quality articles leading with research papers, case studies, and general reviews contributed by the advanced researchers in the field of LIS. In this direction Partnership: The Canadian journal of library

and information practice and research has set due goal for reflection the quality of research articles around the world.

References

1. Guan, J & Ma, N. (2007). A Bibliometric study of China's Semiconductor Literature compared with other major Asian countries. *Scientometric*, 70 (1): 107-124.
2. Hussain, Akhtar & Fatima, Nishat (2011). A bibliometric analysis of the 'Chinese Librarianship: an International Electronic Journal, (2006-2010). *Chinese Librarianship: an International Electronic Journal*, 31. <http://www.iclc.us/cliej/cl31HF.pdf>
3. Kannappanavar, B. U., Swamy, C & Vijay Kumar, M. (2004). Publishing Trend of Indian Chemical Scientists: A Bibliometric Study. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, 51 (1): 39-41.
4. Khan, Imran (2016) A scientometric analysis of DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology (2010-2014), *Library Hi Tech News*, Vol. 33 Issue: 7, pp.8-12, <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHTN-03-2016-0014>
5. Kumara, Anil and Prakasan, E. R. and Mohan, Lalit and Kademani, B. S. and Kumar, Vijai *Bibliometric and Scientometric Studies in Physics and Engineering: Recent Ten Years Analysis.*, 2009 . In Putting Knowledge to Work: Best Practices in Librarianship, Mumbai (India), 1-2 May 2009.
6. Patra, S. K., Bhattacharya, P. & Verma, N. (2006). Bibliometric study of literature on bibliometrics. *DESIDOC Bulletin of Information Technology*, 26(1), 27-32.
7. Sanni, S. A & Zainab, A. N. (2010). Google Scholar as a source for citation and impact analysis for non-ISI indexed medical journal. *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, 15 (3), 2010; pp.35-51.
8. Singh J. K. (2012). A bibliometric analysis of LIBRI Journal (2001-2009), *Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services*, 2(1), 55-60.
9. Singh, J. K. (2014). *Research Journal of Library Sciences*, 1(2). 7-12.
10. Thanuskodi, S. (2010). Journal of social sciences: A bibliometric study. *Journal of Social Science*, 24(2), 77-80.
11. Velmurugan, C. & Radhakrishnan, N. (2015). Webology journal: a scientometric profile. *International Journal of Information Dissemination and Technology*, 5(2), 137-142.
12. Velmurugan, C. (2013). Bibliometric analysis with special reference to authorship pattern and collaborative research output of *Annals of Library and Information studies* for the year 2007-2012. *International Journal of Digital Library Services*, 3(3), 13-21.
13. Vijay, K R. & Raghavan, I. (2007). Journal of Food Science and Technology: A Bibliometric Study. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, 54 (4): 207-212.
14. Yeoh, K.H; & Kaur, K. (2008). Subject support in collection development: Using the bibliometric tool. *Collection Building*, 27(4), 157-166.

