

# Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans of Library and Information Science Schools

David F. Kohl and Charles H. Davis

*A study of the perceived prestige of a core group of library journals by directors of ARL libraries and library school deans reveals a prestige hierarchy for each group. Although in rough agreement on the rating of two-thirds of the journals, the deans and directors differ significantly on the ratings of the remaining one-third. The subset of ARL directors in institutions where librarians have faculty status as evidenced by tenure does not rate journals substantially more like library school deans than do ARL directors as a whole, and library school deans are shown to agree much more as a group on their ratings than the ARL directors.*



In the academic world one of the most important issues is the evaluation of publications, particularly journal publications.

These evaluations typically play a major role in promotion and tenure decisions and, in most cases, affect salary decisions as well. It has long been the conventional wisdom—and not just in the library field—that the evaluation of a journal article is influenced in part by the perceived prestige of the journal in which the article appears. Although purists may argue that an article should be evaluated only on its intrinsic merits and considered independently of any outside opinion or context, it is a difficult proposition to put into practice. The academic community is a community based on shared opinions, and the academic enterprise derives much of its strength from such interchange. The editors, assistant editors, boards, and referees involved in the publication of an academic or professional journal are

necessarily part of that community and appropriately so. Furthermore, each of their journals presents an ongoing public record of which articles they, in their individual or collective judgment, have considered of significance to the discipline or profession. The conventional wisdom is that not all these public records are equally well established or regarded and that consequently some journals are considered more prestigious than others.<sup>1</sup>

The issue which particularly intrigued us was whether there were any consensus in the perception of journal prestige, particularly insofar as publishing for promotion and tenure was concerned. The issue of consensus is important not only because consensus—or its lack—affects academic promotion and tenure, but because it can begin to tell us something about the way information is shared in the library profession. For instance, a high degree of consensus focused on only a few, closely related high-prestige journals would sug-

---

*David F. Kohl is assistant director for undergraduate services and Charles H. Davis is dean and professor of the Graduate School of Library and Information Science. Both are at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801.*

*We would like to acknowledge, with thanks, the advice and comments of Stephen Hay, Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.*

gest a structure of disseminating information very different from one in which there is no real consensus or one in which widely different kinds of journals are identified as having high prestige.

As a first step towards determining whether such a consensus existed, we decided to conduct an exploratory survey similar to the perception study used by White to rank programs in library and information science.<sup>2</sup> While perception studies have in the past engendered some criticism in academic circles as mere expressions of opinion, we felt that in the academic environment—where peer review and evaluation play a particularly important role—studies reflecting and reporting these perceptions were both appropriate and helpful.<sup>3</sup> The critical point in our view is how the findings are interpreted. A perception study is not a prescriptive statement of how the world should be, nor do perceptions necessarily change as quickly as the reality being perceived. Perceptions, like prejudices, often are remarkably resistant to change. The point is to understand and clarify a phenomenon that has powerful consequences.

### CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

A list of thirty-one core library journals was selected from Jesse H. Shera's "'hard-core' of library literature for the American Librarian."<sup>4</sup> We first added to it all new library publications since 1976, the date of Shera's article, to reflect the surge in new library periodical publications. We then pruned the list by excluding most special-interest publications, e.g., *Notes, Medical Library Bulletin*, and most foreign publications, e.g., *Canadian Library Journal, Library Association Record*, in order to focus on a core group of generally known library journals. The decision to exclude Canadian publications was particularly difficult and based on several factors. Although Canadian professionals were included in the population surveyed, they represented a distinct minority. Moreover, U.S. professionals may not often monitor Canadian publications, while their Canadian counterparts are highly aware of American journals and other periodicals. For these reasons, Canadian

journals were omitted in an effort to reduce the anticipated bias that might have resulted from their inclusion in this particular study. It is worth noting that this problem also existed in the case of the White survey of North American programs in library and information science.

The survey population chosen was divided into two groups, deans of all North American library schools having accredited programs (N=66) and ARL directors (N=85). These groups reflect the two major areas of librarianship where publishing for promotion and tenure is most likely to be important.

Individuals were asked to rank each of the journals familiar to them on a scale of one to five, depending on how important publication in that journal was for the consideration of promotion and tenure at their institution. If respondents were not familiar with a particular journal, they were asked to give no rating whatever. Respondents were also asked to identify, in no particular order, the five most prestigious journals (again in the context of tenure and promotion) and to indicate whether faculty status and tenure applied to their professional staff.

A one-page questionnaire using a Likert-scale format was sent out in fall 1982. A brief cover letter accompanied each questionnaire. Response was good enough that no follow-up was considered necessary. Usable responses were received from forty-seven (71.1 percent) of the library school deans and forty-three (50.6 percent) of the ARL directors. Inspection of identifiable responses indicated a generally representative sample of the larger population. In a few cases faculty bodies or promotion and tenure committees were polled, and multiple responses were returned. In these cases the responses were averaged into a single rating for the institution.

### ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The journals were rank-ordered for each of the two groups to see if there were enough consensus to form a hierarchy of perceived prestige. A single, weighted score for each journal was computed by summing each respondent's ranking for a

journal and dividing by the number of respondents. Since respondents were instructed not to rank any journal with which they were unfamiliar, no response was treated as a zero value in the framework of the questionnaire. Inspection showed the responses did form a hierarchy for each of the two groups, and table 1 shows the results of this overall ranking.

The second step was to determine how different or similar the rankings by ARL directors were from the rankings by library school deans. Inspection of table 1 reveals that there is no one-to-one uniformity. Consequently, means were computed for each journal, both as rated by ARL directors and as rated by library school deans, and each pair of means was

subjected to individual t-tests to determine whether the differences were statistically significant. Eleven of the thirty-one journals had significant scores at the .05 level. These are listed in table 2.

Since one or two type I errors can be expected at the .05 level of significance out of a group of thirty-one t-tests, a conservative estimate indicates that ARL directors and library school deans actually disagree on fewer than one-third of the rankings (see table 3). Of the journals where there is disagreement, subject matter is the clear cause in the majority of the cases.

The third step of the analysis involved determining the degree of internal group consensus revealed by the ratings of ARL directors and library school deans (see ta-

TABLE 1  
AVERAGE RANKING OF JOURNAL PRESTIGE IN TERMS  
OF VALUE FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

ARL Directors		Library School Deans	
Journal Title	Average Ranking	Journal Title	Average Ranking
<i>College and Research Libraries</i>	4.7381	<i>Library Quarterly</i>	4.5106
<i>Library Quarterly</i>	4.4048	<i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science (ASIS Journal)</i>	4.3830
<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	4.3810	<i>College and Research Libraries</i>	4.2128
<i>Library Resources and Technical Services</i>	4.3810	<i>Library Trends</i>	4.1489
<i>Library Trends</i>	4.2381	<i>Journal of Education for Librarianship</i>	3.8511
<i>Information Technology and Libraries (formerly Journal of Library Automation)</i>	4.1429	<i>Library Resources and Technical Services</i>	3.7872
<i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science (ASIS Journal)</i>	4.0952	<i>Drexel Library Quarterly</i>	3.5745
<i>Library Journal</i>	3.8571	<i>Special Libraries</i>	3.4255
<i>American Libraries</i>	3.5000	<i>Information Technology and Libraries (formerly Journal of Library Automation)</i>	3.4043
<i>RQ</i>	3.3810	<i>Library and Information Science Research (formerly Library Research)</i>	3.4043
<i>Special Libraries</i>	3.1667	<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	3.3830
<i>Wilson Library Bulletin</i>	2.9762	<i>Journal of Library History, Philosophy &amp; Comparative Librarianship</i>	3.3191
<i>Library and Information Science Research (formerly Library Research)</i>	2.8810	<i>Library Journal</i>	3.2128
<i>Journal of Library History, Philosophy &amp; Comparative Librarianship</i>	2.6667	<i>RQ</i>	3.1277
<i>Journal of Education for Librarianship</i>	2.5714	<i>School Library Media Quarterly (formerly School Media Quarterly)</i>	3.0426
<i>Collection Management</i>	2.5238	<i>American Libraries</i>	3.0213
<i>Library of Congress Quarterly Journal</i>	2.5238	<i>School Library Journal</i>	2.8298
<i>Drexel Library Quarterly</i>	2.4524	<i>Collection Management</i>	2.8085
<i>Harvard Library Bulletin</i>	2.3571	<i>Wilson Library Bulletin</i>	2.8085
<i>Microform Review</i>	2.2619	<i>Information Processing and Management</i>	2.7872
<i>Reference Services Review</i>	2.2143	<i>Law Library Journal</i>	2.5957
<i>Online</i>	2.1667	<i>Harvard Library Bulletin</i>	2.4468
<i>Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory</i>	2.0000	<i>Microform Review</i>	2.4043
<i>Information Processing and Management</i>	1.9286	<i>Public Libraries</i>	2.3404
<i>Public Libraries</i>	1.7381	<i>Library of Congress Quarterly Journal</i>	2.2979
<i>School Library Journal</i>	1.7381	<i>Online</i>	2.2979
<i>International Library Review</i>	1.5714	<i>Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory</i>	2.2128
<i>Micrographics Today</i>	1.5714	<i>International Library Review</i>	2.1915
<i>School Library Media Quarterly (formerly School Media Quarterly)</i>	1.5714	<i>Micrographics Today</i>	1.9574
<i>International Journal of Law Libraries</i>	1.5476	<i>Reference Services Review</i>	1.7660
<i>Law Library Journal</i>	1.5238	<i>International Journal of Law Libraries</i>	1.7021

TABLE 2  
JOURNALS WHOSE ARL AND LIBRARY SCHOOL  
RATINGS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY

Journals	ARL Rating	LS Rating	Significance Level
<i>College and Research Libraries</i>	4.7381	4.2128	.001
<i>Drexel Library Quarterly</i>	2.4524	3.5745	.001
<i>Information Processing and Management</i>	1.9286	2.7872	.032
<i>Journal of Education for Librarianship</i>	2.5714	3.8511	< .001
<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	4.3810	3.3830	< .001
<i>Information Technology and Libraries</i> (formerly <i>Journal of Library Automation</i> )	4.1429	3.4043	.006
<i>Law Library Journal</i>	1.5238	2.5957	.005
<i>Library Journal</i>	3.8571	3.2128	.005
<i>Library Resources and Technical Services</i>	4.3810	3.7872	.001
<i>School Library Journal</i>	1.7381	2.8298	< .001
<i>School Library Media Quarterly</i> (formerly <i>School Media Quarterly</i> )	1.5714	3.0426	< .001

TABLE 3  
DEGREE OF INTERNAL CONSENSUS AMONG  
ARL DIRECTORS IN JOURNAL RATINGS

Journal	Top Adjacent* Totals	% of Total	Standard Deviation
<i>College and Research Libraries</i>	42 (4,5)	100.0	0.445
<i>Library Quarterly</i>	38 (4,5)	90.5	0.989
<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	37 (4,5)	88.1	0.764
<i>Information Technology and Libraries</i> (formerly <i>Journal of Library Automation</i> )	36 (4,5)	85.7	1.072
<i>Library Resources and Technical Services</i>	36 (4,5)	85.7	0.731
<i>Library Trends</i>	35 (4,5)	83.3	1.358
<i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science (ASIS Journal)</i>	33 (4,5)	78.6	1.322
<i>Library Journal</i>	32 (4,5)	76.2	1.072
<i>American Libraries</i>	25 (4,5)	59.5	1.366
<i>International Journal of Law Libraries</i>	25 (0,1)	59.5	1.837
<i>International Library Review</i>	25 (0,1)	59.7	1.876
<i>Law Library Journal</i>	25 (0,1)	59.5	1.864
<i>Collection Management</i>	24 (3,4)	57.1	1.784
<i>RQ</i>	24 (3,4)	57.1	1.396
<i>Micrographics Today</i>	23 (0,1)	54.8	1.727
<i>School Library Media Quarterly</i> (formerly <i>School Media Quarterly</i> )	23 (0,1)	54.8	1.595
<i>Special Libraries</i>	23 (4,5)	54.8	1.710
<i>Library and Information Science Research</i> (formerly <i>Library Research</i> )	22 (4,5)	52.4	2.015
<i>School Library Journal</i>	22 (0,1)	52.4	1.594
<i>Information Processing and Management</i>	21 (0,1)	50.0	1.993

\*The sum of the two highest adjacent ratings ( ) = adjacent ratings

bles 3 and 4). Taking a heuristic approach, we chose to sum the responses in the two top adjacent score categories for each of the journals in each group. For example, the top two adjacent score categories for *College & Research Libraries*, as ranked by ARL directors, were four and five. Together these two categories accounted for 100% of the responses—an indication of a strong degree of internal consensus. Use of standard deviation was considered but

rejected as an inappropriate measure, both because it lacked the intuitive clarity of the heuristic approach and because it was too sensitive to extreme scores. In spite of these observations, the standard deviations for these scores also have been included for purposes of comparison.

Considering the number of journals where the sum of the combined responses totals half or more of the total responses, it is clear that there is almost half again the

TABLE 4  
DEGREE OF INTERNAL CONSENSUS AMONG LIBRARY  
SCHOOL DEANS IN JOURNAL RATINGS

Journal	Top Adjacent Totals	% of Total	Standard Deviation
<i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science (ASIS Journal)</i>	45 (4,5)	95.7	0.795
<i>Library Quarterly</i>	43 (4,5)	91.5	1.120
<i>College and Research Libraries</i>	40 (4,5)	85.1	0.883
<i>Library Trends</i>	39 (4,5)	83.0	1.000
<i>Journal of Education for Librarianship</i>	35 (4,5)	74.5	1.161
<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	35 (3,4)	74.5	1.153
<i>Drexel Library Quarterly</i>	34 (3,4)	72.3	1.118
<i>Library Resources and Technical Services</i>	34 (3,4)	72.3	0.907
<i>American Libraries</i>	33 (3,4)	70.2	1.011
<i>Library Journal</i>	33 (3,4)	70.2	1.020
<i>Collection Management</i>	32 (3,4)	68.1	1.439
<i>Journal of Library History, Philosophy &amp; Comparative Librarianship</i>	31 (3,4)	66.0	1.400
<i>Library and Information Science Research (formerly Library Research)</i>	31 (4,5)	66.0	1.728
<i>School Library Journal</i>	31 (2,3)	66.0	1.090
<i>Information Technology and Libraries (formerly Journal of Library Automation)</i>	30 (4,5)	63.8	1.378
<i>Microform Review</i>	30 (2,3)	63.8	1.192
<i>RQ</i>	30 (3,4)	63.8	1.329
<i>Special Libraries</i>	30 (3,4)	63.8	1.137
<i>Wilson Library Bulletin</i>	30 (3,4)	63.8	0.992
<i>Public Libraries</i>	29 (2,3)	61.7	1.273
<i>School Library Media Quarterly (formerly School Media Quarterly)</i>	29 (3,4)	61.7	1.398
<i>Information Processing and Management</i>	28 (3,4)	59.6	1.731
<i>Online</i>	28 (3,4)	59.6	1.428
<i>Micrographics Today</i>	26 (2,3)	55.3	1.474
<i>Law Library Journal</i>	26 (3,4)	55.3	1.624
<i>Reference Services Review</i>	25 (2,3)	53.2	1.402
<i>Library of Congress Quarterly (Quarterly of Library of Congress)</i>	24 (3,4)	51.1	1.545

degree of internal consensus among library school deans in their ranking of journals as there is among ARL directors. Twenty-seven journals were ranked by over half of the library school deans in one or another of two adjacent top categories. Furthermore, such ranking covered a broad spectrum of scores, ranging from the two-three level through the four-five level. The same degree of consensus was reached by ARL directors on only twenty journals and only at the extremes. With only two exceptions, all the ARL directors' scores were in the four-five or zero-one range. Clearly, library school deans show a relatively high degree of consensus among themselves on how a journal's prestige is perceived, while ARL directors show what seems to be only a moderate degree of consensus.

The fourth step in the analysis involved ascertaining the degree to which those ARL directors whose institutions accorded librarians faculty status (as evidenced by tenure) would compare with li-

brary school deans. To determine the degree, a Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed on the Likert means of the library school directors versus the ARL directors' means as a total group and also versus the subset (N=27) of ARL directors whose professionals had faculty status as evidenced by tenure. Although there was a statistically significant correlation (.001) for both pairings, the increase in correlation provided by the subset ( $r^2 = .5649$ ) over the full group ( $r^2 = .5246$ ) was negligible.

Two other issues were of interest to us. The first was the degree to which the list of journals selected did indeed represent a core. A category of "other" was included so that respondents could indicate journals that they felt should be added. Twelve of the ARL respondents and sixteen of the library school directors suggested additional journals. These journals and the frequency with which they were mentioned are given in table 5. Only three journals were suggested by more than two

TABLE 5  
 ADDITIONAL JOURNALS SUGGESTED AS IMPORTANT IN TERMS OF  
 PUBLISHING FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

ARL Directors		Library School Deans	
Journals	# of votes	Journals	# of votes
<i>The Serials Librarian</i>	3	<i>Journal of Documentation</i>	5
<i>Government Publications Review</i>	2	<i>Libri</i>	4
<i>Oklahoma Librarian</i>	1	<i>Journal of Library Administration</i>	2
<i>Southeastern Librarian</i>	1	<i>Public Library Quarterly</i>	2
<i>Libri</i>	1	<i>Journal of Librarianship</i>	2
<i>The Chronicle of Higher Education</i>	1	<i>UNESCO Journal of Information Science</i>	
<i>The Education Board</i>	1	<i>Librarianship and Archives</i>	
<i>Vine</i>	1	<i>Administration</i>	2
<i>State Library Association Bulletins/Journals</i>	1	<i>Canadian Library Journal</i>	2
<i>PNLA Quarterly</i>	1	<i>Information Reports and Bibliographies</i>	1
(Vague or illegible responses)	1	<i>Public Library Review</i>	1
		<i>Government Publications Review</i>	1
		<i>Ontario Library Review</i>	1
		<i>Medical Library Assoc. Bulletin</i>	1
		<i>IFLA Journal</i>	1
		<i>ASLIB Proceedings</i>	1
		<i>OnLine Review</i>	1
		(Vague or illegible responses)	2

respondents. Two of these, *Libri* and the *Journal of Documentation* had been excluded by our original criteria and the third, *The Serials Librarian*, was mentioned by only three respondents. Accordingly, we believe that our choice of core library journals was affirmed.

The second issue involved the possible identification of a select subset of particularly high-ranked journals. We asked respondents to circle the five most important library journals in the context of publishing for tenure and promotion. This approach provided data for a method of ranking that had a quite different basis from that on which table 1 is based, because the "top five" approach allows no value to be added to a journal's score when given a medium or poor ranking. However, it does provide a simple and direct means for identifying the top journals. This method corresponds to the method used by White in his study of library school programs. The data are shown in table 6.

These data underline the strong degree of consensus on journal prestige among responding library school deans. The top five journals ranked by this method correspond exactly to the order of ranking in table 1 and, with only minor variations, to the order presented in table 4. The ARL directors show a similar consensus only

with their very top-ranked journal, i.e., top-ranked on all three of their tables (tables 1, 3 and 5). After that, the rankings based on the "top five" method increasingly vary from the rank order established by the Likert scale in tables 1 and 3.

These data suggest caution in the use of a "top five" selection methodology to rank-order items. Such an approach works well when there is a strong consensus within the group. However, the less the responses are clustered around a relatively few items, the less reliable the method. In a situation showing diffuse ratings, the advantage of the Likert-scale approach is that it allows secondary and tertiary ratings to influence the ranking. Respondents are not forced into extreme choices such as a "top five" rating or nothing, and so a fuller and more balanced picture emerges. The data also suggest that the use of a nonordered "top five" approach to rank data may not be reliable in this kind of survey when the consensus on a ranking drops much below 40 percent of the survey population.

#### SUMMARY

The data show that there is a perceived hierarchy of journal prestige. This may influence where authors send their manuscripts for publication, and, once published, the value that the article has for

TABLE 6  
JOURNALS RELATED AMONG TOP FIVE IN THE LIBRARY FIELD

ARL Directors			Library School Deans		
Journal Title	# of* votes	% of total	Journal Title	# of votes	% of total
<i>College &amp; Research Libraries</i>	22	.5116	<i>Library Quarterly</i>	29	.6170
<i>Library Quarterly</i>	17	.3953	<i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science (ASIS Journal)</i>	23	.4893
<i>Library Trends</i>	13	.3023	<i>College &amp; Research Libraries</i>	22	.4680
<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	12	.2970	<i>Library Trends</i>	19	.4042
<i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science (ASIS Journal)</i>	10	.2325	<i>Journal of Education for Librarianship</i>	12	.2553
<i>Library Resources &amp; Technical Services</i>	8	.1860	<i>Library &amp; Information Science Research (formerly Library Research)</i>	7	.1489
<i>Library Journal</i>	5	.1162	<i>Information Technology &amp; Libraries (formerly Journal of Library Automation)</i>	5	.1063
<i>Information Technology &amp; Libraries (formerly Journal of Library Automation)</i>	4	.0930	<i>Library Resources &amp; Technical Services</i>	5	.1063
<i>American Libraries</i>	3	.0697	<i>School Library Media Quarterly (formerly School Media Quarterly)</i>	5	.1063
<i>Library &amp; Information Science Research (formerly Library Research)</i>	3	.0697	<i>Drexel Library Quarterly</i>	4	.0851
<i>Harvard Library Bulletin</i>	2	.0465	<i>Journal of Library History, Philosophy &amp; Comparative Librarianship</i>	4	.0851
<i>RQ</i>	2	.0465	<i>RQ</i>	4	.0851
<i>Special Libraries</i>	2	.0465	<i>Information Processing &amp; Management</i>	3	.0638
<i>Collection Management</i>	1	.0232	<i>Library of Congress Quarterly Journal</i>	3	.0638
<i>Drexel Library Quarterly</i>	1	.0232	<i>Law Library Journal</i>	2	.0425
<i>Library of Congress Quarterly Journal</i>	1	.0232	<i>Library Journal</i>	2	.0425
<i>Microform Review</i>	1	.0232	<i>American Libraries</i>	1	.0212
<i>Wilson Library Bulletin</i>	1	.0232	<i>International Library Review</i>	1	.0212
			<i>Journal of Academic Librarianship</i>	1	.0212
			<i>Microform Review</i>	1	.0212
			<i>Special Libraries</i>	1	.0212

\*Not all ranked top five and not who did listed five

tenure and promotion purposes. Not all journals are perceived as having equal "track records" for identifying those authors and materials contributing significantly to the growth and development of the profession. It is interesting to note that responding library school deans and ARL directors are in fundamental agreement on the rankings of two-thirds of the journals. We find this reassuring evidence of a common intellectual community and dialogue between educators and practitioners. More intriguing, perhaps, is the smaller group of journals on whose rating library school deans and ARL directors disagree. While in most cases the journals on which there is disagreement are predictable, they do provide insights into the priorities and interests of the two groups.

The data show that library school deans appear to have a much greater consensus on the ranking of journal prestige than do directors of ARL libraries. Library school deans represent a smaller group than the ARL directors, and we suspect that the former may be a more cohesive and interactive group. Also, the stronger research and publication environment of library school deans probably means that the significance of journal prestige, as well as publishing in general, plays a more central role in their lives than it does in the world of ARL directors.

It is interesting that the subset of ARL responses from institutions granting tenure to their library professionals is not a substantially better predictor of journal ratings by library school deans than the

ratings provided by the ARL group as a whole. Additionally, it was gratifying to find that the selection of core journals in library and information science was affirmed, although there may well be an element of self-fulfilling prophecy in the presentation of any list. It is also possible that the rating of *Library Trends* was affected somewhat, because both surveyors are associated with the University of Illinois, where it is published.

At least two directions for further research seem worth considering. The first is the degree to which school or public librarians would concur with the rankings established here. Although the question of journal prestige could not be approached in terms of the promotion and tenure issue, it might work as well simply to ask the question in terms of importance to their professional work. Such surveys might help determine the extent to which librarianship represents a single and coherent profession.

The second direction would involve tak-

ing a close look at the ranking of the journals to determine whether there are objective factors that correlate with journal prestige. A citation analysis might be particularly revealing in the context of a prestige hierarchy. Presumably the articles in the high-prestige journals would be more cited than articles in the less prestigious journals.

In conclusion, it should be stressed that in a world where opinions change, judgments differ, and mistakes are made, the prestige of a journal is only an indication, not a guarantee of the quality of its articles. It is also important to keep in mind that, in this particular study, several worthwhile journals were excluded by design and so not rated at all. Furthermore, librarians as a group do not publish only in library journals.<sup>5</sup> These are important limitations in the scope and nature of such a study, and they must be considered in order to maintain a proper perspective on the findings reported.

---

## REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. The issue of identifying "quality" journals appears to be particularly important for library school deans. Kingsbury's study of the evaluation of library school faculty, for instance, showed that the current use and importance assigned by library school deans to "articles in quality journals" was second only to "books or sole or senior author" in both programs that grant the Ph.D. and programs that do not. While "publications in all professional journals" was ranked tenth in importance in Ph.D. programs, it tied for third place with "honors or awards from profession" in programs not granting the Ph.D.  
The difference between publishing in "quality" journals or "all professional journals" increased even further when library school deans were asked about which criterion *should* be used to evaluate library school faculty. In this case "articles in quality journals" was ranked first in importance by deans in Ph.D.-granting programs, compared to twelfth place for "publications in all professional journals"; while deans in programs that do not grant the Ph.D. continued to rank "articles in quality journals" second after "books or sole or senior author" but ahead of "publications in all professional journals," which they ranked in a tie for sixth place in importance.
2. Mary Kingsbury, "How Library Schools Evaluate Faculty Performance," *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 22:219-38 (Sept. 1982).
3. Herbert S. White, "Perceptions By Educators and Administrators of the Ranking of Library School Programs," *College & Research Libraries* 42:191-202 (May 1981).
4. Such studies, for example, have been heavily used to rate graduate and professional school programs; see David R. Gerhan, "Graduate & Professional School Rankings: Facing the Need to Know," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 5:215-21 (Sept. 1979).
5. Jesse H. Shera, *Introduction to Library Science* (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1976).
6. See, for instance, Priscilla Geahigan and others, "Acceptability of Non-Library/Information Science Publications in the Promotion & Tenure of Academic Librarians," *College & Research Libraries* 42:571-75 (Nov. 1981).