Florida State University Libraries

2011

Evaluating Journal Quality: Is the H-index a Better Measure than Impact Factors?

David R. Hodge and Jeffrey R. Lacasse

Evaluating Journal Quality:

Is the H-index a Better Measure than Impact Factors?

David R. Hodge, Ph.D.

&

Jeffrey R. Lacasse, Ph.D.

Arizona State University

David R. Hodge, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, Arizona State University, and Senior Nonresident Fellow, Program for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society, University of Pennsylvania. Jeffrey R. Lacasse, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, Arizona State University. Correspondence can be addressed to the first author at: Mail Code 3271, 4701 West Thunderbird Road, Glendale, AZ 85306-4908.

Abstract

Objectives: This study evaluates the utility of a new measure—the h-index—that may provide a more valid approach to evaluating journal quality in the social work profession. **Methods**: H-index values are compared with Thomson ISI five-year impact factors and expert opinion. **Results**: As hypothesized, the h-index correlates highly with ISI five-year impact factors; but exhibits closer agreement with expert opinion, particularly with high familiarity disciplinary journals. **Conclusions**: This evidence of convergent and discriminatory validity suggests that the h-index may have some utility in assessing social work journals. Notable advantages of the h-index include its compatibility with the profession's applied research culture and its ability to be used with essentially all journals in which social workers publish.

Key Words:

Evaluating Journal Quality:

Is the H-index a Better Measure than Impact Factors?

The quality of social work's academic journals is an important professional concern (SSWR Presidential Task Force on Publications, 2008). Journal quality influences the venue selected to publish new findings, the tenure and promotion process, funding success, and even departmental rankings (Cameron, 2005; Green, 2008; Ligon & Thyer, 2001). A journal's quality is a primary factor in its readership, impact on practice, and use in educational settings (Cnaan, Caputo & Shmuely, 1994).

Two methods are commonly used to evaluate journal quality: reputation and citation approaches (Sellers, Perry & Smith, 2004). In the former method, a sample of experts is asked to evaluate journals. This approach has been used in social work to determine perceptions of overall quality (Sellers, Mathiesen, Smith & Perry Robin, 2006), and prestige (Cnaan et al., 1994; Sellers et al., 2004).

Although reputation based approaches represent an important contribution to the literature, they are characterized by a number of limitations, of which perhaps the most prominent flow from the subjective nature of the approach (Sellers et al., 2004). Journal reputation is ostensibly a proxy for quality and may not reflect actual quality. For instance, journals may be ranked highly due to achieving a level of excellence in the past, even though their current performance is relatively modest. Alternatively, respondents may rank journals with which they are unfamiliar poorly, even though they perform well using other measures.

Due to these limitations, citation approaches are widely used (Furr, 1995). This method relies upon the tabulation of citations, based the assumption that higher quality work will be cited more frequently. It is important to note that limitations are also associated with the citation approach. For instance, citations can be listed inaccurately causing miscounts (Spivey & Wilks, 2004). Nevertheless, since this approach is based upon actual publication behavior, it is commonly viewed as the most objective, reliable approach to classifying journal quality (Holden, Rosenberg & Karker, 2005).

The most influential citation approach is the impact factor featured in the Journal Citation Reports (JCR) produced by Thomson ISI Web of Knowledge (Green & Baskind, 2007; Jenson, 2005; Seipel, 2003). The yearly JCR (2008) purport to offer a systematic, quantifiable, objective method to evaluate the leading journals in the world. As Olden (2007) notes, it is recognized as the *de facto* measure for assessing journal quality across the sciences.

Below, we overview the construction of the impact factor, discuss three limitations that are particularly pertinent to social work, and propose an alternative approach. We are sympathetic to those who question the quantification of journals and other aspects of the social science project (Martinez-Brawley & Zorita, 2007). However, given widespread use of impact factors as a means of ranking journals, from a pragmatic perspective, it seems advisable to ensure that the process used to evaluate journals is as accurate and professionally appropriate as possible.

<div align="center">Impact Factors</div>

A journal's impact factor is defined as the average number of times articles from the journal, which have been published in the past two years, have been cited in the present year by journals indexed by Thomson ISI (Journal Citation Reports, 2008). Thus, the impact factor is calculated by dividing the number of citations in the most recent calendar year (e.g., 2010) by the total number of articles published in the previous two years (i.e., 2008-09). If a journal recorded an impact factor of 1.0 in 2010 that means articles published in 2009 or 2008 have been cited, on average, one time in 2010.

In spite of its wide use, the impact factor has been the subject of numerous criticisms (Brumback, 2009). Many of these are reviewed in the following articles (Cameron, 2005; Favaloro, 2009; Holden, Rosenberg, Barker & Onghena, 2006; PLoS Medicine Editors, 2006; Seglen, 1997). Three limitations particularly relevant to social work are the use of the two year citation window, the reliance upon the mean in computing impact factors, and the limited number of journals indexed by Thomson ISI.

Two Year Citation Window

A significant limitation of the impact factor is the two year window in which citations are counted (Ligon & Thyer, 2005). This window was originally adopted because of its fit with knowledge dissemination patterns in biochemistry and molecular biology (Leydesdorff, 2008). In such disciplines, knowledge advances quickly and ideas are published rapidly.

In disciplines with different norms regarding either scholarship shelf-life or publication times, the two year window provides a poor assessment of journal impact (Cameron, 2005). For example, in disciplines with long publication times, significant portions of the literature are simply unavailable to authors at the time the manuscript is written. A study in social psychology found that, for the typical paper at submission, approximately two-thirds of the literature that could have affected impact factors was not yet published (McGarty, 2000). In business, a similar study found that 88% of the literature that could theoretically have been included at the time of submission had yet to be published (Harzing & van der Wal, 2009).

Research examining publication times in social work indicates similar problems (Barker & Thyer, 2005; Epstein, 2004). For instance, Barker and Thyer (2005) found that the average time from submission to initial decision letter was 16.35 weeks ($SD = 23.30$), and from acceptance letter to print was 10.90 months ($SD = 6.46$). Studies require time to write, are rarely accepted without at least one set of revisions (which require time to address and another round of reviewer assessment), and to appear in academic databases such as Social Work Abstracts. For a typical manuscript, approximately 27 months might conceivably elapse from the time the literature search was conducted to the time of publication in a database: 4 months (to draft and submit manuscript) + 4 months (to receive initial decision letter with reviewers' comments) + 3 months (to revise and resubmit manuscript) + 4 months (to receive acceptance letter) + 11 months (to publish) + 1 month (to appear in academic database). Thus, a paper that appears in a database in March of 2010 could not have any effect on the journal's impact factor because the literature for 2008-9 was not in existence at the time the literature search was conducted.

Recognizing that it takes longer than two years to disseminate and respond to published works in many disciplines, Thomson ISI introduced a five year impact factor in 2007 (Journal

Citation Reports, 2008). This represents a step in the right direction since, even if publication times could theoretically be eliminated, the applied nature of social work scholarship suggests that research remains relevant far beyond two years (Favaloro, 2009; Jacobs, 2009). Using a five year window to count citations, instead of a two year window, would seem to represent movement towards a more valid measure, although longer time periods have been suggested (Ha, Tan & Soo, 2006).

It is unclear, however, how widely used the new five year impact factor is in social work. In the JCR, the default "impact factor" continues to use the traditional two year window. In addition, the method in which the impact factor is calculated, regardless of whether a two year or a five year window is used, may compound the problems discussed above.

Reliance Upon the Mean

As noted above, the computation of impact factors is based upon the average number of citations. For normal distributions, the mean is an appropriate statistic. When distributions are skewed, means are inappropriate measures of central tendency since they are disproportionately sensitive to the effects of outliers (Weinbach & Grinnell, 1997).

Research suggests that citation distributions are rarely, if ever, normal (Holden et al., 2006; Seglen, 1997). Seglen (1997) found highly skewed citation distributions; only a few articles were close to the population mean. Some 15% of the articles accounted for 50% of the citations. Fifty percent of the articles accounted for 90% of the citations. Put differently, the most cited half of papers was cited nine times as often as the least cited half.

In short, heavily cited articles distort a journal's impact factor. Review articles, which are common in social work, are one such source of bias since they tend to be disproportionately cited (Leydesdorff, 2008; Seglen, 1997). Another source of bias stems from the choice of journals covered by Thomson ISI.

Journal Coverage

The journals indexed by Thomson ISI directly effects impact factors (Holden, Barker, Covert-Vail, Rosenberg & Cohen, 2008). In order for journal citations to be counted, the journal

must be indexed. Thomson ISI only covers a small portion of journals (Cameron, 2005).

According to some estimates, 126,000 scientific journals exist globally (Whitehouse, 2001). In

comparison, Thomson ISI contains data from some 5,900 journals in science and technology, and

just 1,700 journals in the social sciences (Journal Citation Reports, 2008).

The 2008 JCR, the latest available at the time this paper was written, included just 29

journals in the social work category. In addition, many of these journals are arguably

interdisciplinary in nature (e.g., *Child Welfare*) or extra-disciplinary (e.g., *Journal of Community

Psychology*). Thus, relatively few of the over 70 disciplinary social work journals appear to be

covered by Thomson ISI (Thyer, 2005).

The under-representation of social work journals produces an inaccurate picture of

journal citation counts (Jacobs, 2009). Legitimate citations are not factored into impact factors

because the journals, and other relevant academic sources (e.g., books), are not covered

(Cameron, 2005). Below, an alternative method is proposed for assessing journal quality that

may be more accurate and inclusive.

The H-index: An Alternative to Impact Factors

Although recent in origin, the h-index has had a "spectacularly quick success" and has

become a well-established tool for measuring scientific performance (Radicchi, Fortunato &

Castellano, 2008). Developed by physicist J.E. Hirsch (2005), the h-index is a measure of both

quality (number of citations) and quantity (number of publications). An h-index value of X is

obtained if an entity has X publications that have all been cited at least X times. Thus, a journal

would have an h-index value of 20 if 20 of its articles had been cited at least 20 times each. An

h-index of 10 would indicate 10 articles that had each been cited at least 10 times.

The h-index, while originally developed to assess scholarship at the individual level, has

been used to evaluate journal quality in a number of fields. Included among these are business

(Saad, 2006), ecology (Olden, 2007), economics (Harzing & van der Wal, 2008a),

pharmacology, psychiatry (Bador & Lafouge, 2009), forestry (Vanclay, 2008), management

(Ashkanasy, 2007), and across the sciences (Braun, Glanzel & Schubert, 2006). Although a

journal's h-index value can be calculated with data from Thomson ISI, Elsevier's Scopus, or Google Scholar, it is often used with the latter. This combination offers several advantages relative to Thomson ISI impact factors (Harzing & van der Wal, 2009).

First, the h-index metric is not limited to a fixed time period. The citation window can be set at whatever time frame is most appropriate for a given discipline. H-index values have been calculated using various citation windows, including one year (Braun et al., 2006), two years (Bador & Lafouge, 2009 in press), five years (Harzing & van der Wal, 2008a) and longer (Olden, 2007; Saad, 2006; Vanclay, 2008).

Second, since the h-index is not based upon the mean, it attenuates the effect of highly cited articles on computations of journal quality. Indeed, the h-index is unaffected by those few papers that are highly cited. In keeping with its design (Hirsch, 2005), the h-index emphasizes sustained and durable performance, rather than a few one hit wonders. As such, it more accurately reflects the unit of analysis, which is journals, rather than individual articles (Harzing & van der Wal, 2009).

Third, Google Scholar provides much wider coverage of the social science literature, relative to Thomson ISI (Baneyx, 2008; Harzing & van der Wal, 2008a; Walters, 2009). A number of studies have examined the citation coverage of Google Scholar and Thomson ISI from different perspectives (Bakkalbasi, Bauer, Glover & Wang, 2006; Clarke, 2008; Jacobs, 2009; Falagas, Pitsouni, Malietzis & Pappas, 2008; Kulkarni, Aziz, Shams & Busse, 2009; Kousha & Thelwall, 2008; Meho & Yang, 2007; Mikki, 2010; Smith, 2008). Both databases have their respective advantages and limitations, which are somewhat discipline dependent. In general, Google Scholar captures more citations, but more noise (e.g., non-academic citations). Thomson ISI is more rigorous but fails to harvest many academically relevant citations, particularly in the social sciences. For instance, Jacobs (2009) examined citation coverage for four sociology journals, perhaps the nearest disciplinary neighbor to social work in which comparisons have been conducted (Althouse, West, Bergstrom & Bergstrom, 2009). She found that Google

Scholar, relative to Thomson ISI, captured more citations for every journal, including over twice as many citations for *Gender and Society*.

Although variation exists from discipline to discipline, h-index values derived from Thomson ISI and Google Scholar tend to exhibit modest to strong correlations. Coefficients of .55 to 66 have been reported for management journals (Harzing & van der Wal, 2008b), .61 for disciplinary computer science journals (Franceschet, 2010), .78 for interdisciplinary computer science journals (Franceschet, 2010), and .93 for forestry journals (Vanclay, 2008). Although well correlated, Google Scholar tends to produce higher h-index values due to the wider coverage of academic source material (Franceschet, 2010). Due in part to the perceived increase in accuracy, Google Scholar is increasingly being used in citation-based analyses (Ashkanasy, 2007; Baneyx, 2008; Keloharju, 2008; Lee, Kraus & Couldwell, 2009; Mingers, 2009; Moussa & Touzani, 2010).

These three rationales suggest that a Google Scholar h-index may be a better measure of journal quality than Thomson ISI impact factors in social work. The flexible time frame, the computational method that emphasizes quality and quantity, and the superior source coverage may yield more valid depictions of journal quality. Hypotheses that reflect this perspective are delineated below.

<div align="center">Hypotheses</div>

This study examines the utility of the h-index with social work journals by comparing h-index values obtained with Google Scholar with: 1) an established measure of journal quality—five year impact factors obtained from Thomson ISI and, 2) expert opinion—reputation rankings based upon faculty perceptions of empirical quality. First, it is posited that h-index values will correlate highly with five year impact factors.

Since both measures purport to evaluate the same construct, journal quality, they should exhibit a relatively high correlation (Babbie, 2007). Measures that assess the same entity are typically understood to be highly correlated (Kline, 2000). If a low correlation exists, then it is questionable whether or not the measures are tapping the same construct.

Second, it is posited that faculty perceptions of empirical quality will correlate more highly with h-index values than with five year impact factors. The h-index appears to be a more accurate measure of journal quality than the impact factor, and Google Scholar covers more of the social science literature than Thomson ISI. As are result of these two improvements, the Google Scholar h-index should be correlated somewhat more strongly with faculty perceptions of empirical quality, relative to Thomson ISI impact factors.

These two hypotheses are tested with: 1) all the journals that comprise the JCR social work category and 2) a subset of disciplinary specific, American based journals with which United States based faculty may be more familiar. The methods used to test these hypotheses are described below.

Method

Data Sources

Five year impact factors were obtained for all 29 journal listed in the social work category from Thomson ISI 2008 JCR (2008), which was the most current year at the time of the study. Thus, the impact factors were based upon cites to articles in the previous five years, or the 2003-07 time frame. As noted above, the five year citation window is a more valid time period for social work journals.

Faculty ratings of empirical quality were drawn from Sellers and associates' work (2004; 2006). Although faculty were surveyed in 2000, perceptions of journal quality are relatively stable across decades. Sellers and associates reported a Spearman correlation of 0.77 between perceptions of quality in 2000 and perceptions of quality obtained 10 years earlier in a similar study by Cnaan and associates (1994).

H-index values were computed using Harzing's (2010) Publish or Perish, version 2.8, available at (http://www.harzing.com/pop.htm). This free software program retrieves and analyzes academic citations using Google Scholar as the data source. This program has been used to conduct citation analysis in a number of disciplines (Ashkanasy, 2007; Franceschet,

2010; Keloharju, 2008; Lee et al., 2009; Mingers, 2009; Moussa & Touzani, 2010; Vanclay, 2008). It is designed to compute h-index values for academic journals.

Procedures

To compute the h-value for each of the 29 journals in the JCR social work category, searches were conducted following the procedures outlined in the Publish or Perish software manual. In keeping with previous research comparing the h-index with impact factors, the parameters were set to cover the years 2003-07 to correspond to the five year impact time period (Bador & Lafouge, 2009 in press). Where relevant, searches were conducted using spelling/grammatical variations (e.g., "and" and "&"). In addition, searches were conducted using each journal's ISSN. The query results were compared and assessed for incomplete or inaccurate results.

The initial searches were conducted in the winter of 2009-10. A subsequent search was conducted in early spring 2010 to ensure the reliability of the h-index values. The results of the two searchers were almost perfectly correlated (r_s = .99, p < .001). The research was conducted with the approval of the institutional review board at the authors' university.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 17. Distributions were examined to ensure that the assumption of normality was supported for each variable. Although Spearman correlation coefficients are reported, analysis was conducted with both parametric and non-parametric statistical procedures. The same general pattern of results emerged in both cases.

<div align="center">Results</div>

JCR Social Work Category

Table 1 lists the 29 social work journals and their associated five year impact factors, h-index values, and empirical quality ratings, with the exception of two journals that were not evaluated by Sellers and associates (2004). The Table is ranked in order of decreasing h-index values. Interestingly, of the three variables, only the five year impact factor had a somewhat skewed distribution (Skewness = 1.65, Kurtosis = 2.97). Analysis with the Kolmogorov-

Smirnov procedure indicated that the assumption of normality was not supported for this variable, $D(29) = 0.20$, $p = .005$.

[Place Table 1 about here]

The first hypothesis was that h-index values would correlate highly with five year impact factors. This hypothesis was supported. Analysis indicated a very strong correlation between h-index values and impact factors ($r_s = .89$, $p < .001$) (Cohen, 1988).

The second hypothesis was that faculty perceptions of empirical quality would correlate more highly with h-index values than with five year impact factors. Before testing this hypothesis, analysis was conducted to assess the validity of the 2000 year perceptions with the more recent impact factors. Sellers and associates (2004) reported a Spearman correlation coefficient of .45 between faculty empirical quality ratings and standard (two year) impact factors. The correlation between the 2000 empirical quality ratings and 2008 (two year) impact factors was a relatively comparable .51 ($p = .007$). The correlation increased to .61 ($p = .001$) for 2008 five year impact factors. This result is consistent with the view that five year impact factors are a more accurate measure of journal quality in social work than two year impact factors. Given these findings, the second hypothesis was tested.

As hypothesized, faculty empirical quality ratings correlated more strongly with h-index values ($r_s = .625$) compared to five year impact factors ($r_s = .606$). The degree of difference, however, was marginal, with less than a 2% difference in r_s values. This finding may be due to the inclusion, in the JCR social work category, of many interdisciplinary, extra-disciplinary, and internationally based journals.

American based, Disciplinary Specific Journals

Additional analysis was conducted with a subset of journals that may be more familiar to social workers in the United States. To obtain the list of journals in Table 2, interdisciplinary, extra-disciplinary, and international journals were eliminated from the dataset. The remaining periodicals, again ranked by h-index, are disciplinary journals based in the United States. Given

that Sellers and associates (2004) surveyed faculty in the United States, the respondents likely have more expertise in evaluating this subset of journals.

[Place Table 2 about here]

In keeping with the first hypothesis, analysis revealed a high correlation between h-index values and impact factors for these American disciplinary journals (r_s = .83, p < .001). Likewise, faculty quality ratings correlated more strongly with h-index values (r_s = .56) compared to five year impact factors (r_s = .48). Thus, both hypotheses were supported with this subset of journals.

Particularly interesting, however, were the correlations that emerged regarding faculty perceptions of journal prestige. Sellers and associates (2004) did not report any correlation coefficients between perceptions of journal prestige and 2000 impact factors, and no significant relationships emerged between perceptions of prestige and 2008 (two year) impact factors, five year impact factors, or h-index values, using the complete listing of all JCR social work journals.

Significant relationships did emerge, however, when correlations were examined with the subset of high familiarity journals. Analysis revealed progressively stronger correlations between perceptions of prestige and: (two year) impact factors (r_s = .59, p = .033), five year impact factors (r_s = .64, p = .018), and h-index values (r_s = .72, p = .005). In short, when the dataset if restricted to journals about which respondents may have more expertise, the results are consistent with theorized expectations regarding the validity of various measures of journal quality.

Discussion and Applications to Social Work

This study evaluated the utility of using the h-index to measure journal quality in the social work profession. It was hypothesized that: 1) h-index values would correlate highly with five year impact factors and 2) that faculty perceptions of journal quality would correlate more highly with h-index values than with five year impact factors. These two hypotheses were generally supported using the complete universe of JCR social work journals, and a subset of disciplinary journals with which United States based faculty may be more familiar.

Figure 1 depicts the results in the form of a scatterplot. The y-axis depicts the ISI five-year impact factors and the x-axis depicts the five-year h-index values. Journals are represented with common abbreviations. The straight line depicts the regression equation. Journals that appear above the line are ranked more favorably using ISI impact factors. Conversely, journals that appear below the line are ranked more highly using the h-index.

[Place Figure 1 about here]

As can be seen, *Trauma Violence & Abuse*, and to a lesser degree, *Child Maltreatment*, are ranked more favorably using impact factors. Using the h-index favors the *British Journal of Social Work*, and to a smaller degree, *Child Youth Services Review*, and *Families in Society*. Most journals, however, are clustered around the regression line.

The findings are consistent with the results reported in other disciplines (Ashkanasy, 2007). Although other studies have typically used the standard (two year) impact factor, or standard impact scores averaged over five years, correlations between impact factors and h-index values reported in other disciplines are comparable to the coefficients reported in this study (i.e., .89 & .83). In an analysis of seven different sub-fields within business and economics, correlations ranged from .63 to .89 (Harzing & van der Wal, 2009). Similar coefficients have been reported in ecology (.73) (Olden, 2007), pharmacology (.59), psychiatry (.88) (Bador & Lafouge, 2009 in press), and forestry (.88) (Vanclay, 2008).

Correspondence also exists regarding the second hypothesis. In forestry, the h-index was correlated more highly with expert assessment (.62) than with impact factors (.56) (Vanclay, 2008). This same differential pattern also emerged in the present study, particularly with the subset of high familiarity journals.

This evidence of convergent and discriminatory validity suggests that the h-index may have some utility in assessing social work journals (Saad, 2006; Vanclay, 2008). It correlates highly with an established measure, but exhibits closer agreement with expert opinion. In addition, it offers two key advantages that are particularly relevant to social work: 1) a citation

window that can be adjusted to correspond to the profession's research culture and 2) the ability to compute a value for essentially all disciplinary social work journals.

According to Thomson ISI, the aggregate cited half-life for journals in the social work category in 2008 is 8.3 years (Journal Citation Reports, 2008). In other words, roughly 50% of all articles cited by journals in the social work category were published prior to 2000, and 50% were published previous to 2000. In six cases, individual journals recorded a cited half life of over ten years.

While publication time frames influence cited half life, other factors are also relevant, such as the degree to which knowledge maintains its currency. The shelf-life of knowledge varies from profession to profession (Cameron, 2005). In an applied profession such as social work, it can take a considerable amount of time plan, operationalize, execute, and publish research. Because of the time involved, such research if often relevant far beyond the two and five year time frames used by Thomson ISI.

In professions with a long cited half life, validity may be improved by using the h-index (Vanclay, 2008). Although a five year window was used in this study to be comparable with Thomson ISI's five year impact factor, longer time periods may be advisable. In social work, it would seem that eight to ten years would be a minimally appropriate time period (Vanclay, 2008). This would be consistent with recommendations to increase the citation window of Thomson ISI impact factors to ten years (Ha et al., 2006). Others might argue that an even longer time period would result in a more accurate picture, since an eight year window would only capture approximately half of the relevant citations given the profession's 8.3 aggregate cited half-life (Journal Citation Reports, 2008). In short, using a time period that matches the profession's culture will likely increase the validity of journal classification in social work.

Another pertinent advantage offered by the h-index is the ability to classify social work journals not indexed by Thomson ISI. Social workers publish in a wide array of disciplinary specific journals (Thyer, 2005), of which only a fraction appear in the JCR (2008). Due to the

current reliance on impact factors in assessing journal quality, scholars publishing in journals not indexed by Thomson ISI are often disadvantaged.

For example, publication in top tier, disciplinary-specific social work journals is typically a key factor in tenure and promotion decisions (Seipel, 2003). Inclusion in the JCR social work category is often perceived to signify top-tier status, in keeping with Thomson ISI's claim that they index the most preeminent journals (Green, Bellin & Baskind, 2002; Green & Baskind, 2007; Jenson, 2005; Olden, 2007). Consequently, social work authors publishing in disciplinary journals that are not indexed by Thomson ISI may have a difficult time demonstrating the quality of the journals in which they publish.

The h-index provides an alternative way for scholars to document venue quality. Consider, for instance, the *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, which is not presently indexed by Thomson ISI. A search using the parameters discussed in the method section revealed an h-index value of 12, which is similar to other widely respected journals in the JCR social work category (see Table 1). This finding is consistent with research conducted in other disciplines illustrating that non-indexed journals can have h-index values comparable to those that are indexed by Thomson ISI (Harzing & van der Wal, 2008a).

Since the majority of disciplinary social work journals are not indexed by Thomson ISI, the h-index offers the important advantage of inclusivity (Thyer, 2005). Essentially all social work journals can be classified using the h-index and Google Scholar. This provides social workers with another tool to document journal quality. Yet, like other tools, the Google Scholar h-index is characterized by a number of limitations that are important to note.

All citation based approaches are premised on the assumption that higher quality work will be cited more frequently, an assumption that may not be true in all situations. Thus, citations, like journal reputations, function as a proxy for journal quality. Metrics like the h-index or impact factor provide an approximation of journal quality, not a definitive picture. While such metrics may be relatively reliable, they are not completely valid measures of quality.

Citations may be listed inaccurately (Spivey & Wilks, 2004), journal issues may be missing from databases (Holden et al., 2008), and Google Scholar accesses more non-academic citations than Thomson ISI (Falagas, Pitsouni, Malietzis & Pappas, 2008). The h-index is, however, quite robust to measurement problems (Mingers, 2009), including the citation "noise" generated by Google Scholar (Mikki, 2010). In addition, Google Scholar accesses substantially more citations than Thomson ISI in the social sciences (Baneyx, 2008; Jacobs, 2009), and the majority of unique citations appear to be academic (Kousha & Thelwall, 2008).

Citation rates vary from discipline to discipline. Thus, h-index values (as well as impact factors) should be not used to compare journals across disciplines (Althouse et al., 2009; Seglen, 1997). If comparisons must be made, at a minimum, some type of correction must be applied to correct for differences in disciplinary norms (Barendse, 2007; Mingers, 2009).

Evidence suggests Google Scholar undercounts citations (Baneyx, 2008). Thus, while providing broader coverage than Thomson ISI in the social sciences, Google Scholar does not access the available universe of academic citations (Harzing & van der Wal, 2008a). This suggests that the actual h-index values of the social work journals are higher than the values reported in this study.

Finally, it should be noted that other methods exist for quantifying journal quality in addition to the h-index and impact factors. For instance, Bergstrom (2007) has developed the eigenfactor as a means to assess journal quality. In much the same way that Google ranks websites, this approach employs a form of network analysis to identify the most influential journals. The eigenfactor website includes a category for social work, which lists 25 journals (available at http://eigenfactor.org).

Conclusion

Many stakeholders in the profession have an interest in reliable, accurate measures of journal quality. In keeping with work in other disciplines, this study suggests that the h-index represents an important complement, and perhaps improvement, to the use of impact factors as a way to assess journal quality. It is perhaps unsurprising that Thomson ISI impact factors have

limited utility in professions' such as social work, given they were developed to reflect disciplinary norms of fields such as biochemistry and molecular biology (Cameron, 2005; Leydesdorff, 2008).

The h-index may represent a more accurate measure of journal quality in disciplines such as social work. The h-index captures both quality and quantity in a single number that is intuitively easy to comprehend, its parameters can be set to correspond to the profession's research norms, and it can be easily computed for essentially all journals in which social workers publish. Perhaps it is time to give it a try in the social work profession?

References

Althouse, B. M., West, J. D., Bergstrom, C. T., & Bergstrom, T. (2009). Differences in impact factors across fields and over time. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 60*(1), 27-34.

Ashkanasy, N. M. (2007). Playing the citation game. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28,* 643-645.

Babbie, E. (2007). *The practice of social research* (11th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Bador, P., & Lafouge, T. (2009 in press). Comparative analysis between impact factor and h-index for pharmacology and psychiatry journals. *Scientometrics.*

Bakkalbasi, N., Bauer, K., Glover, J., & Wang, L. (2006). Three options for citation tracking: Google Scholar, Scopus and Web of Science. *Biomedical Digital Libraries, 3*(7). Retrieved 12/03/2010, from http://www.bio-diglib.com/content/3/1/7.

Baneyx, A. (2008). "Publish or Perish" as citation metrics used to analyze scientific output in the humanities: International case studies in economics, geography, social sciences, philosophy, and history. *Archivum Immunologiae et Therapiae Experimentalis, 56*(6), 363-371.

Barendse, W. (2007). The strike rate index: A new index for journal quality based on journal size and the h-index of citations. *Biomedial Digital Libraries, 4*(3), 1-7.

Barker, K. L., & Thyer, B. A. (2005). An empirical evaluation of the editorial practices of social work journals: Voices of authors published in 2000. *Journal of Social Service Research, 32*(1), 17-31.

Bergstrom, C. (2007). Eigenfactor: Measuring the value and prestige of scholarly journals. *C&RL News, 68*(5). Retrieved 12/03/2010, from http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/crlnews/backissues2007/may07/eigenfactor.cfm.

Braun, T., Glanzel, W., & Schubert, A. (2006). A Hirsch-type index for journals. *Scientometrics, 69*(1), 169-173.

Brumback, R. A. (2009). Impact factor wars: Episode V—the empire strikes back. *Journal of Child Neurology, 24*(3), 260-262.

Cameron, B. D. (2005). Trends in the usage of ISI bibliometric data: Uses, abuses, and implications. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 5*(1), 105-125.

Clarke, R. (2008). An exploratory study of information systems researcher impact. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 22*(1), 1-32.

Cnaan, R. A., Caputo, R. K., & Shmuely, Y. (1994). Senior faculty perceptions of social work journals. *Journal of Social Work Education, 30*(2), 185-199.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Epstein, W., M. (2004). Conformational response bias and the quality of the editorial processes among American social work journals. *Research on Social Work Practice, 14*(6), 450-458.

Falagas, M. E., Pitsouni, E. I., Malietzis, G. A., & Pappas, G. (2008). Comparison of PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar: Strengths and weaknesses. *The FASEB Journal, 22,* 338-342.

Favaloro, E. J. (2009). The journal impact factor: Don't expect its demise any time soon. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 47*(11), 1319-24.

Franceschet, M. (2010). A comparison of bibliometric indicators for computer science scholars and journals on Web of Science and Google Scholar. *Scientometrics, 83*(1), 243-258.

Furr, A. L. (1995). The relative influence of social work journals: Impact factors vs. core influence. *Journal of Social Work Education, 31*(1), 38-45.

Green, R. G. (2008). Tenure and promotion decisions: The relative importance of teaching, scholarship, and service. *Journal of Social Work Education, 44*(2), 117-127.

Green, R. G., & Baskind, F. R. (2007). The second decade of the faculty publication project: Journal article publications and the importance of faculty scholarship. *Journal of Social Work Education, 43*(2), 281-295.

Green, R. G., Bellin, M. H., & Baskind, F. G. (2002). Results of the doctoral faculty publication project: Journal article productivity and its correlates in the 1990s. *Journal of Social Work Education, 38*(1), 135-152.

Ha, T. C., Tan, S. B., & Soo, K. C. (2006). The journal impact factor: Too much of an impact? *Annals of the Academy of Medicine, Singapore, 35*(12), 911-916.

Harzing, A. W. (2010). *Publish or Perish [software program]* (Version 2.8). Retrieved 27/12/2009, from http://www.harzing.com/pop.htm.

Harzing, A. W., & van der Wal, R. (2008a, Aug. 8-13). *A Google Scholar h-index for journals: A better metric to measure journal impact in economics and business?* Paper presented at the 2008 Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Anaheim, CA.

Harzing, A. W. K., & van der Wal, R. (2008b). Google Scholar as a new source for citation analysis. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics, 8*(1), 61-73.

Harzing, A. W., & van der Wal, R. (2009). A Google Scholar h-index for journals: An alternative metric to measure journal impact in economics and business. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 60*(1), 41-46.

Hirsch, J. E. (2005). An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output. *PNAS, 102*(46), 16569-16572.

Holden, G., Barker, K., Covert-Vail, L., Rosenberg, G., & Cohen, S. A. (2008). Does Social Work Abstracts work? *Research on Social Work Practice, 18*(5), 487-499.

Holden, G., Rosenberg, G., Barker, K., & Onghena, P. (2006). An assessment of the predictive validity of impact factor scores: Implications for academic employment decisions in social work. *Research on Social Work Practice, 16*(2), 613-624.

Holden, G., Rosenberg, G., & Karker, K. (Editors). (2005). *Bibliometrics in social work.* Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.

Jacobs, J. A. (2009). Assessing the visibility of articles published in Gender & Society with
Google Scholar. *Gender & Society, 23*(6), 817-832.

Jenson, J. M. (2005). Structural factors and the quality of publication in social work journals.
Social Work Research, 29(2), 67-71.

Journal Citation Reports. (2008). *Information for new users index* (Documentation Version 4.5).
Retrieved 27/12/2009, from http://admin-
apps.isiknowledge.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/JCR/help/h_index.htm.

Kousha, K., & Thelwall, M. (2008). Sources of Google Scholar citations outside the Science
Citation Index: A comparison between four science disciplines. *Scientometrics, 74*(2),
273-294.

Keloharju, M. (2008). What's new in finance? *European Financial Management, 14*(3), 564-608.

Kline, P. (2000). *The handbook of psychology testing* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kousha, K., & Thelwall, M. (2008). Sources of Google Scholar citations outside the Science
Citation Index: A comparison between four science disciplines. *Scientometrics, 74*(2),
273-294.

Kulkarni, A. V., Aziz, B., Shams, I., & Busse, J. W. (2009). Comparisons of citations in Web of
Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar for articles published in general medical journals.
JAMA, 302(10), 1092-1096.

Lee, J., Kraus, K. L., & Couldwell, W. T. (2009). Use of the h index in neurosurgery. *Journal of
Neurosurgery, 111,* 387-392.

Leydesdorff, L. (2008). Caveats for the use of citation indicators in research and journal
evaluations. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology,
59*(2), 278-287.

Ligon, J., & Thyer, B. A. (2005). Bibliometrics and social work: A two-edged sword can still be
a blunt instrument. *Social Work in Health Care, 41*(3/4), 123-128.

Ligon, J., & Thyer, B. (2001). Academic affiliations of social work journal authors: A
productivity analysis from 1994-1998. *Journal of Social Service Research, 28*(2), 69-81.

Martinez-Brawley, E. E., & Zorita, P. M.-B. (2007). Tacit and codified knowledge in social

    work: A critique of standardization in education and practice. *Families in Society, 88*(4),

    534-542.

McGarty, C. (2000). The citation impact factor in social psychology: A bad statistic that

    encourages bad science? *Current Research in Social Psychology, 5*(1), 1-16.

Meho, L. I., & Yang, K. (2007). Impact of data sources on citation counts and rankings of LIS

    faculty: Web of Science versus Scopus and Google Scholar. *Journal of the American

    Society for Information Science and Technology, 58*(13), 2105-2125.

Mikki, S. (2010). Comparing Google Scholar and ISI Web of Science for Earth Sciences.

    Scientometrics, 82(2), 321-331.

Mingers, J. (2009). Measuring the research contribution of management academics using the

    Hirsch-index. *Journal of the Operational Research Society, 60,* 1143-1153.

Moussa, S., & Touzani, M. (2010). Ranking marking journals using the Google Scholar-based

    hg-index. *Journal of Informetrics, 4,* 107-117.

Olden, J. D. (2007). How do ecological journals stack-up? Ranking of scientific quality

    according to the h-index. *Ecoscience, 14*(3), 370-376.

PLoS Medicine Editors (2006). The impact factor game. *PLoS Medicine, 3*(6), e291.

Radicchi, P., Fortunato, S., & Castellano, C. (2008). Universality of citation distributions:

    Toward an objective measure of scientific impact. *PNAS, 105*(45), 17268-17272.

Saad, G. (2006). Exploring the h-index at the author and journal levels using bibliometric data of

    productive consumer scholars and business-related journals respectively. *Scientometrics,

    69*(1), 117-120.

Seglen, P. O. (1997). Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating

    research. *British Medical Journal, 314*(7079), 498-502.

Seipel, M. M. O. (2003). Assessing publication for tenure. *Journal of Social Work Education,

    39*(1), 79-88.

Sellers, S. L., Mathiesen, S. G., Smith, T., & Perry Robin. (2006). Perceptions of professional social work journals: Findings from a national study. *Journal of Social Work Education, 42*(1), 139-160.

Sellers, S. L., Perry, R., Mathiesen, & Smith, T. (2004). Evaluation of social work journal quality: Citation versus reputation approaches. *Journal of Social Work Education, 40*(1), 143-160.

Smith, A. G. (2008). Benchmarking Google Scholar with New Zealand PBRF. *Scientometrics, 74*(2), 309-316.

Spivey, C. A., & Wilks, S. E. (2004). Reference list accuracy in social work journals. *Research on Social Work Practice, 14*(4), 281-286.

SSWR Presidential Task Force on Publications. (2008). *Journal publication practices in social work*. Retrieved 27/12/2009, from http://www.sswr.org/PTFP%20final%20report%202008.pdf.

Thyer, B. A. (2005). A note from the editor: A comprehensive listing of social work journals. *Research on Social Work Practice, 15*(4), 310-311.

Vanclay, J. K. (2008). Ranking forestry journals using the h-index. *Journal of Informetrics, 2,* 326-334.

Walters, W. H. (2009). Google Scholar search performance: Comparative recall and precision. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 9*(1), 5-24.

Weinbach, R. W., & Grinnell, R. M. (1997). *Statistics for social workers* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Whitehouse, G. H. (2001). Impact factors: Facts and myths. *European Radiology, 12,* 715-717.

Table 1

Thomson ISI Social Work Journals (N = 29) Ranked by H-index

Journal	5-yr IF	H-index	Quality[1]
Child Abuse & Neglect	2.977	40	5.35
American Journal of Community Psychology	2.310	33	5.22
British Journal of Social Work	1.003	28	4.92
Family Relations	1.469	27	5.04
Trauma Violence & Abuse	3.982	25	n/a
Journal of Social Policy	1.253	25	5.33
Child Youth Services Review	1.114	25	5.18
Child Maltreatment	2.724	24	n/a
Health and Social Care in the Community	1.414	23	4.77
Social Work	1.108	23	4.90
Journal of Community Psychology	1.479	22	5.06
Research on Social Work Practice	1.096	21	5.35
Social Service Review	1.083	18	5.99
Health in Social Work	1.071	18	4.85
Social Work Research	1.204	16	5.52
Journal of Social Work Education	.853	16	4.69
International Journal of Social Welfare	.764	16	5.02
Families in Society	.450	16	5.07
Health Care in Social Work	.802	13	4.79
Child Welfare	.616	13	4.95
Administration in Social Work	.446	13	4.87
International Social Work	.409	12	4.75
Affilia	.421	10	4.61
Journal of Social Work Practice	.561	9	4.65
Journal of Social Service Research	.241	9	5.37
Clinical Social Work Journal	.504	8	4.51
Smith College Studies in Social Work	.190	6	4.56
Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work	.118	2	3.79
Indian Journal of Social Work	.036	2	4.19

[1]Faculty perceptions as reported by Seller et al. (2004).

Table 2

American Disciplinary Social Work Journals Ranked by H-index

Journal	H-Index	Prestige[1]
Social Work	23	4.73
Research on Social Work Practice	21	3.86
Social Service Review	18	5.12
Health and Social Work	18	3.29
Social Work Research	16	4.20
Journal of Social Work Education	16	4.19
Families in Society	16	3.99
Administration in Social Work	13	2.75
Social Work in Health Care	13	2.53
Affilia	10	3.19
Journal of Social Service Research	9	3.98
Clinical Social Work Journal	8	2.47
Smith College Studies in Social Work	6	2.46

[1]Faculty perceptions as reported by Seller et al. (2004).

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Correlation between ISI 5-yr Impact Factors and H-index values