



## Bibliometric analysis of Journal of Information Literacy (JIL)

Priyanka Singh\* and Neerja Verma

M.L.B. Government College of Excellence, Gwalior, MP, India  
priyankasujitkushwah@gmail.com

Available online at: [www.isca.in](http://www.isca.in), [www.isca.me](http://www.isca.me)

Received 20<sup>th</sup> June 2018, revised 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2018, accepted 15<sup>th</sup> December 2018

### Abstract

*This bibliometric study analyses the “Journal of Information Literacy (JIL)” from 2007 to 2017. It analyses the journal to trace the growth of micro literature. Further, it analyzes various other aspects such as authorship pattern, year wise distribution of articles per volume, length of articles, authors’ degree of collaboration, institute wise distribution of articles/ authors and their ranking pattern, type of publication cited etc. This study evaluated and analysed 141 articles found in 11 volumes of this journal.*

**Keywords:** Bibliometrics, information literacy, authorship pattern, author productivity, websites on information literacy etc.

### Introduction

In 1974 Paul Zurkowski gave the term “Information Literacy”. After that different definitions are suggested by different organizations, authors, practitioners, subject experts etc. A well accepted definition is given in 1989 in the final report of the Presidential Committee on Information Literacy of the American Library Association (ALA) as “To be information literate, a person must be able to recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information” (1989)<sup>1</sup>.

In 2018 CILIP gave a new definition of information literacy as “The ability to think critically and make balanced judgements about any information we find and use. It empowers us as citizens to reach and express informed views and to engage fully with society”<sup>2</sup>.

In 1969 Allen Pritchard gave the term “bibliometrics” and defined it as “the application of mathematical and statistical methods to books and other communication medium. It is the very important quantitative study in library science.

“Journal of Information Literacy” has been selected for this study. This Journal is an international, peer-reviewed, open access and professional journal. The publisher of this journal is the Information Literacy Group (Part of UK’s Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP) Community Services Group). It is published under Gold Open Access Model in which the author published their paper in an Open Access journal or a book supported by Open Access publisher. This journal is hosted by Loughborough University Library in place of CILIP Information Literacy Group. The journal is a Biennial published from year 2007. Total 11 volumes are published till date. Only volume 1 has 3 issues and all other volume have 2 issues per year. Its issue contains many sections as editorial, book reviews, research studies, conference

updates, articles from practice, peer reviewed article, project report, article from LILAC, student views but not necessary all the section are present in every issue. Its most cited articles are available at Google Scholar followed by twitter@JinfoLit. JIL is indexed in LISA (Library and Information Science Abstract), SCOPUS (Elsevier’s abstract and citation) and also in LISTA (Library, Information Science and Technology Abstract) from year 2009 to till date. JIL is also available to access through Browzine (Journal Enhancement Platform / Journal Browsing Service). It has now completed 11 volumes including 141 papers which have been selected for this study.

**Literature Review:** There are numbers of bibliometric studies which have been already carried out, some of them that researcher consulted for present study were:

Regolini and Jannès-Ober Irstea (2013)<sup>3</sup> studied “A Bibliometric Study of Informing Science: The International Journal of an Emerging Transdiscipline” reveals high degree of transdisciplinarity of Informing Science and confirms possibility to observe the evolution of a new transdiscipline by analysing the citations to papers from its journal.

Cortes and Rodrigues (2016)<sup>4</sup> studied ‘A bibliometric study on “Education for sustainability’ reveals the most used journals, associated sub-themes, most cited papers, most productive authors and their affiliations.

Verma and others (2015)<sup>5</sup> revealed in their study “A bibliometric study of the Library Philosophy And Practice (e journal) for the period 2005-2014” that majority of contribution were emanating from Nigeria as well as single authored with average rate of degree of collaboration 0.51. Average number of articles were 116.7 and mostly articles (161) were written on ‘library services’ subject etc.

Gogoi and Barooah (2016)<sup>6</sup> studied “Bibliometric Analysis of Indian Journal of Chemistry, Section B to study the usage

pattern of information in the field of Material Science". They identified number of cited documents, average number of references per article, authorship pattern, geographical distribution of journals cited. etc.

Panda and others (2013)<sup>7</sup> studied on the topic "The Journal of Information Literacy: A Bibliometric Study". They selected articles, book reviews, conference papers, editorials etc for the purpose of analysis from year 2007 to 2012 and revealed authorship pattern, geographical distribution, number of references/pages etc.

Talolli and Mulla (2016)<sup>8</sup> studied "A Bibliometric Analysis of Journal of Information Literacy (2011 to 2015)". They selected articles, projects, conferences, book reviews for the purpose of analysis and revealed distribution of articles by volume, authorship pattern, citation pattern, most prolific contributors and affiliations etc.

After the depth review of the above mentioned literature, researcher prefer to work on the "Journal of Information Literacy" because of two main reasons as most of the aspects have not been covered in both the previous bibliometric analysis and the present study covered all the neglected aspects and performed comparative study of all the volumes of the journal till date.

**Difference between Present Study and both the Previous Studies:** Present study is differ from the previous ones in various aspects as: i. First study analyzed the journal only from year 2007 to 2012 while second study analyzed the journal from year 2011 to 2015 but the present study gives the comparative study of all the volumes from 2007 to 2017. ii. First study selected articles, book reviews, conference papers, editorials etc for analysis while second study selected articles, projects, conferences, book reviews for the purpose of analysis but present study selected research studies, articles from practice, peer reviewed articles, articles from LILAC (Librarian's Information Literacy Annual Conference) and student views for analysis while editorials, book reviews, conference updates and project reports have excluded from the study.

**Aims and objectives:** The objectives are to analyse and determine the: i. Number of articles published in JIL; ii. Year-wise distribution of articles per volume; iii. Average length of the articles published per volume; iv. Authorship pattern of the articles published in JIL; v. Author's degree of collaboration; vi. Institute-wise distribution of articles; vii. Institute-wise distribution of authors; viii. Citation pattern; ix. Average number of citations per article; x. Types of cited documents.

## Methodology

All 23 issues of total 11 volumes (2007-2017) of "Journal of Information Literacy" were selected for the study. All the

articles were downloaded from their website<sup>9</sup> and analysed properly to fulfil the above stated objectives. Editorial, book reviews, conference updates and project reports were excluded from the study. Research studies, articles from practice, peer reviewed articles, articles from LILAC (Librarian's Information Literacy Annual Conference) and student views were only selected for the study. An attempt has been made to do the comparative study of all the 11 volumes of the Journal.

**Significance of the Study:** The significance of this bibliometric study lies on the popularity of the open access journal. In the digital and Information Technology age, open access journals are considered as most prominent source of information among students, researchers, practioners. They are always in huge demand by users in libraries therefore such study will be helpful in literature searching by researcher and the planning and collection building of the library by a librarian. This study also provides popularity to the journal among subject experts and researchers.

## Results and discussion

After completion of data collection carefully, data are classified and organised in tables to find the specific conclusion for the study.

**Distribution of Articles (Yearwise):** The total number of articles of the 23 issues of 11 volumes is 141, out of which the highest number of article is 16 (11.35%) in vol 1 and 11 and lowest number of article is 10(7.09%) in vol. 5 and 10. Table-1 indicates the year-wise distribution of articles in 11 volumes of the journal and it also shows that number of articles are found in decreasing order from vol.1 to vol.5 and vol.6 to vol.10 means the three volumes (vol.1, vol.6 and vol.11) have good number of articles at point from where decrement occurs. Table-2 indicates that the average number of articles per volume is 12.81 and the average number of articles per issue is 6.13.

**Length of articles (Page-wise):** Table-3 indicates the range of pages covered by articles year wise. Highest number of articles i.e 38 (26.95%) covered 16-20 pages and lowest number of articles i.e 1 (0.71%) covered 31-35 pages. Data trend also indicates that majority of articles i.e 89 (63.12%) covered 11-20 pages. Similarly year wise article's length and their strength can also seen from Table-3 in each particular case.

**Authorship pattern of the articles (Year wise):** Analysis of authorship pattern of the articles reveals that articles of the one author are more than those with two, three, four and more than four authors. Table-4 shows that out of the 141 articles, 74(52.48%) have been contributed by single author; 40(28.37%) by 2 authors; 15(10.64%) by 3 authors; 8(5.67%) by 4 authors; 1(0.71%) by 5 authors; 1(0.71%) by 6 authors; 1(0.71%) by 7 authors and 1(0.71%) by 8 authors. Overall trend indicates single and joint authorship dominates over multiple authorship.

**Table-1:** Distribution of Articles (Year wise).

Year	Volume No.	No. of Issues	No. of Articles	%age
2007	1	3	16	11.35
2008	2	2	13	9.22
2009	3	2	12	8.51
2010	4	2	12	8.51
2011	5	2	10	7.09
2012	6	2	15	10.64
2013	7	2	13	9.22
2014	8	2	11	7.8
2015	9	2	13	9.22
2016	10	2	10	7.09
2017	11	2	16	11.35
Total= 11 yrs	11	23	141	100

**Table-2:** Average number of articles per volume.

No. of Volumes	Total No. of Articles	Average
11	141	12.81

**Table-3:** Length of Articles (Year-wise)

Paper Length (No. of pages)	Year											Total	%
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017		
1-5	4	---	1	1	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	8	5.67
6-10	6	2	5	1	1	1	1	---	1	---	1	19	13.48
11-15	3	7	5	8	3	6	4	2	3	5	5	51	36.17
16-20	3	3	1	2	4	5	4	5	4	1	6	38	26.95
21-25	---	1	---	---	2	2	1	2	4	3	1	16	11.35
26-30	---	---	---	---	---	---	3	2	---	1	2	8	5.67
31-35	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	0.71
Total	16	13	12	12	10	15	13	11	13	10	16	141	100

Table-5 indicates authorship pattern of articles volume wise. It indicates that out of 74 articles of single author, vol.2 and 11 have the highest number i.e 10(13.51%) and vol.3 has the lowest number i.e 4(5.40%). Out of the 40 articles by two authors, vol.1 has the highest number i.e 8(20%) and vol.10 has the lowest number i.e 1(2.5%). Vol.2 and 8 have no articles by three authors and out of 15 articles by three authors, vol.4 and 5 have the highest number i.e 3(20%) and vol.3,6,7,9 and 10 have the lowest number i.e 1(6.66%). Vol.2,3,4 and 11 have no articles by four authors and out of the 8 articles by four authors, vol.10 has the highest number i.e 2(25%) and rest of the volumes have the lowest number i.e 1(2.5%). Only vol.10 has one article by five authors, vol.3 has one article by six authors, vol.6 has one article by seven authors and vol.11 has one article by eight authors.

**Author’s degree of collaboration (C):** A mathematical formula is given by Subramanyam in 1983 to calculate the extent of collaboration among authors in a research (Table-6). It is expressed by a formula as:

$$C = Nm / Nm + Ns,$$

Where: C= degree of collaboration, Nm=number of multi-authored works, Ns= Number of single authored works.

The analysis revealed that author’s degree of collaboration in Journal of information Literacy ranged from 0.68 to 0.23 during the year 2007-2017. The average rate of degree of collaboration is 0.47.

**Table-4:** Authorship Pattern of Articles (Year wise).

No. of authors	Year											Total	%
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017		
One	5	10	4	6	6	7	9	6	6	5	10	74	52.48
Two	8	3	6	3	---	5	2	4	5	1	3	40	28.37
Three	2	---	1	3	3	1	1	---	1	1	2	15	10.64
Four	1	---	---	---	1	1	1	1	1	2	---	8	5.67
Five	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1	0.71
Six	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	0.71
Seven	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1	.071
Eight	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	0.71
Total	16	13	12	12	10	15	13	11	13	10	16	141	100

**Table-5:** Authorship Pattern of Articles (Volume-wise).

V. No	One Author	%age	Two Author	%age	Three Author	%age	Four Author	%age	Five* <sup>1</sup> , Six* <sup>2</sup> , Seven* <sup>3</sup> , Eight* <sup>4</sup> Author	% age
1	5	6.75	8	20	2	13.33	1	12.5	---	---
2	10	13.51	3	7.5	---	---	---	---	---	---
3	4	5.40	6	15	1	6.66	---	---	1* <sup>2</sup>	100
4	6	8.10	3	7.5	3	20	---	---	---	---
5	6	8.10	---	---	3	20	1	12.5	---	---
6	7	9.45	5	12.5	1	6.66	1	12.5	1* <sup>3</sup>	100
7	9	12.16	2	5	1	6.66	1	12.5	---	---
8	6	8.10	4	10	---	---	1	12.5	---	---
9	6	8.10	5	12.5	1	6.66	1	12.5	---	---
10	5	6.75	1	2.5	1	6.66	2	25	1* <sup>1</sup>	100
11	10	13.51	3	7.5	2	13.33	---	---	1* <sup>4</sup>	100
Total	74	99.93	40	100	15	99.96	8	100	1	100

**Table-6:** Author’s degree of collaboration (C).

Year	Volume No.	NS	NM	C(NM/NM+NS)
2007	1	5	11	0.68
2008	2	10	3	0.23
2009	3	4	8	0.66
2010	4	6	6	0.5
2011	5	6	4	0.4
2012	6	7	8	0.53
2013	7	9	4	0.30
2014	8	6	5	0.45
2015	9	6	7	0.53
2016	10	5	5	0.5
2017	11	10	6	0.37
Total		74	67	0.47

**Article’s Distribution (Institution wise):** Table-11 indicates the Institution wise distribution of articles of this journal. Out of 141 articles the highest number i.e 4(2.83%) has been given by Loughborough University, next to this is 3(2.12%) by Menchester Metropolitan University, University of Leeds and University of Worcester and the lowest number i.e 1(0.70%) given by 93 institutions individually.

Research analysis also revealed that there were articles contributed by the involvement of 2 or more institutions. 17 articles (each article) has been given by the involvement of 2 institutions, 1 article by 3 institutions and 1 by 4 institution. Thus the trend indicates that majority of articles (65%) are single article contributed by 93 institutes individually.

**Author’s distribution (Institution wise):** Table-8 indicates the Institution wise distribution of authors. Out of 141 articles the highest number of authors i.e. 8(5.67%) has been associated with Loughborough University followed 6(4.25%) by University of Worcester and Nanyang Technological University and the lowest number i.e 1(0.70%) given by 82 institution.

During the analysis of institution wise distribution of authors, it has been found that 3 authors were without their institutional description, 18 authors were repeated to contribute the article i.e contribute 2 articles by one author and 2 authors were found in contribution of 3 article i.e 3 articles by aone author in JIL. It means most of the authors contributed single article.

**Table-7:** Article’s Distribution (Institution wise).

Rank	Name of Institution	Total Articles	%age
1	Loughborough University	4	2.83
2	Menchester Metropolitan University	3	2.12
2	University of Leeds	3	2.12
2	University of Worcester	3	2.12
3	California State University, Fullerton	2	1.41
3	Sheffield Hallam University	2	1.41
3	University of Manchester	2	1.41
3	University of Huddersfield	2	1.41
3	University of West London	2	1.41
3	Østfold University College	2	1.41
3	Queen Mary University of London	2	1.41
3	University of West Georgia	2	1.41
4	93 Articles (each article contribute by 1 institution)	93	65.1
5	17 Articles (each article contribute by 2 different institutions)	17	11.9
6	1 Article(by 3 institution)	1	0.70
7	1 Article(by 4 institution)	1	0.70
	Total	141	98.87 %

**Articles with and without Citations:** Table-9 indicates the number of Articles with and without Citations. Out of total 141 Articles, 139 (98.58%) articles are found with citations while only 2(1.41%) are without any citations.

**Distribution of Citations (Year-wise):** Table-10 indicates the range of Citations appeared at the end of the each article published yearwise in JIL. Out of 139 (98.58%) articles with citations, highest number of articles i.e 32(22.7%) are found in citation range of 21-30 and lowest number of articles i.e 1(0.71%) respectively in the range of 81-90; 101-110 and 151-160 citations. Table also indicates the entire range of citation appended with articles and their strength which are published in JIL year-wise.

**Table-8:** Author’s Distribution (Institution wise).

Rank	Name of Institution	No. of Authors	%age
1	Loughborough University	8	5.67
2	University of Worcester	6	4.25
2	Nanyang Technological University	6	4.25
3	Menchester Metropolitan University	5	3.54
3	Queensland University of Technology (QUT) Australia	5	3.54
4	University of Leeds	4	2.83
4	University of Liverpool	4	2.83
4	Sheffield Hallam University	4	2.83
4	West Chester University of Pennsylvania	4	2.83
4	Lehman College, New York	4	2.83
4	University of Brighton	4	2.83
4	ITI Dublin	4	2.83
4	Leibniz Institute of Psychology Information Trier, Germany	4	2.83
4	Østfold University College	4	2.83
3	10 institutions	3	21.2
2	28 institutions	2	39.71
1	82 institutions	1	58.15
Total	134	234	165.78

**Table-9:** Articles with and without Citations.

Items	No. of Articles	%age
Articles with citations	139	98.58
Articles without citations	2	1.42
Total	141	100

**Distribution of Citations (Volume wise):** Table-11 indicates that all the 11 volumes of JIL have 4468 citations. Out of 4468 citations, vol.11 has the highest number i.e 776(17.36 %) and vol.1 has the lowest number i.e 225(5.03%). Similarly volume wise distribution of citations and their percentage can be observed in Table-11.

**Average Citations per Article:** Table-12 indicates that the average number of citations per articles of 11 volumes of JIL is 31.69.

**Table-10:** Year wise (2007-2017) Citations of Articles.

No. of Citations	Year											Total	%
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017		
Nil	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	1.42
1-10	8	---	2	3	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	14	9.93
11-20	2	6	4	2	2	2	3	---	1	2	3	27	19.15
21-30	2	3	3	5	3	4	1	3	5	1	2	32	22.70
31-40	1	3	2	2	3	6	3	3	2	3	3	31	21.99
41-50	---	---	---	---	1	2	1	---	2	2	3	11	7.80
51-60	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	3	1	---	2	8	5.68
61-70	---	1	1	---	1	1	1	2	2	---	1	9	6.38
71-80	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	2	---	3	2.13
81-90	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	0.71
91-100	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0	---
101-110	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	0.71
111-120	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0	---
121-130	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0	---
131-140	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0	---
141-150	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0	---
151-160	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	0.71
Total	16	13	12	12	10	15	13	11	13	10	16	141	100

**Table-11:** Distribution of Citations (Volume-wise).

Vol. No	No. of Citations	%age
Vol.1	225	5.03
Vol.2	325	7.27
Vol.3	296	6.62
Vol.4	237	5.30
Vol.5	287	6.42
Vol.6	480	10.74
Vol.7	474	10.60
Vol.8	483	10.81
Vol.9	497	11.12
Vol.10	388	8.63
Vol.11	776	17.36
Total	4468	99.9

**Table-12:** Average Citations Per article.

No. of Articles	Total Citation	Average (%age)
141	4468	31.69

**Average Citations Per article (Volume wise):** Table-13 indicates that highest average number of citations per article is 48.5% in Vol.11 and the lowest citations is 14.06% in Vol.1.

**Types of publication cited:** Table-14 indicates that out of 4468 citations 2546(56.98%) are Online resources, 874(19.56%) are books/guides and 849(19.00%) are Journals.

**Findings:** The following findings can be drawn from the present study. i. There are total 141 articles found in 11 volumes (2007-2017) with the average number of articles per volume is 12.81. ii. Most of the articles i.e 51 have 11-15 pages. Hence it proved to be the ideal length for research article. iii. Most of the articles are contributed by single author. It means author prefer to work individually. iv. The degree of collaboration in the Journal of Information Literacy is ranged from 0.68 to 0.23 during 2007-2017. The average rate of degree of collaboration is 0.47. v. Most of the articles i.e 32 have 21-30 references. vi. This journal is hosted by Loughborough University and maximum articles i.e 4(2.83%) with maximum authors i.e 8(5.67%) are from this university. vii. During authorship pattern analysis out of 141 articles, 36 articles have been contributed by 18 authors i.e 2 articles given by one author and rest contribute single article. viii. Most of the contributions with citations and average number of citations per article is 31.68. ix.

It is clear from the study that maximum information on subject “information literacy” is available online that’s why most of the articles have cited online resources.

**Table-13:** Average Citations Per Article (Volume wise).

Vol. No.	No. of Articles	No. of Citations	Average(%age)
Vol.1	16	225	14.06
Vol.2	13	325	25
Vol.3	12	296	24.67
Vol.4	12	237	19.75
Vol.5	10	287	28.7
Vol.6	15	480	32
Vol.7	13	474	36.46
Vol.8	11	483	43.91
Vol.9	13	497	38.23
Vol.10	10	388	38.8
Vol.11	16	776	48.5
Total	141	4468	31.68

**Table-14:** Types of Publication Cited (Volume wise).

Pub. Cited	V.1	V.2	V.3	V.4	V.5	V.6	V.7	V.8	V.9	V.10	V.11	Total	%
E-Resources*1	95	110	65	127	126	231	299	313	401	309	474	2546	56.98
Book/Guide	46	50	96	30	69	75	97	86	61	41	224	874	19.56
Journal	80	138	116	66	59	150	61	67	24	32	53	849	19.00
Thesis/Dissertation/Project	1	2	2	6	1	1	3	3	3	1	3	26	0.58
Literature Review/ Research Review	-	-	1	-	4	1	-	1	=	=	1	8	0.17
Report*2	1	1	5		17	5	2	3	1	1	4	40	0.89
Conference /Workshop/ Form	2	18	5	2	3	10	5	1	4	3	12	65	1.45
Encyclopaedia/Glossary			1		1			3	1			6	0.13
Policy/Plan/Act/Strategy	1		2		2							5	0.11
Reference Sources*3								3				3	0.06
Miscellaneous	2	6	1	3	6	7	3	3	2	1	5	36	0.80
Total	225	325	296	237	287	480	474	483	497	388	776	4468	99.73

\*1: Standards, Journals, Definitions, Report, Speech, Books, Articles, Documents, Projects, Plan, Guide, Tutorial, Working paper, Workshop, Dissertation, Learning app, Email, Conference Consortium, Webinar, Update. \*2: Research/Departmental/ Review/ Conference/ working group summary. \*3: Yearbook, Manual, Statistics.



## Conclusion

The study shows that 234 authors from 134 institutions are involved to contribute the articles in this journal using mostly online/e resources as a source of information which clearly states that most of the information on subject “information literacy” is available online. This study is helpful for librarians, researchers, readers to choose information for their study.

**Areas of Further Research:** It is recommended that the area of further research (not included in this study) related to the above topic are as follows: i. Subject Wise Distributions of Articles; ii. Country wise Distributions of Articles; iii. Rank list of most prominent contributor; iv. Rank list of cited journals etc.

## References

1. ALA (1989). Presidential Committee on Information Literature. Final Report. Chicago:n American Library Association. Available at: <http://www.ala.org/acrl/publications/whitepapers/presidential> (Accessed: 15. 05. 2018)
2. CILIP (2018). Information literacy: definition. Available at <https://infolit.org.uk/definitions-models/> (Accessed: 15. 05. 2018)
3. Regolini A. and Jannes-Ober Irstea E. (2013). A Bibliometric Study of Informing Science. *The International Journal of an Emerging Transdiscipline*, 16. Available at: <http://www.inform.nu/Articles/Vol16/ISJv16p117-130RegoliniFT111.pdf> (Accessed:30 April 2018)
4. Cortes P.L. and Rodrigues R. (2016). A bibliometric study on “education for sustainability. *Brazilian Journal of Science and Technology*, 3, 8. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40552-016-0016-5> (Accessed: 30 April 2018)
5. Verma A., Sonkar S.K. and Gupta V. (2015). A bibliometric study of the Library Philosophy And Practice (ejournal) for the period 2005-2014. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3464&context=libphilprac>. (Accessed:30 April 2018).
6. Gogoi M. and Barooah P.K. (2016). Bibliometric analysis of Indian Journal of Chemical, section B to study the usage pattern of information in the field of material science. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3519&context=libphilprac>.
7. Panda Ipsita, Maharana Bulu and Chhatar Durlav Charan (2013). The Journal of Information Literacy: A Bibliometric Study. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 3(3). Available at: <http://www.ijsrp.org/research-paper-0313/ijsrp-p15122.pdf>.
8. Somaraya B.T. and Mulla K.R. (2016). A bibliometric analysis of journal of information literacy (2011 to 2015). *IISST Journal of Advances In Librarianship*, 7(2), 44-51. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313823427\\_A\\_Bibliometric\\_analysis\\_of\\_journal\\_of\\_information\\_literacy\\_2011\\_to\\_2015](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313823427_A_Bibliometric_analysis_of_journal_of_information_literacy_2011_to_2015). (Accessed: 1 May 2018).
9. JIL (2018). The Journal of Information Literacy. Retrieved from <http://ojs.lboro.ac.uk/ojs/index.php/JIL>
10. Verma, Neerja (1994-95). Analysis of contribution of ILA Bulletin. *ILA Bulletin*, 30(3-4), 78-83.
11. Verma Neerja (2001). Analysis of contribution of Library Herald. *Library Herald*, 39(1-2), 32-49.
12. Verma Neerja (2004). Analysis of contribution of IASLIC Bulletin. *IASLIC Bulletin*, 49(2), 93-104.