

Sociology and Library Research

LEIGH ESTABROOK

TO ANYONE FAMILIAR with them both, the relevance of sociological theory and methodology to research in librarianship may seem self-evident. For example, community analysis and user studies examine social and demographic factors that are assumed to affect attitudes toward and use of libraries; the seemingly endless debate about the extent to which librarianship is a profession is based on the belief that one can examine an occupational group as a social unit; and in library research about scholarly communication, there is a belief that something called the "scholarly community" exists and can be analyzed.

Relevance of one field to another does not imply that that relationship has been adequately developed, however. There are in fact several reasons why one might suspect work in sociology to have little impact on work in librarianship: (1) problems besetting any interdisciplinary research; (2) the difficulties in interpreting the relevance of sociological research for library practice; and (3) the differences between research in a subject discipline and that in a professional field.

To apply sociological theory and methodology to librarianship requires that one be a competent interdisciplinary scholar. Librarianship as a field has its own research and literature, and it is itself interdisciplinary (a fact to which this issue of *Library Trends* attests). Sociology is also interdisciplinary, even if one excludes areas such as "applied sociology." The political sociologists overlap with the economists and political scientists, the ethnographers look like anthropolo-

Leigh Estabrook is Associate Professor, School of Information Studies, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

gists, and those who work with small groups draw directly on work by the psychologists. The problem is more than whether or not it is still possible to be the renaissance scholar. Territorial divisions within universities and within the publishing community also make it difficult to cross disciplinary boundaries. At the present time, few library school faculty hold the doctorate outside their field. In Kilpela's¹ review of 454 library school faculty with doctorates in 1978, 64.1 percent held the Ph.D. in library science or the Doctor of Library Science (D.L.S.). Only twenty-three (5.1 percent) were identified as holding the Ph.D. in any one of the social sciences. Formal training in an area may not be necessary for competence in a discipline; but it provides the critical introduction to theory and research. Moreover, the formal credential in a field is one of the first requirements for entry into a particular scholarly community.

A related problem is the likelihood that the sociological material used by library researchers may not reflect the most recent advances in sociological thought. The challenges of interdisciplinary research make it difficult for scholars to create informal connections with all others who may be working currently on the same problems. If, for example, a faculty member is involved in the American Library Association and the American Society for Information Science or the Special Library Association—activities that are promoted within the library school community—it is difficult also to maintain a level of involvement with the American Sociological Association and the Society for the Study of Social Problems or other sociological associations. Not to have those informal collegial relationships means that a scholar working on sociological research and its applications to library research must depend primarily on written reports of the sociological work. By the time these appear, the work may be several years out of date; and, moreover, the library research that cites the sociological research may also be several years old by the time it appears in print. This compounded time-lag leads to a situation in which it is likely that much of the sociological research that is brought to the library community's attention will not reflect the current debates within sociology.

A second barrier to applying sociological findings to library research is the problem of interpreting the meaning of those findings. Blalock² discusses the complexity of social research relative to the large number of interrelated variables which the researcher must consider. It is often difficult to ascertain what are causes and what the effects of different social factors. More significantly for the library practitioner, sociological research findings do not lead naturally to a conclusion

about the social policies that should be implemented. For example, research has consistently shown that less than 30 percent of a community's members are likely to be users of public libraries. The factors to which this is attributed include educational level of nonusers, location of branches, and the middle-class orientation of most public libraries. From this information, practitioners seeking to increase library use could infer a number of different strategies, including raising the educational level of the general population, relocating branches, or changing the types of services that are provided in the public library. Ideological and practical considerations are more likely to determine which changes might be implemented than any sociological findings about library users.

Finally, there are the differences between research in a subject discipline and that in a professional field, which may limit the application of one to another. Allen³ found little direct application of scientific research by the engineers in a research and development laboratory.

It is becoming generally accepted that technology builds upon itself and advances quite independently of any link with the scientific frontier, and often without any necessity for an understanding of the basic science which underlies it.⁴

Schön,⁵ in his recent analysis of the ways in which professionals "think in action" concludes that "the practice context is different from the research context in several important ways, all of which have to do with the relationship between changing things and understanding them."⁶ From this he concludes "there is a disturbing tendency for research and practice to follow divergent paths. Practitioners and researchers tend increasingly to live in different worlds, pursue different enterprises, and have little to say to one another."⁷

This analysis suggests that it is not only difficult for librarians to be sociologists, too; but also that sociological findings may be difficult to apply and finally may be seen by librarians as irrelevant. If we return then to the question of how sociological research has affected research in librarianship we may expect to find the answer to be, "not much." This answer tells us nothing, however, about the nature of the relationship that does exist.

Sociology as a discipline has both a set of methodologies commonly applied in its research and a body of theories built upon those research findings. The contributions of the two can be looked at in somewhat different ways. First, the research methodologies commonly employed within librarianship can be analyzed to determine the extent

to which sociological methods are applied. Second, the research reported within the library field can be examined to identify the ways in which sociological research findings and theories are important to library research.

Library Science Research Methodology

The contribution of sociological methodology to library research is the easier of the two topics to analyze. Several recent studies of library research methodology have been conducted and two recent textbooks of methods of library research have been published. A reading of these suggests the importance of making the distinction between research design, data collection techniques, and data analysis in discussing sociological research and library research. At the present time, library research seems to incorporate some of the sociological approaches toward research design and data collection, but only a limited spectrum of the data analytic techniques.

At the 1978 Association of College and Research Libraries conference Kim and Kim presented an analysis of twenty years of articles in *College & Research Libraries*. They found that even in the second decade of publication (when *CRL* articles were more quantitative than those in the first), less than half (43 percent) of the articles could be classified as quantitative studies. In both periods, "survey research was the principle research methodology employed...[and] questionnaires [were] the primary data collection method..."⁸

Coughlin and Snelson, in an examination of two sets of Association of College and Research Libraries conference papers found that only 33.3 percent of the 1978 papers and 31.5 percent of the 1981 papers could be categorized as "research reports." "In 86% of the papers, data were collected from a realistic environment, that is, the author did not attempt to set up experiments or otherwise control the environment."⁹ Even those papers that are based on research use limited methodologies. "Questionnaires and observations accounted for 70 percent of the data collected."¹⁰

Similar patterns were identified by Peritz in a study of methodologies of library research. Of all the library research studies analyzed, one-third were "surveys or experiments in libraries" and only 6 percent were "surveys on the public."¹¹

These studies indicate that the design of library research employs experimental or quasi-experimental techniques only infrequently. The major sociological data collection method—survey research—is, how-

ever, used in many studies of libraries that employ systematic research. Use of observational techniques is also common to both library and sociological research.

The aspect of sociological methodology that is least likely to be employed in library research seems to be the forms of data analysis that are employed. For the most part, library research analyzes data through descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations, and correlation coefficients). Those studies that do indicate analyses by inferential statistics are dominated by uses of chi-square and T-tests. Kim and Kim's analysis identified only 6 percent of their 1967-1976 articles as using analysis of variance, multiple regression or factor analysis.¹² Path analysis, log linear models and other more complex statistical techniques have been used rarely in library research although they are increasingly employed in sociological analysis.

An examination of two recent library research textbooks suggests that current library school students are not likely to increase the sophistication of their data analysis techniques. Martyn and Lancaster's introduction to research methods does present information on questioning procedures, sampling and design, including attitude scales, interviews, user panels, diaries, critical incident techniques, and sociometric analysis. But the seventy-one pages devoted to that body of material are scarcely adequate to enable a student to employ these methods independently. The book briefly discusses data analysis, but is not designed to be a comprehensive introduction to it.¹³ Busha and Harter's *Research Methods in Librarianship* is so designed, but the discussion on presentation of data offers only linear regression and significance testing.¹⁴

These works, designed primarily for master's students, are not the only ones used to train library researchers. Many doctoral students do, in fact, use standard social science research texts. However, without a research-literate consumer group—i.e., library practitioners—those who are familiar with more complex analytic tools may be limited in reporting their use in the professional literature.¹⁵

Although citation analysis has limited value in trying to understand the types of methodologies employed within library research, an examination of the methodological works cited in the professional literature does provide further support for the findings discussed above.

The citation analysis for this study was developed from a bibliographic search of the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) database.¹⁶ The procedure for carrying it out was as follows:

1. A list was compiled of all journals (N=43) within the ISI database that the author could identify as related to library and information science.
2. A bibliographic search was conducted to identify which of those journals contained "journal articles" with more than one cited reference. This eliminated three of the original library science journals and left a list of forty journals from which the citation search was conducted (see appendix A for a list of these forty journals).
3. A second search provided a list of all articles within the forty journals in the ISI database that contained more than one reference. It also provided bibliographic information on each of the citations for each of the articles—a total of 16,936 references.
4. The list of 16,936 references was then analyzed to identify those that were to sociological journals, books or reports.

The interdisciplinary nature of sociology leads to inherent problems in identifying whether a specific citation should be considered within the field of sociology. The strategy adopted for this study involved two different approaches. First, citations to journals were counted as "sociological" if the journal was included in the citation study of Baughman¹⁷ or the readership analysis of Satariano.¹⁸ Baughman identified twenty-four core sociological journals through an analysis of what was at that time *Social Sciences and Humanities Index*. Satariano analyzed the journals that sociologists reported they read. A total of fifty-nine journals were included in his listing. When duplicates are eliminated these studies provide a set of sixty-one journals that sociologists consider relevant to their work (see appendix B).

No similar studies exist that could be used to identify which of the cited books or reports should be categorized as sociological. For this group of materials, the author used the author and/or title of the work to determine whether it should be considered a sociological reference. Because this way of classifying monographs is subjective and nonsystematic, the author sought to be inclusive: that is, all works that could remotely be expected to be sociological were included in this group of references. Of the 16,936 cited references resulting from the original ISI search, 1327 (7.8 percent) were identified as sociological. Of these, 961 were books or reports and 366 were articles.¹⁹

In an analysis of 16,936 citations in forty library journals, 113 were identified by the author as related to social science methodology. (References to the handbooks for computerized statistical packages—e.g., *The SPSS Primer*—were not included.) Within these 133 citations, only two

authors were mentioned more than four times: Donald Campbell and Julian Stanley's *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research* (one of the most highly cited social science works, according to Eugene Garfield) was referred to three times and other works of Campbell's were cited twice. Hubert M. Blalock's *Social Statistics* had four references; his *Causal Inferences in Non-experimental Research*, had two references. The wide scattering of references to statistical and methodological works could be categorized as follows: general methodology, statistics, research design, evaluation research, qualitative methods, multivariate techniques, measurement, and content analysis.

TABLE 1
ANALYSIS OF CITATIONS TO SOCIAL SCIENCE METHODOLOGY
BY TYPE OF WORK AND NUMBER OF CITATIONS

<i>Type of Work</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage of Cited Works (n=113)</i>
General Methodology	33	29.2
Statistics	29	25.7
Research Design	20	17.7
Evaluation Research	9	8.0
Qualitative Methods	8	7.1
Multivariate Techniques	6	5.3
Measurement	5	4.4
Content Analysis	3	2.6
Total	113	100.0

Of the 113 works cited, only six (5.3 percent) dealt with multivariate analysis, although most of the statistics books also included units on multiple regression and analysis of variance. Over half the works cited were concerned with general social science methodology and research design.

Sociological Theory and Research and Librarianship

Citation analyses are justifiably criticized for their inability to reveal "intellectual indebtedness" and for the biases built into the analysis by the literature base that is used, among other things. Nonetheless, a citation analysis can provide that first level of description of a relationship between fields that can allow further questions to be articu-

lated. For the purposes of this paper, an analysis of the references to sociological literature that are made by those who are writing within the field of library and information studies provides evidence about the age and type of sociological material used in library research. Although library researchers may use sociological materials that are not cited, the study of those that are may reveal a pattern of what within sociology is seen to be significant enough that it must be cited.

The analysis of that body of 1327 references that were considered sociological revealed little acknowledgment of those individuals who are classically important to sociological theory: Marx, Durkheim, and Weber. Max Weber, whose ideas have provided a foundation for organizational theorists, was cited eight times; Marx and Durkheim, once. The one major sociological theorist who is referred to frequently is Robert K. Merton (twenty citations) principally for his works on bureaucratic structure and professions.

An analysis of the most frequently cited authors reflects further the limited extent to which sociology is drawn on by library researchers; table 2 shows authors who received ten or more references.

TABLE 2
MOST FREQUENTLY CITED AUTHORS FROM 1327 SOCIOLOGICAL
REFERENCES WITHIN LIBRARY LITERATURE

Price, D.	28
Garfield, E.	24
Merton, R.K.	20
Bell, D.	19
Crane, D.	16
Garvey, W.D.	14
Griffith, B.	12
Blau, P.	12
Ziman, J.	10

These nine authors account for only 10.2 percent of the citations analyzed. The remaining 90 percent of the references are scattered widely. Although all have been classified as within the scope of sociology, only four authors can be classified as academic sociologists. The other five are information scientists and other social scientists whose names are included because they publish within what have been categorized as sociological works. The range of journals and books categorized

as sociological for this analysis explain in part the group of authors most frequently cited. For example, *Science* is included as one of the journals read by sociologists in Satariano's study. Its inclusion in this study accounts for most of the citations to Garfield. An analysis of citations to books, reports and journals reflects this same mix of sociological works and items from related fields (see table 3).

TABLE 3
MOST FREQUENTLY CITED JOURNALS AND BOOKS FROM 1327
SOCIOLOGICAL REFERENCES WITHIN LIBRARY LITERATURE

<i>Science</i>	62
<i>American Sociological Review</i>	37
<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>	25
<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	20
* <i>Little Science, Big Science</i>	16
<i>Journal of Social Issues</i>	16
* <i>Invisible Colleges</i>	14
<i>American Sociologist</i>	13
<i>Sociology of Education</i>	13
<i>Human Relations</i>	12
* <i>Professionalization</i>	10
<i>Social Forces</i>	10
<i>Daedalus</i>	7
<i>Psychology Today</i>	6
<i>American Psychologist</i>	6
<i>Society (Transaction)</i>	6
Total	273

*monograph

These 273 citations represent 20.6 percent of the sociological references analyzed. If citations to journals are considered separately, the 233 citations in thirteen journals on this list account for nearly two-thirds (63.7 percent) of the citations in the body of sixty-one journals considered. Thirty-one journals were cited a total of 184 times; twenty-three of the sociological journals identified by Baughman or Satariano received no citation.

It is also illustrative to examine the rank order of these journals with the rank ordering developed by Baughman and Satariano (see table 4).

The citation analysis of sociology references within library literature reveals a mixed pattern of references to those journals that are

TABLE 4
 RANK ORDER OF SOCIOLOGICAL JOURNALS CITED IN LIBRARY LITERATURE^a
 AND IN SOCIOLOGICAL LITERATURE^b, AND READ BY SOCIOLOGISTS^c

	Estabrook ^a	Baughman ^b	Satariano ^c
<i>Science</i>	1.0	NR*	43.0
<i>American Sociological Review</i>	2.0	1.0	1.0
<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>	3.0	2.0	3.0
<i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>	4.0	19.0	19.0
<i>Journal of Social Issues</i>	5.0	12.0	5.0
<i>American Sociologist</i>	6.5	NR	2.0
<i>Sociology of Education</i>	6.5	NR	18.0
<i>Human Relations</i>	8.0	11.0	32.0
<i>Social Forces</i>	8.0	5.0	4.0
<i>Daedalus</i>	10.0	24.0	9.0
<i>Psychology Today</i>	12.0	NR	7.0
<i>American Psychologist</i>	12.0	NR	26.0
<i>Society (Transaction)</i>	12.0	NR	5.0

*NR=not ranked

^aEstabrook, Leigh. "Sociology and Library Research" *Library Trends* 32(Spring 1984).

^bBaughman, James C. "A Structural Analysis of the Literature of Sociology." *Library Quarterly* 44(Oct. 1974):293-308.

^cSatariano, William A. "Journal Use in Sociology: Citation Analysis vs. Readership Patterns." *Library Quarterly* 48(July 1978):293-300.

highly cited in the sociological literature and those that are frequently read by sociologists, including the "popular" literature such as *Society*, *Psychology Today*, and *Daedalus*. Inclusion of *Science* and *Administrative Science Quarterly* and the exclusion of such journals as *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, and *American Anthropologist* (ones highly cited in sociology—see appendix B) are clear reflections of the nature of the specific type of interdisciplinary focus within library research. Research and writing in librarianship tend to focus more on managerial and technical and scientific issues than on the interpersonal and community ones.

It was also suggested at the beginning of this paper that one might expect to find the cited sociological literature to be older. The mean date of citation for journal articles is 1968. For all works—books, reports and journals—the mean date of publication is 1972.

This citation analysis has weaknesses similar to all such research. Of greatest significance is the questionable use of the Baughman and Satariano ranked lists as a basis for determining sociological journals. These earlier studies were based on research carried out several years before actual publication of the articles. Since the early to mid-1970s, the

issues raised and even types of publications issued have changed. In consideration of these changes, the citations within library literature were examined by this author independently of the Baughman and Satariano lists. Eight additional journals were identified which contained sociological articles to which library researchers referred. Two journals were highly cited: *Social Studies of Science* (begun in 1975 as a continuation of *Science Studies*) with thirty-seven citations and *International Social Science Journal* (1949-) with eighteen citations. Neither of these was included in the analyses of sociology citation and readership patterns. Important articles by Daniel Bell and Shoshona Zuboff were cited in the *Harvard Business Review* (six citations), as were articles by Nina Toren and other recognized sociologists in the *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, *The Futurist*, *Public Administration Quarterly*, and *The Academy of Management Review*. A total of eighty-one additional journal citations that are sociological in subject and by authorship were identified from the original ISI search. A calculation of citations to sociological literature by authors in library science with these items added gives a total of 1408 sociological citations (961 books, 447 articles) or 8.3 percent of the total number of citations in the library science articles surveyed. The other 91.7 percent of the citations within the library literature were to other behavioral sciences, the sciences, or to other library literature. In the future, one might also expect to find the computer magazines and other technological works to contain articles on the sociological impact of information systems and services and the sociology of computing.

Discussion

Despite conditions that make it difficult for researchers to carry out interdisciplinary work, the evidence that has been presented indicates that library research is incorporating both the methodology of sociology and its research findings. The indication that approximately 8 percent of library citations can be considered sociological does not seem insignificant to this author, although individuals may differ in their opinions of what level of citation should be considered significant. Of concern, however, is the relative age of the sociological references and the apparently limited sociological theoretical framework from which library researchers have drawn.

A debate about whether Schön²⁰ is correct in questioning the relevance of academic disciplines to professional practice is beyond the scope of this paper. Nonetheless, since library research is building on

the work of sociology, it seems important that it do so critically and with full consideration of current sociological thinking and forms of analysis. There are several reasons for making this argument. First, use of sociological techniques for research design and data collection without employing multivariate techniques for data collection limits the researcher's ability to make causal inferences about relationships between variables. It may even lead her or him to make false conclusions about the ways in which different factors should be altered to effect changes in library or user behavior. For example, in the Estabrook and Heim study of members of the American Library Association,²¹ simple correlations between variables suggest that gender is the major variable determining salary differences among librarians. Multivariate analysis indicates that rates of publication, activity in professional associations, and other variables are more strongly associated with salary differential than gender; but the nature of the survey design limits further conclusions about the causal relationships among variables.²²

Second, to draw on limited theoretical work in sociology for hypotheses about librarianship may both limit the ways in which questions about librarianship are formed and the types of research conducted. A cursory examination of the types of sources on the subject of professionalism or professionalization that were cited by library research indicates, for example, a heavy emphasis on one model of professionalization: that which sees occupational groups along a continuum—one that can be traversed from semiprofessional to professional. In this model, professions are characterized by the skills, autonomy and other attributes of their members. The effect of buying into such a theoretical model of professionalism—one that is in fact debated within sociology—is that much of what is written in librarianship begins from the standpoint of whether librarians possess or can acquire the attributes necessary for them to become professionals. Analysis of librarianship as a profession in its relationship to wider social institutions, examination of librarians' professional striving and power relationships, and even consideration of the issue of deprofessionalization of librarianship have been briefly considered by researchers in the library field; but these problems, framed by alternative models of the sociology of occupations, appear to be less frequently identified and discussed.

The challenges that face library research regarding the use of sociological research involve more than adopting increasingly sophisticated analytic techniques and examining competing theoretical models. It also seems important that library researchers seek colleagues who can

comment on their work in an informed manner. The barriers to interdisciplinary work that have been discussed earlier create a situation in which it is difficult to find colleagues who know the limits of certain methods and who are aware of competing theories. To advance such interdisciplinary research requires not only collegial relationships, but also those critical dialogues that provide opportunities for testing the validity of research and alternative explanations.

References

1. Kilpela, Raymond. "Library School Faculty doctorates: A Statistical Review." *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 22(Spring 1982):239-59.
2. Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. *An Introduction to Social Research*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
3. Allen, Thomas J. *Managing the Flow of Technology: Technology Transfer and the Dissemination of Technological Information within the Research and Development Organization*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, 1977.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
5. Schön, Donald A. *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 147.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 308.
8. Kim, Soon D., and Kim, Mary T. "Academic Library Research: A Twenty Year Perspective." In *New Horizons for Academic Libraries: ACRL 1978* (Papers presented at the First National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, Boston, 8-11 Nov. 1978), edited by Robert D. Stuart and Richard D. Johnson, p. 377. New York: K.G. Saur, 1979.
9. Coughlin, Caroline, and Snelson, Pamela. "Searching for Research in ACRL Conference Papers." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 9(March 1983):23.
10. *Ibid.*
11. Peritz, Bluma C. "The Methods of Library Science Research: Some Results from a Bibliometric Survey." *Library Research* 2(Fall 1980):255-56.
12. Kim, and Kim, "Academic Library Research."
13. Martyn, John, and Lancaster, F. Wilfrid. *Investigative Methods in Library and Information Science*. Arlington, Va.: Information Resources Press, 1981.
14. Busha, Charles H., and Harter, Stephen P. *Research Methods in Librarianship: Techniques and Interpretation*. New York: Academic Press, 1980.
15. In preparing a recent article for *American Libraries*, Kathleen Heim and I were asked to explain r^2 —the correlation coefficient—in a note to the text. It was thought that too many readers would not be able to interpret the findings otherwise.
16. I am indebted to Vice-president for Research and Graduate Affairs Volker Weiss of Syracuse University, for making the funds available for this research; and to Lane Hart, a graduate assistant at the school, who did much of the data analysis. James S. McPhee, search analyst, Bird Library, Syracuse University, conducted the difficult bibliographic search.
17. Baughman, James C. "A Structural Analysis of the Literature of Sociology." *Library Quarterly* 44(Oct. 1974):293-308.
18. Satariano, William A. "Journal Use in Sociology: Citation Analysis vs. Readership Patterns." *Library Quarterly* 48(July 1978):293-300.

19. The books were selected as "sociological" on the basis of the title. I sought to be inconclusive in my selection—that is, when a title was in question, I included it—and this led to what is probably an overestimation of the number of sociological books or reports that are cited in library literature. This policy of selection and the fact that no independent jury was used should caution the reader about making inferences based on the number of books and reports cited or the ratio of books cited to articles cited.

20. Schön, *The Reflective Practitioner*.

21. Estabrook, Leigh S., and Heim, Kathleen M. "A Profile of ALA Personal Members." *American Libraries* 11(Dec. 1980):654-59.

22. For example, the authors could not answer whether men publish more than women because men have more access to resources or achieve higher positions from which they are encouraged to publish or whether men achieve these positions in part because of their higher rate of publication. An investigator may have hunches about the relationship; but the data do not (and cannot, given the limited design) provide the necessary basis for unravelling the causal relationships.

Appendix A

Library and Information Science Journals Analyzed for Citations to
Sociological Literature
(search conducted on BRS 8 October 1983)

American Archivist

ASLIB Proceedings

Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian

Bulletin of the Medical Library Association

Canadian Journal of Information Science

Canadian Library Journal

College and Research Libraries

Computer Networks

Database

Drexel Library Quarterly

Government Publications Review

IFLA Journal

Information Age

Information Processing and Management

Information Technology in Libraries

International Forum on Information and Documentation

International Library Review

Journal of Academic Librarianship

Journal of Documentation

Journal of Education for Librarianship

Journal of Information Science

Journal of Librarianship

Journal of Library History

Journal of Library History Philosophy and Comparative Librarianship

Journal of the American Society for Information Science

Sociology & Library Research

Law Library Journal
Library Acquisitions-Practice and Theory
Library and Information Science
Library Journal
Library Quarterly
Library Resources and Technical Services
Library Trends
Libri
Online
Online Review
Program-Automated Library and Information Systems
RQ
Serials Librarian
Special Libraries
UNESCO Journal of Information Science Librarianship and Archives Administration

Appendix B

Rank Order of Findings for Baughman and Satariano

James Baughman (1974)

- 1 *American Sociological Review*
- 2 *American Journal of Sociology*
- 3 *Journal of Marriage and the Family*
- 4 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*
- 5 *Social Forces*
- 6 *American Anthropologist*
- 7 *American Political Science Review*
- 8 *Sociology and Social Research*
- 9 *Sociometry*
- 10 *Public Opinion Quarterly*
- 11 *Human Relations*
- 12 *Journal of Social Issues*
- 13 *Human Organization*
- 14 *Social Problems*
- 15 *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*
- 16 *Journal of Social Psychology*
- 17 *Child Development*
- 18 *Sociological Quarterly*
- 19.5 *Administrative Science Quarterly*
- 19.5 *British Journal of Sociology*
- 21.5 *Psychology Bulletin*
- 21.5 *Rural Sociology*

LEIGH ESTABROOK

- 24 *Daedalus*
- 24 *Family Process*
- 24 *Man*

William A. Satariano (1978)

- 1 *American Sociological Review*
- 2 *American Sociologist*
- 3 *American Journal of Sociology*
- 4 *Social Forces*
- 5 *Society (Trans-action)*
- 6 *Social Problems*
- 7 *Psychology Today*
- 8 *Sociometry*
- 9 *Daedalus*
- 10 *Sociological Quarterly*
- 11 *Journal of Marriage and the Family*
- 12 *Sociological Inquiry*
- 13 *Rural Sociology*
- 14 *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*
- 15 *Pacific Sociological Review*
- 16 *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*
- 17 *Public Opinion Quarterly*
- 18 *Sociology of Education*
- 19 *Administrative Science Quarterly*
- 20 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*
- 21 *American Anthropologist*
- 22 *Journal of the American Statistical Association*