WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

Assessing the Visibility of Articles Published in Gender & Society *with Google Scholar*

JERRY A. JACOBS
University of Pennsylvania

Gender & Society *is the leading specialty journal in the sociology of gender, as indicated by its high ranking in the ISI Web of Knowledge Journal Citation Reports. The ISI system, however, does not track citations appearing in books, and thus a significant potential source of references for* Gender & Society *is missed. This article reports the results of an analysis of highly cited articles that compares their visibility in Google Scholar to that documented in the ISI data system. Google Scholar captures more than twice as many references to these* Gender & Society *articles than does the ISI Web of Knowledge. The analysis shows that the incremental coverage is greater for* Gender & Society *than for several other prominent sociology journals. The absolute and relative standing of* Gender & Society *would improve if a more comprehensive system of tracking citations were employed.*

Keywords: *knowledge; science; media; mass communications; method*

The journal *Gender & Society* was founded in 1987 for the purpose of "contributing a fresh perspective to research and theory on gender" (Lorber 1988, 3). The Publication Committee of the American Sociological Association (ASA) decided against sponsoring *Gender & Society* as an official journal of the ASA, a decision that ASA subsequently regretted. *Gender & Society* has thrived over the past 20 years. It currently has approximately 5,000 library subscriptions and is now a major revenue source for its sponsoring organization, Sociologists for Women in Society.

The analysis reported here examines whether *Gender & Society* and its authors deserve more credit than they are accorded by the standard journal

AUTHORS' NOTE: *This article has benefitted from comments by the anonymous reviewers and Margaret Andersen, Dana Britton, Myra Marx Ferree, Anita Garey, Paul DiMaggio, and Brian Powell. Thanks to Sam Summers for research assistance on this project.*

GENDER & SOCIETY, Vol. 23 No. 6, December 2009 817-832
DOI: 10.1177/0891243209351029

ranking system, the ISI Web of Knowledge Journal Citation Reports. In so doing, the article revisits some of *Gender & Society*'s "greatest hits."

RANKING JOURNALS

Citation counts have become part of the landscape of academic journal publication. Faculty promotion and tenure decisions, as well as other forms of academic recognition, reflect judgments about the quality as well as the quantity of publications. It is often difficult to assess the quality of a given article or book, especially in the social sciences, when the full impact of a piece of scholarship is often not fully evident for a decade or more. As a result, in addition to soliciting the opinions of leading experts in the field, university committees often solicit information about the ranking of journals in which articles are published. Promotion and tenure committees seek to identify leading generalist and specialist journals.

The ISI Web of Knowledge has developed a tool for ranking academic journals (ISI Web of Knowledge 2009). The ISI Journal Citation Reports provide a statistic called the "impact factor," which is essentially the ratio of citations to publications. For example, if a journal published 50 articles and there were a total of 50 other articles that referenced these articles, then the impact factor would be 1.0. ISI Journal Citation Reports group journals according to field, such as sociology or women's studies, and annually report the impact factor and various other journal statistics.

The use of citations counts as proxies for research quality remains controversial (MacRoberts and MacRoberts 1996). Although some assume high visibility equates to high productivity and hence "faculty effectiveness" (Adkins and Budd 2006; Borgman and Furner 2002; Garfield 2006), others remain skeptical of the validity of citation measures (van Raan 2005). Here, I use the terms *visibility* and *impact* rather than *quality* in recognition of the fact that some high-quality articles receive less recognition than they deserve while other high-quality studies may have been published before their time.

Until recently, a principal limitation of the ISI Impact Factor was its short time frame: Citing articles were counted one to two years after the cited article was published. In many fields, including the social sciences, this is too short of a time to fully assess the visibility and influence of research. For example, articles published in *Gender & Society* have a "half-life" of ten years. This means that after ten years, on average, only half of the references that will eventually accumulate have been recorded. Thus, the two-year time frame significantly understates the long-term impact of social science research. The ISI Journal Citation Reports now include

a five-year impact factor, which allows more time for the influence of an article to be appraised.

For many years, the ISI Web of Knowledge was the only data source for measuring journal citations. In recent years, other indices, including High Wire (High Wire 2009) and Elsevier's Scopus (Scopus 2009), have begun to compete with the Web of Knowledge. The focus here is on another source for assessing the impact or visibility of research, namely, Google Scholar, which more fully covers books than do these other sources (Google Scholar 2009).

Google Scholar and Scopus have been available since 2004. A research literature in the fields of library science, information science, and bibliometrics has begun to compare the coverage of these different sources (e.g., Meho and Yang, forthcoming). For example, Bakkalbasi et al. (2006) found that the Web of Knowledge was the most comprehensive of these three indices for two journals in the fields of oncology and condensed matter physics. It may be disconcerting to learn that there is a relatively low degree of coverage overlap between the different citation systems, even in as identifiable a field of scholarship as physics research. Bakkalbasi et al. reported 58.9 percent of citations in oncology research were captured by both citation counting systems, while only 40.1 percent of citations overlapped in the field of condensed matter physics.

Cronin, Synder, and Atkins (1997) examined citations in leading sociological monographs and journals. They suggested that there may be two distinct populations of highly cited authors, one prominent in journals and one prominent in monographs (also see Clemens et al. 1995). The goal of the present analysis is similar in spirit to that of the Cronin, Snyder, and Atkins study but slightly different in practice. The goal here is to see whether the addition of citations in books alters our understanding of the citation profile of a single journal.

CITATIONS FOR *GENDER & SOCIETY*

As noted above, *Gender & Society* has developed a reputation as the leading specialty journal in the sociology of gender. The journal currently ranks 18th in terms of its two-year impact factor out of 99 sociology journals ranked in the ISI Journal Citation Reports and 5th out of 29 women's studies journals. Using the more comprehensive five-year impact factor, *Gender & Society* ranks 14th among sociology journals and 3rd among women's studies journals.

A major limitation of the ISI citation system is that it focuses only on citations found in journal articles and, among journals, recognized by ISI.[1]

When either articles or books are cited in journals covered by the ISI system, these citations are recorded. When citations appear in the bibliography or reference section of books, these citations are not counted in the ISI system.

In some fields, such as the sociology of gender, a considerable proportion of important scholarship is published in books and non-ISI journals rather than in journal articles. Consequently, it is quite possible that journal articles in such fields would be credited with a disproportionately small share of all of the citations appearing in scholarly publications. The question addressed here is whether the Google Scholar system provides any evidence to support this expectation. Specifically, I address four hypotheses:

1. Articles in *Gender & Society* will receive more citations in Google Scholar than in the ISI Web of Knowledge.
2. The surplus of citations in Google Scholar will primarily be because of citations appearing in books rather than in journals.
3. The surplus of citations in Google Scholar will be most pronounced for qualitative and theoretical articles and will be least evident in quantitative, empirical studies.
4. The surplus of citations in Google Scholar will be greater for *Gender & Society* than for other highly ranked sociology journals.

RESULTS

In Table 1, I compare citations from Google Scholar to those reported in the ISI Web for 30 highly cited articles from *Gender & Society.* For the purpose of this analysis, I defined a article as *highly cited* if it has received 50 or more cumulative citations in the ISI Web of Knowledge system. The analysis focuses on highly cited articles because this provides a discrete and manageable group of articles for analysis. It is also likely that any differences between the two systems will be quite visible when the focus is on highly cited articles.[2]

Neither the one-year impact score nor the five-year impact score fully captures the remarkable rate at which *Gender & Society* has produced articles with high long-term visibility. *Gender & Society* has produced 30 articles with more than 50 citations, including 2 articles with more than 500 citations and 9 articles with more than 100 citations as indexed by ISI. These articles represent "citation classics," highly cited articles that have achieved considerable visibility.[3]

Many of these highly cited articles are theoretical essays. It appears that compelling theoretical works have widespread applications and thus are

TABLE 1: Comparison of Google Scholar and ISI Web of Science Citation Counts for 30 Top Articles in Gender & Society

Author(s)	*Title*	Gender & Society *Year, Issue, and Pages*	*ISI Citations*	*Google Scholar Citations*	*Ratio of Google to ISI*
1. C. West and D. H. Zimmerman	Doing Gender	1987, 1 (2): 125-51	964	2,279	2.36
2. J. Acker	Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations	1990, 4 (2): 139-58	506	1,488	2.94
3. C. West and S. Fenstermaker	Doing Difference	1995, 9 (1): 8-37	189	485	2.57
4. B. F. Reskin	Bringing the Men Back In: Sex Differentiation and the Devaluation of Women's Work	1988, 2 (1): 58-81	175	261	1.49
5. D. Kandiyoti	Bargaining with Patriarchy	1988, 2 (3): 274-90	164	543	3.31
6. J. D. Yoder	Rethinking Tokenism—Looking Beyond Numbers	1991, 5 (2): 178-92	119	183	1.54
7. A. Komter	Hidden Power in Marriage	1989, 3 (2): 187-216	115	185	1.61
8. K. O. Mason and Y. H. Lu	Attitudes toward Familial Roles: Changes in the United States, 1977-1985	1988, 2 (1): 39-57	111	112	1.01
9. P. Hondagneu-Sotelo and E. Avila	"I'm Here But I'm There"—The Meanings of Latina Transnational Motherhood	1997, 11 (5): 548-71	110	254	2.31
10. P. Y. Martin and R. A. Hummer	Fraternities and Rape on Campus	1989, 3 (4): 457-73	90	162	1.80
11. R. W. Connell and J. W. Messerschmidt	Hegemonic Masculinity—Rethinking the Concept	2005, 19 (6): 829-59	84	229	2.73

(continued)

TABLE 1: (continued)

Author(s)	*Title*	Gender & Society *Year, Issue, and Pages*	*ISI Citations*	*Google Scholar Citations*	*Ratio of Google to ISI*
12. R. Leidner	Serving Hamburgers and Selling Insurance—Gender, Work, and Identity in Interactive Service Jobs	1991, 5 (2): 154-77	82	151	1.84
13. B. J. Risman	Intimate Relationships from a Microstructural Perspective: Men Who Mother	1987, 1 (1): 6-32	72	107	1.49
14. J. R. Wilkie	Changes in United States Men's Attitudes toward the Family Provider Role, 1972-1989	1993, 7 (2): 261-79	69	91	1.32
15. P. C. Rust	Coming Out in the Age of Social Constructionism—Sexual Identity Formation among Lesbian and Bisexual Women	1993, 7 (1): 50-77	67	93	1.39
16. A. Browne and K. R. Williams	Gender, Intimacy, and Lethal Violence—Trends from 1976 through 1987	1993, 7 (1): 78-98	67	93	1.39
17. L. D. Brush	Violent Acts and Injurious Outcomes in Married Couples: Methodological Issues in the National Survey of Families and Households	1990, 4 (1): 56-67	65	148	2.28
18. C. Warshaw	Limitations of the Medical Model in the Care of Battered Women	1989, 3 (4): 506-17	64	128	2.00
19. D. L. Tolman	Doing Desire—Adolescent Girls' Struggles with Sexuality	1994, 8 (3): 324-42	62	122	1.97

(continued)

TABLE 1: (continued)

Author(s)	*Title*	Gender & Society *Year, Issue, and Pages*	*ISI Citations*	*Google Scholar Citations*	*Ratio of Google to ISI*
20. P. Y. Martin	Rethinking Feminist Organizations	1990, 4 (2): 182-206	60	144	2.40
21. L. Sanchez and E. Thomson	Becoming Mothers and Fathers—Parenthood, Gender, and the Division of Labor	1997, 11 (6): 747-72	60	130	2.17
22. P. Hondagneu-Sotelo	Overcoming Patriarchal Constraints—The Reconstruction of Gender Relations among Mexican Immigrant Women and Men	1992, 6 (3): 393-415	54	121	2.24
23. P. Y. Martin	"Said and Done" versus "Saying and Doing"—Gendering Practices, Practicing Gender at Work	2003, 17 (3): 342-66	54	109	2.02
24. S. R. Bird	Welcome to the Men's Club—Homosociality and the Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity	1996, 10 (2): 120-32	54	119	2.20
25. K. A. Joe and M. Chesney-Lind	Just Every Mother's Angel—An Analysis of Gender and Ethnic Variations in Youth Gang Membership	1995, 9 (4): 408-31	54	94	1.74
26. K. D. Pyke	Class-Based Masculinities—The Interdependence of Gender, Class, and Interpersonal Power	1996, 10 (5): 527-49	53	102	1.92

(continued)

TABLE 1: (continued)

Author(s)	*Title*	Gender & Society *Year, Issue, and Pages*	*ISI Citations*	*Google Scholar Citations*	*Ratio of Google to ISI*
27. D. Kurz	Social Science Perspectives on Wife Abuse: Current Debates and Future Directions	1989, 3 (4): 489-505	53	126	2.38
28. C. K. Riessman	When Gender Is Not Enough: Women Interviewing Women	1987, 1 (2): 172-207	53	136	2.57
29. A. L. Greil, T. A. Leitko, and K. L. Porter	Infertility: His and Hers	1988, 2 (2): 172-99	52	83	1.60
30. B. Thorne	Revisioning Women and Social Change: Where Are the Children?	1987, 1 (1): 85-109	51	126	2.47
Total			3,667	8,047	2.19

in a position to be a point of reference for a wide swath of scholars. Thus, the most cited article in the history of *Gender & Society* (thus far) is "Doing Gender" by Candace West and Donald H. Zimmerman, with more than 2,000 citations in Google Scholar. Joan Acker's "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations" also has accumulated nearly 1,500 references in Google Scholar.

The evidence clearly supports the expectations set forth in hypothesis 1, namely, that there are more citations in Google Scholar than in the ISI Web of Knowledge. In 14 of the 30 cases, Google Scholar has collected more than twice as many citations as has the Web of Knowledge. Thus, a journal impact factor that relies on the ISI Web of Knowledge understates the visibility and influence of articles in *Gender & Society.* On average, the Google Scholar count was more than twice (2.19 times) as high as the citation count reported by the ISI Web of Knowledge.

What accounts for the differences in counts between Google Scholar and the Web of Knowledge? The obvious place to look is the treatment of books. I picked two articles and examined each of the citations. The results are presented in Table 2. The higher citation counts evident in Google Scholar are indeed partly because of the fact that Google Scholar's system extends to include books and not just journal articles. But interestingly enough, there is an incomplete overlap in the count of articles as well.

Patricia Yancey Martin's 1990 article (one of the three that Martin has on this list) has received 62 citations to date according to the ISI Web of Knowledge, compared to 141 in Google Scholar. Of the 79 additional references captured by Google Scholar, 38 represent citations in books, along with one citation in a book chapter. Thus, in this case, a considerable amount of the incremental coverage in Google Scholar is because of the addition of references in books.

In addition to these references to books, the Google Scholar search also reveals a number of journal articles unique to each system. While there is considerable overlap, neither of these two data bases provides comprehensive coverage of journal articles.[4] In the references to Martin's article, 39 journal article citations are common to both data bases, 23 are unique to ISI, and 42 are unique to Google Scholar. In this case, if one defines total citations as the union of these two data sources, then Martin's article would receive not 144 but 167 citations.

Finally, in addition to covering books and additional journal articles, a minority of the references in Google Scholar are to other types of citing documents. Specifically, in the case of Martin's article, nine references were located in dissertations, four were in conference proceedings, and three were in working papers. Only a handful were classified as "invalid

TABLE 2: Detailed Comparison of ISI and Google Scholar Citations for Two *Gender & Society* Articles

1. Martin, Patricia Yancey. 1990. Rethinking feminist organizations. *Gender & Society* 4 (2): 182-206.	
Number of citations in ISI	62
Number of citations in Google Scholar	141
Number of articles in ISI only	23
Number of articles in both ISI and Google	39
Number of articles in Google only	43
Other items in Google only	
Books	38
Book chapters	1
Dissertations	9
Conference proceedings	4
Working papers	3
Invalid references	4
2. Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette, and Ernestine Avila. 1997. "I'm here, but I'm there": The meanings of Latina transnational motherhood. *Gender & Society* 11 (5): 548-71.	
Number of citations in ISI	109
Number of citations in Google Scholar	254
Number of articles in Google	214
Number of books in Google	37
Number of articles in ISI only	33
Number in both ISI and Google	76
Number of articles in Google only	81
Other items in Google only	
Books	32
Book chapters	9
Dissertations	8
College syllabi	3
Conference proceedings	8
Published research reports	6
Working papers	8
Invalid references	13

Note: Invalid references included links that did not work and duplicate references.

references," a category that covers duplicate references and links that are no longer functional.

The same overall pattern holds for references to the 1997 article published by Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo and Ernestine Avila, one of the two highly cited articles Hondagneu-Sotelo has on this list.

This article was cited in books 37 times, along with 9 references in book chapters, but it also received 81 journal citations that were missed by the

ISI Web of Knowledge system. Her Google Scholar citation count is 254, and the union of the two systems would produce 287 citations.[5] Hypothesis 2 thus receives qualified support: Google Scholar's coverage of books accounts for much but not all of its higher citation counts.

Is the differential between Google Scholar and ISI citation counts smaller for quantitative articles? The reasoning behind this possibility is that most journal articles are quantitative, and the coverage of quantitative research journals is likely to be reasonably comprehensive in the ISI Web of Knowledge. If quantitative articles published in *Gender & Society* are most commonly cited by quantitative journal articles covered by the ISI system, then the incremental references captured by Google Scholar might be few in number and of marginal significance.

Three of the four articles with the smallest Google Scholar increment are quantitative articles: those by Mason and Lu, by Wilkie, and by Browne and Williams. On the other hand, three other quantitative articles, by Brush, by Sanchez and Thomson, and by Warshaw, have average Google Scholar to ISI ratios. These results are not definitive since there are a limited number of quantitative articles on this list and because the concentration of these articles at the lower end of the differential is not entirely clear. The difference in means between the quantitative and other articles is not statistically significant. The evidence points in the direction of hypothesis 3, but not decisively so.

How does the *Gender & Society* pattern compare to those of other journals? I wanted to select journals that do not focus on gender issues because this would blur the comparison. For example, of the top 10 most cited articles in the journal *Work and Occupations*, no fewer than 7 consider issues of gender and the workplace. As a result, *Work and Occupations* would not serve as the clearest comparison case for the present purposes.

I selected three sociology journals for comparison: *Social Networks*, *Social Forces*, and *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* (*JHSB*). Each of these is a highly regarded journal, and each of these journals typically features quantitative analyses. I selected the 10 most cited articles in each journal published since 1987 (when *Gender & Society* began publishing) for examination.

What insights does this comparison yield? First, Google Scholar generally produces higher citation counts than does the Web of Knowledge for all of the social science journals examined. In all of the *Gender & Society* articles, the citation count was higher for Google Scholar. This pattern held consistently for the top 10 cited articles in the three comparison journals. Thus, it is clear that Google Scholar casts a wider net and catches more citations than does the Web of Knowledge for these sociological journals.

TABLE 3: Comparison of ISI and Google Scholar Citations for Selected Journals

Journal	Years Covered	Journal Ranking: Two-Year Impact Factor	Journal Ranking: Five-Year Impact Factor	Mean ISI Citation Count for 10 Top Articles	Ratio of Google to ISI Citations
Gender & Society	1987–2009	18	14	254.3	2.09
Journal of Health and Social Behavior	1987–2009	7/24[a]	4/3[a]	537.4	1.71
Social Networks	1987–2009	4	4	96.2	1.60
Social Forces	1987–2009	21	12	299.8	1.55

a. Although it is published by the American Sociological Association, *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* (*JHSB*) is grouped with public health journals in the ISI Journal Citation Reports. The first entry indicates where *JHSB* would rank among sociology journals, and the second indicates where it ranks among public health journals in the ISI journals. *JHSB* would rank fourth among sociology journals based on the five-year impact factor.

Second, the expanded coverage of Google Scholar is most beneficial to articles in *Gender & Society.* Let us define "the Google bounce" as the ratio of citations in Google Scholar to those in the Web of Knowledge. The Google bounce averages 2.19 for the 30 highly cited articles in *Gender & Society* and 2.09 for the top 10 cited articles. Thus, there are often twice as many references to *Gender & Society* articles captured in Google Scholar compared to the Web of Knowledge. Although the Google bounce is often considerable for articles in other journals as well, the ratio is typically less than 2 for the other three journals examined. The average Google bounce was 1.71 for *JHSB*, 1.60 for *Social Networks*, and 1.55 for the top articles published in *Social Forces.* Thus, a more complete accounting of the impact of *Gender & Society* articles would raise not only the absolute but also the relative ranking of this journal. Thus, the journal comparisons presented in Table 3 are consistent with hypothesis 4.

Finally, the top cited articles in *Gender & Society* are more visible than those published in *Social Networks*. The mean (ISI) citation count for the top 10 articles in *Gender & Society* is 254, compared to 96 for *Social Networks.* On the other hand, *Gender & Society* trails *Social Forces* and *JHSB* on this particular metric.

Is the greater visibility of *Gender & Society* articles in Google Scholar because of the interdisciplinary nature of this journal? This is an intriguing possibility, and there may well be some truth to this point, but the comparison

journals examined do not support this conclusion. *Gender & Society* indeed reaches an interdisciplinary audience: Only 32.3 percent of the citations to *Gender & Society* articles appear in sociology journals, based on the ISI journal classification system.[6] However, the comparison journals also rank relatively low in this regard as well: 41.0 percent of citations in sociology journals for *Social Forces*, 29.18 percent for *Social Networks*, and only 7.50 percent for *JHSB*. Articles published in sociology journals are frequently cited by researchers working in adjacent fields. The interdisciplinary reach of *Gender & Society* is an important feature of this journal, but *Gender & Society* is not unique in crossing disciplinary boundaries.

Is the pattern I observe here unique to *Gender & Society*, or is it common to other feminist journals? To explore this possibility, I repeated this analysis for the journal *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. Indeed, the results (not shown) are remarkably consistent with those observed for *Gender & Society.* Google Scholar captures more than twice as many citations (2.10) than does the ISI Web of Knowledge for the most highly cited articles published in *Signs*.[7]

In one additional analysis, I considered whether Google Scholar altered the number of articles with no citations. Scholarship is a highly skewed activity, and many published articles are never cited. Based on the ISI Web of Knowledge data, I calculated that 89 percent of *Gender & Society* articles have been cited at least once, while the remaining 11 percent have not been cited. Many of the noncited articles are relatively recent and may be cited at some point in the future. Would the fraction of noncited articles decline if *Gender & Society* articles were indexed via Google Scholar?

I examined a sample of 30 articles from the late 1990s that have not been cited to date according to the ISI Web of Knowledge. I was able to find 26 of these via Google Scholar, but only 2 had garnered references in the Google Scholar system. I conclude from this inquiry that Google Scholar does more to highlight the visibility of prominent articles than it does to rescue overlooked articles from obscurity.

CONCLUSION

Gender & Society has given a platform to a number of both fledgling and accomplished scholars to advance gender scholarship. Based on the impact score analysis reported from the Web of Knowledge, it is clear that *Gender & Society* is the top journal in its specialty. The current analysis suggests that *Gender & Society* deserves even more credit as its articles are far more influential than the ISI journal impact scores suggest. *Gender & Society* articles are often cited in books and other sources, such as

dissertations, book chapters, conference proceedings, and research reports from policy-oriented think tanks, among others. When this additional source of visibility is taken into account, along with the broader coverage of academic journals in the Google Scholar tracking system, the top articles examined here roughly doubled in their impact.

I am not suggesting that *Gender & Society* has a higher Google to ISI ratio than any other social science journal but rather that this ratio is higher than for some other prominent journals. A more thorough examination of a range of sociological and other social science journals would be required before one could assess this possibility. Rather, the evidence suggests that social science journals typically benefit substantially when their citations are tracked with Google Scholar compared to the ISI Web of Knowledge. Furthermore, the feminist, theoretical, and qualitative approaches characteristic of many articles in *Gender & Society* may give these articles an advantage in Google Scholar that is not available to quantitative articles likely to be cited in journals extensively covered by the ISI Web of Knowledge. It may be that other factors, such as the degree of interdisciplinary interest in an article, are important in determining citation counts. Additional research that considers in detail which factors are associated with differences in citation rates will be needed to further explore these hypotheses.

Neither Google Scholar nor the ISI Web of Knowledge is comprehensive in its coverage of journal articles. The union between ISI and Google Scholar citations is a closer approximation of the true visibility of these articles, and this figure would more than double the references to top cited articles in *Gender & Society.*

Gender & Society has produced many high-impact articles, even more than the much higher ranked journal *Social Networks.* The ranking of journals with long article "half-lives" should take the number of their "greatest hits" into account, as these will not be fully reflected even in the five-year impact statistics. It makes sense to focus on highly visible articles because academic scholarship is a skewed activity. In other words, in this type of endeavor, the average citation count for the average article is not nearly as informative as the prevalence of highly visible studies.[8] Casting a broader net for citations would give fuller credit to *Gender & Society* and other feminist journals.

NOTES

1. The fact that the ISI Web of Knowledge is not comprehensive with respect to covering academic journals is not well known by many who rely on this system, even though the ISI documents make no secret of this fact.

2. The citation counts reported here are for "direct hits" and ignore "near misses," those citations that are not completely accurate. Both the ISI and the Google Scholar systems are vulnerable to this problem. The present analysis assumes that the patterns observed for variant citations parallel those reported here for accurate citations.

3. For more on the analysis of top cited articles, see Jacobs (2005, 2007).

4. The discrepancies in journal coverage reflect incomplete coverage of journals rather than individual articles missing in journals covered by both systems.

5. A modest number (20) of links were duplicative or otherwise inoperative. This represents just over 5 percent of the citations, slightly higher than the 3 percent of cases in the Martin article. Despite these invalid links, the Google Scholar count is nonetheless an undercount of the total citations since it misses articles cited only in the ISI system. The truest count would represent the union between the ISI and Google Scholar counts, minus the number of invalid references in the Google Scholar system. Moreover, some of the citations to links that no longer operate may be to legitimate reference sources. In other words, the inability of certain scholars or institutions to keep functioning links on the World Wide Web does not necessarily translate into a lack of a valid source document.

6. The journal classification system is imprecise, and one may question the placement of one journal or another. However, this should not greatly affect the relative ranking of journals. Moreover, as a practical matter, it would be hard to improve on the consistent classification of thousands of citations into hundreds of journals by discipline.

7. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* has published 56 articles with 50 or more cumulative citations to date, 36 of which were published before *Gender & Society* was founded in 1987. During the past 22 years, both *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* and *Gender & Society* have featured 30 articles that reached this level of visibility.

8. One consideration with focusing on highly cited article is that this tends to be a backward-looking indicator, in that it can take 10 or even 20 years for an article to attain a high level of scholarly recognition.

REFERENCES

Adkins, D., and J. Budd. 2006. Scholarly productivity of U.S. LIS faculty. *Library & Information Science Research* 28 (3): 374-89.

Bakkalbasi, N., K. Bauer, J. Glover, and L. Wang. 2006. Three options for citation tracking: Google Scholar, Scopus and Web of Knowledge. *Biomedical Digital Libraries* 7. http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1533854 (accessed October 4, 2006).

Borgman, C. L., and J. Furner. 2002. Scholarly communication and bibliometrics. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* 36:3-72.

Clemens, Elisabeth, Walter W. Powell, Kris McIlwaine, and Dina Okamoto. 1995. Careers in print: Books, journals and scholarly reputations. *American Journal of Sociology* 101 (2): 433-94.

Cronin, B., H. Snyder, and H. Atkins. 1997. Comparative citation rankings of authors in monographic and journal literature: A study of sociology. *Journal of Documentation* 53 (3): 263-73.

Garfield, E. 2006. The history and meaning of the journal impact factor. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 295 (1): 90-93.

Google Scholar. 2009. http://scholar.google.com/.

High Wire. 2009. http://highwire.stanford.edu/.

ISI Web of Knowledge. 2009. www.isiknowledge.com/.

Jacobs, Jerry A. 2005. ASR's greatest hits. *American Sociological Review* 70 (1): 1-4.

Jacobs, Jerry A. 2007. Further reflections on ASR's greatest hits. *American Sociologist* 38 (1): 99-131. http://www.asanet.org/journals/asr/2005/043sup1.pdf.

Lorber, Judith. 1988. From the editor. *Gender & Society* 1 (1): 3-5.

MacRoberts, M. H., and B. R. MacRoberts. 1996. Problems of citation analysis. *Scientometrics* 36 (3): 435-44.

Meho, Lokman I., and Kiduk Yang. Forthcoming. Impact of data sources on citation counts and rankings of LIS faculty: Web of Knowledge vs. Scopus and Google Scholar. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology.*

Scopus. 2009. www.scopus.com/.

van Raan, A. F. J. 2005. Fatal attraction: Conceptual and methodological problems in the ranking of universities by bibliometric methods. *Scientometrics* 62 (1): 133-43.

Jerry A. Jacobs is professor of sociology at the University of Pennsylvania. His five books and numerous articles have addressed a number of aspects of women's employment, including authority, earnings, working conditions, part-time work, and entry into male-dominated occupations. He is currently studying communication among scholars across disciplinary boundaries.