

	<p><b>A peer-reviewed, double-blind, open-access Journal</b></p> <p><b>Research Journal of Human and Social Aspects</b></p> <p><b>Web link: <a href="https://rjhsa.com/index.php/rjhsa">https://rjhsa.com/index.php/rjhsa</a></b></p> <p><b>P-ISSN: 3006-9696, E-ISSN: 3006-970X</b></p> <p><b>Volume 2, Issue 4, 2024</b></p>	
---	--	--

<p><b>A Bibliometric Analysis of Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science: 2007-2015</b></p>	
<p>Dr. Muhammad Adam Bin Skand </p> <p>BS Political Science, International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), Malaysia</p> <p>Correspondence: <a href="mailto:adam.m@iium.edu.my">adam.m@iium.edu.my</a></p>	

<p><b>Article information</b></p>	<p><b>ABSTRACT</b></p>
<p><b>Article History:</b>  <b>Received: 2024-09-17</b>  <b>Received in revised form: 2024-10-09</b>  <b>Accepted: 2024-11-13</b>  <b>Published Online: 2024-12-03</b></p> <p><b>Keywords:</b>  <b>Bibliometrics; MJLIS; Authorship Patterns; Citation Analysis; Library Science; Malaysia.</b></p>	<p>This study presents a comprehensive bibliometric analysis of the <i>Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science</i> (MJLIS) across three distinct timeframes: 1996–2000, 2001–2006, and 2007–2015. By examining 270 articles, the research identifies evolving trends in publication volume, authorship patterns, geographical distribution, and citation behaviors. Findings reveal a steady increase in total publications and a significant shift toward collaborative authorship, with double authorship becoming the most prevalent pattern by 2015. Malaysia and India remain the primary contributing nations, though the journal has seen increasing international diversity from countries like Iran and Thailand. Citation analysis indicates a substantial growth in the number of references per article and a notable rise in both author and journal self-citation rates in recent years. The study concludes that MJLIS has matured into a significant regional hub for library and information science research, characterized by longer, more deeply referenced, and increasingly collaborative scholarly outputs.</p>



© 2024 by the Authors. Licensee Skand. This article is an open-access distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) License <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

The Journal is published quarterly (March, June, September & December) by the Centre for Children Literacy and Lifelong Learning (CCLLL), Pakistan. **Web link:** <https://cclll.org>

## Introduction

The scholarly landscape of Library and Information Science (LIS) has undergone a dramatic transformation over the last two decades, driven by the digitalization of information and the globalization of research. In this context, core journals serve as vital barometers for measuring the progress and thematic shifts within the discipline. The Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science (MJLIS) has emerged as a premier venue for such scholarship, particularly within the Southeast Asian region. This bibliometric study seeks to map the journal's growth from its inception in 1996 through 2015, providing a quantitative look at how the journal has shaped and been shaped by the academic community.

Over the years, the journal has seen a gradual increase in publication output. Starting with 76 articles in the 1996–2000 period, the volume rose to 85 articles between 2001 and 2006, and finally reached 109 articles in the 2007–2015 window. This upward trajectory reflects not only the journal's stability but also the increasing research productivity of LIS professionals globally. Interestingly, the nature of these publications has evolved; while research articles consistently form the backbone of the journal (over 78% in the latest period), review articles and concept papers have seen significant fluctuations in their share of the total output.

The importance of this study lies in its ability to highlight the professionalization of the field. For instance, the length of articles has trended toward longer, more comprehensive pieces. The percentage of articles within the 11–20-page range grew from 50% in the late 90s to over 72% by 2015. Simultaneously, the depth of research is reflected in the increasing number of references per article, shifting from a majority having only 1–10 references to a more robust 21–30 references per article. This suggests a more rigorous engagement with existing literature and a more sophisticated scholarly discourse within MJLIS.

Furthermore, the geographical and institutional affiliations of authors provide insight into the

journal's reach. While the University of Malaya remains the dominant institutional contributor, the emergence of authors from Iran, Nigeria, and Taiwan indicates a diversifying international profile. By analyzing these metrics, this study provides a clear picture of MJLIS's transition from a regional publication to a globally recognized scholarly outlet.

## Literature Review

Bibliometric studies are essential for understanding the "science of science." Previous analyses of LIS journals have frequently focused on authorship productivity and the application of Lotka's Law. In the specific context of MJLIS, early data (1996–2000) showed a heavy reliance on single authorship, which accounted for nearly 47% of all publications. This mirrored broader trends in the humanities and social sciences of that era, where individual research was the norm.

However, more recent literature across various disciplines has noted a "collaboration explosion." MJLIS follows this trend closely. By the 2007–2015 period, single authorship dropped to 28.44%, while double and triple authorship grew significantly. This shift toward "Big Science" models—even in LIS—suggests that research is becoming more complex, requiring multi-disciplinary teams and diverse skill sets.

Geographical studies in bibliometrics often identify a "center-periphery" dynamic. For MJLIS, Malaysia and India have consistently acted as the "center". Comparative literature suggests that regional journals often struggle to attract international citations; however, MJLIS's increasing self-citation rate (reaching 43.11% in the latest period) and rising author self-citations (57.19%) present a complex picture of its internal growth and the concentration of certain prolific authors like Zainab, A. N., who remains the most prolific contributor across all timeframes. These metrics are vital for assessing the journal's impact factor and its role in fostering a local research community.

## Research Questions

1. How has the volume and type of articles

published in MJLIS evolved across the three timeframes from 1996 to 2015?

2. What are the dominant authorship patterns and which geographical regions contribute most significantly to the journal?
3. To what extent have citation behaviors, specifically the number of references and self-citation rates, changed over the life of the journal?

### Research Methodology

The methodology for this research employs a longitudinal bibliometric analysis to evaluate the scholarly output of the Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science (MJLIS). The study utilizes a quantitative approach to examine trends across three specific chronological blocks: 1996–2000, 2001–2006, and 2007–2015. This comparative framework allows for the identification of significant shifts in the journal's editorial and authorship landscape over nearly two decades.

### Data Collection and Scope

The primary data source for this study is the corpus of articles published in MJLIS during the 19-year study period. A total of 270 publications were analyzed, consisting of 76 articles from 1996–2000, 85 from 2001–2006, and 109 from 2007–2015. Each article was manually coded and categorized based on specific bibliometric indicators found within the metadata and content of the published works.

Bibliometric Indicators

### Data Analysis

**Table 1:** Annual numbers and types of article

Year	Articles	Research	Review	Concept Paper
2007	14	11 (78.56%)	3 (21.42%)	0
2008	16	13(81.25%)	3(18.75%)	0
2009	18	17 (94.44%)	1 (5.55%)	0
2010	24	22 (91.66%)	1 (4.16%)	1(4.16%)
2011	10	8 (80%)	0	2 (20%)
2012	05	3 (60%)	0	2 (40%)

The analysis was structured around several key performance and structural indicators:

**Article Typology:** Publications were classified into three categories: Research, Review, and Concept Papers.

**Authorship and Collaboration:** The study examined the number of authors per article to identify patterns of single, double, and multi-authorship.

**Geographical and Institutional Affiliation:** Authors were mapped by their country of origin and their affiliated institutions to determine the journal's international reach.

**Citation Behavior:** The research analyzed the number of references per article and investigated the prevalence of both author self-citations and journal self-citations.

**Physical Characteristics:** Data regarding the length of articles (page counts) was categorized into four ranges (1–10, 11–20, 21–30, and 31–40 pages) to assess the depth of scholarly contributions.

### Data Processing

The collected data was organized into statistical tables to calculate frequencies and percentages, facilitating the identification of growth rates and variance across the three timeframes. This quantitative synthesis provides the basis for the subsequent discussion on the journal's evolution and its role within the Library and Information Science (LIS) field.

2013	08	6 (75%)	0	2 (25 %)
2014	07	5 (71.42%)	0	2 (28.57%)
2015	07	6 (85.7%)	0	1 (14.28)
<b>Total (2007-2015)</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>91 (78.89%)</b>	<b>8 (7.33%)</b>	<b>10 (9.17%)</b>
Total (2001-2006)	85	66 (77.64%)	02 (2.35%)	17 (20 %)
Total (1996-2000)	76	53 (69.74)	17 (22.37%)	06 (7.89%)

Table 1 shows gradually increase in number of publications and variance found in type of articles. The publications were 76 in timeframe of 1996-2000, 85 publications were published in timeframe 2001-2006 while publications were increased to 109 in timeframe of 2007-2015 was 109.

There was minor increase reported in research articles while wide decrease had been found in review articles. A wide decrease in type of review

articles had been reported in timeframe 2001-2006 from 22.37% to 2.35%. However, an increase had been reported in timeframe 2007-2015 from 2.35% to 7.33%. A immense variance had been seen in concepts papers as great increase found from 7.89% to 20% in timeframe 2001-2006 however slightly less than half decrease (9.17%) had been described in timeframe of 2007-2015.

**Table 2:** Number of references per article in 1996-2000, 2001-2006 and 2007-2015

References per article	Articles		
	1996-2000	2001-2006	2007-2015
1-10	37 (48.68%)	20 (23.52 %)	14 (12.84 %)
11-20	21 (27.63%)	35 (41.17 %)	25 (22.93 %)
21-30	10 (13.15 %)	16(18.82 %)	29 (26.60 %)
31-40	8 (10.53 %)	14 (16.47 %)	17 (15.69%)
41-50			11 (10.09%)
51-60			05 (4.58%)
61-70			03 (2.75%)
71-80			01 (0.91%)
80 and above			04 (3.66%)

References per articles had been analyzed through table 2. It showed that the largest fraction of references per articles was 1-10 in 1996-2000 which was 48.68 percent. Further it was shifted to 11-20 references per article with percentage of 41.17 in 2001-2006 whereas 21-30 references

per articles were found in timeframe of 2007-2015 with percentage of 26.60. The trend showed substantial increase in number of references per article. Furthermore, 80 and above references per article were found in only 3.66 percent articles in timeframe of 2007-2015.

**Table 3:** *Authorship patterns of article in 1996-2000, 2001-2006 and 2007-2015*

Authors	Frequency		
	1996-2000	2001-2006	2007-2015
1	36 (47.36 %)	31 (36.47 %)	31 (28.44 %)
2	29 (38.15 %)	34 (40 %)	47 (43.11 %)
3	11 (14.47 %)	20 (23.52 %)	19 (17.43 %)
4			8 (7.33 %)
5			2 (1.83 %)
7			2 (1.83%)

The pattern of authorship had been investigated in table 3. The table showed that there was gigantic variance in single, double and three authors per article. There was great reduction reported in single authorship as it was described 47.36% in 1996-2000 which decayed to 36.47% in 2001-2006. Further, it was decreased to

28.44% in timeframe 2007-2015. Reversely, double authorship had been increased gradually as 38.15% reported in 1996-2000 which increased to 40% in 2001-2006. Further, it was reported 43.11% in timeframe of 2007-2015. However, variance had been found in three authors per article in three timeframes.

**Table 4:** *The most prolific contributors in 2007-2015*

Author	Contributions
Zainab, A. N	11 (10.09 %)
Abdullah, A	8 (7.33 %)
Han, L. P	4 (3.66 %)
Abdul Karim, N. H	4 (3.66 %)
Kassim, N. A	4(3.66 %)
Kumar, V	4(3.66 %)
Noorhidawati, A.	3 (2.75%)
Isfandyari-Moghaddam, A	3 (2.75%)
Sagar, A	3 (2.75%)
Kiran, K	3 (2.75%)
Edzan, N. N.	3 (2.75%)
Rousseau, R	3 (2.75%)
S.A. Sanni, S. A	3 (2.75%)
<b>12 other authors</b>	<b>24 (22.01%)</b>
<b>153 other authors</b>	<b>1 (0.91%)</b>

The most prolific author had been described through table 4. Consistency had been found in most prolific author as Zainab A N was remained

the most prolific author from 1996-2015. Further, growth in ranking of Abdullah A had been found. She was at number five in 2001-2006 and she ranked second in timeframe 2007-2015 while

massive variance in ranking of Edzan N N had been observed as he was at number four during period 1996-2000 and increased his ranking to

second during 2001-2006 while huge decrease in ranking was found as he was ranked eleventh in timeframe of 2007-2015.

**Table 5:** *Authorship by geographical affiliation*

Country	Authors per year		
	1996-2000	2001-2006	2007-2015
Malaysia	36 (45.56%)	45 (50%)	79 (31.98 %)
India	25 (31.64%)	27 (30%)	32 (12.95 %)
Iran	0	0	26 (10.52 %)
Thailand	0	0	21 (8.50%)
Nigeria	0	0	12 (4.85 %)
Taiwan	2 (2.53 %)	0	11 (4.45 %)
Singapore	1 (1.26 %)	0	11 (4.45 %)
China	0	0	9 (3.64 %)
Pakistan	0	0	6 (2.42 %)
Bangladesh	9 (11.39 %)	6 (6.66%)	5 (2.02 %)
Belgium	0	0	5 (2.02 %)
UK	2 (2.53 %)	0	5 (2.02%)
Kuwait	0	0	4 (1.61%)
Botswana	0	0	3 (1.21 %)
Indonesia	1 (1.26 %)	0	3 (1.21 %)
South Korea	0	0	2 (0.80 %)
Turkey	0	0	2 (0.80 %)
USA	1 (1.26 %)	0	2 (0.80 %)
Jordan	0	0	1(0.40 %)
Kenya	0	0	1(0.40 %)
Romania	0	0	1(0.40 %)
Scotland	0	0	1(0.40 %)
Spain	0	0	1(0.40 %)
Sri Lanka	0	5 (5.55%)	1(0.40 %)
Sudan	0	0	1(0.40 %)

UAE	0	0	1(0.40 %)
Yemen	0	0	1(0.40 %)
Unknown	1 (1.26 %)	0	0
All other countries	0	12 (13.33%)	0
Total	79	90	247 (100 %)

Table 5 elaborated the affiliated country of the authors. Malaysia was consistently remained top from 1996 to 2015 as first contributing country in the journal. Similarly, India was also consistently remained second contributing country from 1996 to 2015. Pakistan was observed gradually

increasing its contribution while Bangladesh was observed decreasing its contribution. Interestingly, it had been found that Singapore was the country which increased its contribution rapidly.

**Table 6:** *Institutional affiliations of MJLIS authors*

Type of institution	Frequency		
	1996-2000	2001-2006	2007-2015
University of Malaya			39
University of Tehran			8
University of Technology Thonburi			6
Nanyang Technological Univerisity			6
University Teknologi MARA			6
University of Ibadan			6
Bhabha Atomic Research Centre			4
Other Institutions			59
Total			134

**Table 7:** *Subject Category*

Subject category	Articles		
	1996-2000	2001-2006	2007-2015
Human social aspects of information handling, Organizational behavior, user studies, information literacy, teaching and learning	20	11	23
Digital Libraries, e-books, e-publishing, books, collections, records and library management literature, preservation, printing, publishing	34	34	5
Information retrieval, cataloguing, classification, indexing,	5	6	12

knowledge organization, taxonomies, thesaurus construction			
Automation, database systems, system management, technical issues	8	13	2
Bibliometrics, citation studies, informatics, webometrics	9	21	35
Other subjects	---	---	32

**Table 8:** *Author Self-Citations*

Year	N=Articles	Author Self Citation	
		Yes	No
2007-2015	109	63 (57.19 %)	46 (43.11 %)
2001-2006	85	34 (40 %)	51 (60 %)
1996-2000	76	30 (39.47 %)	46 (60.52 %)

Author's self-citations had been stated in Table 8. An increase had been found in self-citation of authors as 39.47% was reported in 1996-2000

which was slightly increased to 40% in 2001-2006 whereas it was rapidly increased to 57.19% in timeframe of 2007-2015.

**Table 9:** *Ranking of Self-Citing Authors*

Authors	Number of Citation	Percentage
Zainab, A. N	9	8.25%
Abdullah, A	6	5.50%
Isfandyari-Moghaddam, A	3	2.75%
Kassim, N. A	3	2.75%
Rousseau, R	3	2.75%
Kumar, V	3	2.75%
9 other authors	2	16.51%
49 other authors	1	44.95%

The authors who self-cited themselves were ranked through table 9. Remarkably, it had been found that the consistently most prolific author Zainab A N was also at top in self-citing herself. More, second most prolific author Abullah A

during 2007-2015 was also found second in self-citing herself. It had been revealed that less than half of the authors (44.95%) during 2007-2015 were having only one citation and they preferred to cite themselves.

**Table 10: Journal Self-Citations**

Year	N=Articles	Journal Self Citation	
		Yes	No
2007-2015	109	47 (43.11 %)	62 (56.88 %)
2001-2006	85	13 (15.29 %)	72 (84.70 %)
1996-2000	76	21 (27.63 %)	55 (72.36 %)

Table 10 had been presented to show journal self-citations. It had been described that there was massive inconsistency in journal self-citations during three periods. The journal self-citations

were reported 27.63% during 1996-2000 which reduced to 15.29% during 2001-2006 while a rapid increase was observed as it was reached to 43.11% in timeframe of 2007-2015.

**Table 11: Length of articles in term of pages**

Pages per article	Frequency		
	1996-2000	2001-2006	2007-2015
1-10	31 (40.78%)	16 (18.82%)	11 (10.09%)
11-20	38 (50%)	61 (71.76%)	79 (72.47%)
21-30	7 (9.21%)	8 (9.41%)	17 (15.59%)
31-40			2 (1.83%)

Table 11 presented the length of article by dividing number of pages in four categories. The data showed that the number of pages per article was gradually increased. The first category of 1-10 pages per article was decreased while the second category of 11-20 pages per articles was increased swiftly. Similarly, third category of 21-30 pages per article was increased speedily. However, only 1.83% of articles during 2007-2015 were having 31-40 pages per article.

## Discussion

The data analysis reveals a journal in a state of robust expansion. The most striking finding is the shift in authorship patterns. The decay of single authorship from 47.36% to 28.44% indicates a maturing academic environment where collaboration is prioritized. This is further supported by the rise in double authorship, which now accounts for 43.11% of articles. This trend likely reflects the pressure on academics to produce high-impact, collaborative research.

Geographically, MJLIS remains a bastion for Malaysian scholarship, though its dominance has slightly decreased in percentage terms as other

nations like Iran (10.52%) and Thailand (8.50%) have joined the fold. This internationalization is a positive sign for the journal's prestige. However, the concentration of institutional output at the University of Malaya (39 articles) suggests that the journal remains deeply rooted in its home institution.

A point of concern, or at least interest, is the rapid rise in self-citations. Author self-citations jumped from roughly 40% to over 57% in the final timeframe. While self-citation is often a natural byproduct of a specialized field where a few prolific authors (like Zainab, A. N.) lead the research, such high percentages can sometimes skew impact metrics. Similarly, the spike in journal self-citations to 43.11% in 2007-2015 suggests that MJLIS is increasingly citing its own past work to build a cohesive narrative within the discipline.

## Conclusion

This bibliometric study confirms that the Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science has successfully transitioned into a mature, highly productive scholarly journal. The

findings indicate three major trends: an increase in the complexity and length of research, a definitive shift toward collaborative authorship, and a strengthening of the journal's regional and international footprint. While the increase in self-citation rates warrants further qualitative

investigation, the overall data suggests that MJLIS is a vital and growing platform for LIS research. As the journal continues to evolve, it will likely see further diversification in both its subject matter and its global contributor base.

## References

Tiew, W. S., Abdullah, A., & Kaur, K. (2002). Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science 1996–2000: A bibliometric study. *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, 6(1), 43–56.

Bakri, A., & Willett, P. (2008). The Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science 2001–2006: A bibliometric study. *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, 13(1), 103–116.

Brahma, K., & Verma, M. K. (2018). Bibliometric studies of Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science (MJLIS) during 2007–2016. *Journal of the Indian Library Association*, 54(1), 24–35.

Garg, K. C., & Kumar, N. (2020). Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science: A bibliometric study. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*,

3687.

Verma, M. K., & Singh, S. N. (2012). Bibliometric analysis of Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science: 2007–2011. *International Journal of Information Dissemination and Technology*, 2(4), 307–312.

Pritchard, A. (1969). Statistical bibliography or bibliometrics? *Journal of Documentation*, 25(4), 348–349.

Lotka, A. J. (1926). The frequency distribution of scientific productivity. *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences*, 16(12), 317–323.

Zainab, A. N., & Fariza, H. Y. (2000). Categorising of journal articles: Research, review and concept articles. *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*.

## Declaration of Conflicting Interest

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to research.

## Funding Statement

No funding is received for this project.