

University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

10-20-2015

BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF JOURNAL OF EMERGING MARKET FINANCE: A SINGLE JOURNAL STUDY

Sankar P Mr

SNT Global Academy of Management Studies and Technology, amulsankar@gmail.com

Kavitha E S Dr

Department of Library and Information Science, Periyar University, kavithaesk@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

P, Sankar Mr and E S, Kavitha Dr, "BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF JOURNAL OF EMERGING MARKET FINANCE: A SINGLE JOURNAL STUDY" (2015). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1383.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1383>

BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF JOURNAL OF EMERGING MARKET FINANCE: A SINGLE JOURNAL STUDY

P. SANKAR,

Research Scholar,

*Department of Library and Information Science, Periyar University, Salem and
Librarian,*

SNT Global Academy of Management Studies and Technology, Coimbatore 641 105

amulsankar@gmail.com

DR. E. S. KAVITHA

Assistant Professor,

Department of Library and Information Science,

Periyar University, Salem

kavithaesk@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The paper brings out the results of a bibliometric analysis of the journal titled " Journal of Emerging Market Finance" which published 13 volumes and 38 Issues with 160 research articles during the period 2002-2014. The data were downloaded from the journal's website. This study aims at analysing the research output performance of finance on management science subjects. The analysis cover mainly the number of articles, authorship pattern, average number of references per articles length of articles, paper per author and authors per paper, number of cited documents, citation per year, citation per paper and author and identified the year-wise distribution of H index, G index, HG, HI and AWCR. The degree of collaboration in JEMF ranged from 0.30 to 0.86 which collaborative works are remarkably observed.

Keywords: Bibliometrics, Single Journal Analysis, H index, Author Metrics, Journal Metrics, Publish or Perish, JEMF

INTRODUCTION:

Counting, measuring, comparing quantities, analyzing measurements: quantitative analysis is perhaps the main tool of science. Scientific research itself, and recording and communicating research results through publications, has become enormous and complex. The need to measure research performance is largely driven by the necessity to make funding decisions. Traditionally, research has been judged by other scholars in the same research field; by expert review, more widely known as peer review. Measuring the strength of peer review through citation counts allows funders who are not subject experts to make informed decisions. Individual researchers can use bibliometrics to promote their research. Finding bibliometric values is not difficult, but using them requires more consideration of the norms of the discipline and the data source to use.

BIBLIOMETRICS

Bibliometrics (sometimes called Scientometrics) turns the main tool of science, quantitative analysis, on itself. There are various definitions used for “bibliometrics.” Essentially, bibliometrics is the application of quantitative analysis and statistics to publications such as journal articles and their accompanying citation counts. Quantitative evaluation of publication and citation data is now used in almost all nations around the globe with a sizeable science enterprise. Bibliometrics is used in research performance evaluation, especially in university and government labs, and also by policymakers, research directors and administrators, information specialists and librarians, and researchers themselves.

A Two-Pronged Approach The two together—peer review and quantitative analysis of research better inform evaluation. Quantitative analysis offers certain advantages in gathering the objective information necessary for decision-making:

- ❖ Quantitative analysis of research is global in perspective, offering a “top-down” review that puts the work in context, complementing the local perspective of peer review. Quantitative research analysis provides data on all activity in an area, summaries of these data, and a comprehensive perspective on activity and achievements.
- ❖ Weighted quantitative measures, such as papers per researcher or citations per paper, remove characteristics, such as the place of production or past reputation, that color human perceptions of quality.

COMMONLY USED METRICS

JOURNAL METRICS:

- ❖ It is used to compare journals in a chosen academic discipline.
- ❖ It gives rise to a ranking of journals with the most highly cited journal
- ❖ Ranking vary on the formula used, and also on the source data used.
- ❖ The Journal Impact Factor (JIF) from Thomson Reuters is the most common metric in this category.

LIMITATIONS OF JOURNAL METRICS

- ❖ It is not possible to compare journals in various disciplines due to different citation pattern between disciplines, e.g. some disciplines use fewer citations than others.
- ❖ The time span used is arbitrary, with 2, 3 and 5 years; different disciplines may need different timescales.
- ❖ Review journals (that is, journals consisting of review articles) have high numbers of citations

AUTHOR METRICS:

- ❖ Are used to compare researchers, but comparisons can only be made in a given academic discipline due to differing citation patterns.
- ❖ Based on the number of articles a researcher has published, and the number of times these articles have been cited by others.
- ❖ The average number of citations per author is a fairly crude way of measuring a person's research impact, so there are various measures which try and overcome this limitation.
- ❖ The most commonly used author metric is the h-index
- ❖ The h-index is dependent on the data used to calculate it.

LIMITATIONS OF THE H-INDEX

- ❖ Highly cited articles are likely to be the most important.
- ❖ Favours the authors at the middle or end of their career.
- ❖ Ignores small numbers of important articles.
- ❖ Incomplete coverage by citation indexes, e.g. documents covered, disciplines, foreign language materials etc.

SOURCES OF DATA

- ❖ Thomson Reuters provide Journal Citation Reports and the Web of Science. This was the original source for bibliometrics.
- ❖ Scopus is provided by Elsevier. The free service SCImago, uses Scopus data to generate journal metrics.
- ❖ Google Scholar data is used by the website Harzing's Publish or Perish (POP)

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Malathy, S (2015) studied that Journal of Spacecraft and Technology, an in-house publication of ISRO Satellite Centre publishes the research activity of the centre. This paper presents bibliometric study of the journal published during 1991 to 2012, which includes 22 volumes with 330 papers and 2597 citations. The analysis was made on different parameters like year-wise distribution of articles for the period of study (1991-2012), length of articles, authorship pattern of contributions, author productivity, degree of collaboration among co-authors and gender-wise distribution of papers. It also presents Institution-wise contribution, group-wise (only ISAC) contribution, ranked list of prolific/productive authors, number of citations appeared in papers and form-wise distribution of citations. This study provides the insight and development of the journal towards excellence.

Maharana, Rabindra K (2015) aimed to analyze Indian researchers' publications on tuberculosis (TB) which were indexed in Web of Science (WoS) database during the from 2004 to 2013. It also emphasizes the performance of publication covering annual outputs, mainstream journals, leading Indian research institutions, h-index, etc. The present study is a bibliometric analysis of all Indian TB publications over the past 10 years, in the national/international journals of repute. Utilizing the WoS database, 5,073 documents of Indian researcher's publications data on TB research were used for the study period from 2004 to 2013; various statistical techniques and bibliometric measures have been used for further analysis. The study exclusively examines 5,073 research outputs of Indian researchers on TB which have been indexed in Thomson Reuters WoS during 2004-2013. Thus, documents published in any other different channels and sources which have not indexed in WoS are excluded from the purview of research.

Taşkın, Zehra (2015) aimed to undertake a bibliometric investigation of the NASA Astrobiology Institute (NAI) funded research that was published between 2008 and 2012.

Using the NAI annual reports, 1210 peer-reviewed publications are analyzed. The following conclusions are drawn: (1) NAI researchers prefer publishing in high-impact multidisciplinary journals. (2) Astronomy and astrophysics are the most preferred categories to publish based on Web of Science subject categories. (3) NAI is indeed a virtual institution; researchers collaborate with other researchers outside their organization and in some cases outside the U.S. (4) There are prominent scholars in the NAI co-author network but none of them dominates astrobiology

Maddisetty, Balaji (2014) provided access of scientific and scholarly content and peer-reviewed journals that meet s high quality standards and it is free to all the time of publication based on the Budapest open access initiatives a right to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search or link to the full text of the articles. In this paper author made a effort to study the total 57 full-free E-journal in physical education. Journal analyzed based on language-wise, country-wise, subject headings-wise, keywords-wise and year-wise their accessibility of archives of online Journals in the physical education

Patra, Swapan Kumar (2014) stated that Indian library and information science (LIS) journals were not indexed in Web of Science (WoS) database and lately Scopus database of Elsevier B.V. has indexed three Indian LIS journals. Hence, Google Scholar (GS) was the only available global database for the citation analysis of Indian LIS journals. Based on GS, this study has traced the citation and authorship patterns of selected LIS journals. Although, GS covers wide spectrum of scholarly literature worldwide, this study found that Indian LIS journals have low visibility even in GS database. In terms of citations, multiple-authored articles generally got more citations than the single-authored articles. This study suggested LIS researchers to increase collaborations for better visibility of their research

Egghe, L. (2013) presented a comparative study of four impact measures: the h-index, the g-index, the R-index and the j-index. The g-index satisfies the transfer principle, the j-index

satisfies the opposite transfer principle while the h- and R-indices do not satisfy any of these principles. The author studied general inequalities between these measures and also determine their maximal and minimal values, given a fixed total number of citations.

Delgado-López-Cózar (2012) studied Google Scholar Metrics (GSM), a new bibliometric product of Google that aimed at providing the H-index for scientific journals and other information sources. The study conducted a critical review of GSM showing its main characteristics and possibilities as a tool for scientific evaluation. The study discussed its coverage along with the inclusion of repositories, bibliographic control, and its options for browsing and searching. The study concluded that, despite Google Scholar's value as a source for scientific assessment, GSM is an immature product with many shortcomings, and therefore we advise against its use for evaluation purposes. However, the improvement of these shortcomings would place GSM as a serious competitor to the other existing products for evaluating scientific journals.

Pratelli, Luca (2012) stated that the Hirsch index (commonly referred to as h-index) is a bibliometric indicator which is widely recognized as effective for measuring the scientific production of a scholar since it summarizes size and impact of the research output. In a formal setting, the h-index is actually an empirical functional of the distribution of the citation counts received by the scholar. Under this approach, the asymptotic theory for the empirical h-index has been recently exploited when the citation counts follow a continuous distribution. However, in bibliometric applications, citation counts display a distribution supported by the integers. Thus, the author provided general properties for the empirical h-index under the small- and large-sample settings.

Ouimet, Mathieu (2011) aimed to answer the following research question: Are the h-index and some of its derivatives discriminatory when applied to rank social scientists with different epistemological beliefs and methodological preferences? This study reports the

results of five Tobit and two negative binomial regression models taking as dependent variable the h-index and six of its derivatives, using a dataset combining bibliometric data collected with the PoP software with cross-sectional data of 321 Quebec social scientists in Anthropology, Sociology, Social Work, Political Science, Economics and Psychology. The results reveal an epistemological/methodological effect making positivists and quantitative globally more productive than constructivists and qualitative.

Rodrigo, Costas (2008) stated that the ability of g-index and h-index to discriminate between different types of scientists is analysed in the area of Natural Resources at the Spanish CSIC (WoS, 1994–2004). The results show that these indicators clearly differentiate low producers and top scientists, but do not discriminate between selective scientists and big producers. However, g-index is more sensitive than h-index in the assessment of selective scientists, since this type of scientist shows in average a higher g-index/h-index ratio and a better position in g-index rankings than in the h-index ones. Current research suggests that these indexes do not substitute each other but that they are complementary.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

The periodicals are the indicators of literature growth in any field of knowledge. They emerge as the main channel for transmitting knowledge. Due to the escalating cost of the periodicals and lack of adequate library budgets the selection of any particular journal for a library should be done more carefully. Therefore, the library authorities are forced to reduce the number of journal subscriptions. Bibliometric analysis has many applications in the Library and Information science field in identifying the research trends in the subject, core journals, etc. and thereby framing new subscription policy for tomorrow. These studies will be helpful for librarians to plan a better collection development.

JOURNAL OF EMERGING MARKET FINANCE

Emerging markets are affected both by the pace and sequencing of policy reforms. This requires special analytical tools to determine the behaviour of financial variables in an environment which is subjected to policy shocks. **Journal of Emerging Market Finance (JEMF)** is a forum for debate and discussion on the theory and practice of finance in emerging markets. While the emphasis is on articles that are of practical significance, the journal also covers theoretical and conceptual aspects relating to emerging financial markets. JEMF is a blind peer-reviewed journal that attracts articles in these broad areas of research: Idiosyncratic factors that prevail in emerging markets: Some emerging markets are characterised by presence of financial instruments that are absent from other markets. For example, microfinance institutions, instruments to drive financial inclusion, etc. Similarly, certain financial markets are almost non-existent in emerging markets as compared to developed markets. For example, secondary debt market, simple as well as complex derivative instruments, etc. The journal encourages articles on these topics. Comparing emerging markets with developed markets: Some of the key comparison units are market efficiency, corporate governance, derivatives market, ability of the markets to absorb new products, etc.

OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY

The present study has been undertaken with the objective of analysing the following aspects:

Analysis of articles

- ❖ To make an analysis of articles published in Journal of Emerging Market Finance from 2002 to 2014
- ❖ To identify the number of contributions during the period of study
- ❖ To determine the year wise distribution of articles

- ❖ To study the authorship pattern
- ❖ To study the degree of collaboration
- ❖ To study the length of articles
- ❖ To study the paper per author and authors per paper

Analysis of citations

- ❖ To findout the number of cited documents
- ❖ To study the citation per year, citation per paper and author.
- ❖ To identify the year-wise distribution of H index, G index, HG, HI and AWCR

METHODOLOGY

Bibliometrics aim to quantify and monitor the importance of published research by analysing the number of times other researchers refer to (cite) a given publication. The publications analysed are usually, but not exclusively, journal articles. Individual articles can be analysed by the number of times they are cited. Methodology applied in the present study is bibliometric analysis which is used to study in detail the bibliographic features of the articles and citation analysis of reference appended at the end of each article, published in Journal of Emerging Market Finance from 2002 to 2014. The data pertaining to Journal of Emerging Market Finance regarding 160 articles made from volume 1 in 2002 to volume 13 in 2014. Then they are tabulated and analysed for making observations. Journals can also be given an impact factor based on the number of citations made to articles within them. In the present study the attempt has been made to carry out a details study for the 13 volumes of the journal and i.e. for the period of 2002-2014

Table No: 1

Year wise distribution of the articles

Year	Volume No	No of Issues	Papers	Average
2002	1	2	10	6.25
2003	2	3	12	7.50
2004	3	3	16	10.00
2005	4	3	13	8.13
2006	5	3	13	8.13
2007	6	3	12	7.50
2008	7	3	12	7.50
2009	8	3	13	8.13
2010	9	3	14	8.75
2011	10	3	12	7.50
2012	11	3	11	6.88
2013	12	3	10	6.25
2014	13	3	12	7.50
Total		38	160	100

The table no 1 shows the year wise distribution of the articles of Journal of Emerging Market Finance. Journal of Emerging Market Finance published 13 volumes and 38 Issues with 160 research articles during the period 2002-2014. This journal on an average has published 4 research works per issue. The above table no 1 show that the maximum number of articles was published in the year 2004 with 16 articles. In the years of 2010, JEMF published 14 articles. In the years 2005, 2006 and 2009 the journal published 13 research articles and in the years 2003, 2007, 2008, 2011 and 2014 JEMF published 12 research articles. Compared with other years, very lesser research articles published in the year 2002 and 2013.

Table No: 2

Authorship Pattern

Year	Single	Two	Three	Four	Five
2002	7	1	2		
2003	6	4	2		
2004	5	7	3		1
2005	5	4	4		
2006	6	4	2	1	
2007	5	4	3		
2008	3	6	3		
2009	3	7	3		
2010	2	10	2		
2011	6	3	3		
2012	3	5	3		
2013	1	6	3		
2014	3	6	2	1	
Total	55	67	35	2	1
Percentage	34.38	41.88	21.88	1.25	0.63

The table no 2 shows the authorship patter of the JEMF. Collaborative research is very much a feature of the library and information Science especially during the 21st century. It is a natural reflection of complexity, scale and costs of modern investigations in Library and Information Science. Multi authorship provides different measures of collaboration in the subject. Table 2 reveals the authorship pattern of the articles published from 2002-2014. More number of articles was contributed by two author 67 (42%). This is followed by single author with 34% (55) of articles and 22% (35) of articles contributed by three authors. More than three authors contributed 2% (4) of articles.

Table No: 3

Degree of collaboration by year

Year	Single	Joint	DC
2002	7	3	0.30
2003	6	6	0.50
2004	5	11	0.69
2005	5	8	0.62
2006	6	7	0.54
2007	5	7	0.58
2008	3	9	0.75
2009	3	10	0.77
2010	2	12	0.86
2011	6	6	0.50
2012	3	8	0.73
2013	1	9	0.90
2014	3	9	0.75
	55	105	0.66

The table no 3 shows the degree of collaboration of Journal of Emerging Market Finance. Degree of collaboration is an examination of the prominent area of inquiry in bibliometric studies indicating the trend in patterns of single and joint authorship in the publication of JEMF during the period under study shown in the above table. The precise nature and magnitude of collaboration cannot be easily determined by the usual methods of observation or interview because of the complex nature of human interaction that takes place between or among collaborators over a period of time (Subramanyam, 1983). However, the extent of collaboration made in a particular domain or a given set of literature can be measured through some quantitative techniques. In this direction, Subramanyam (1983) has developed a formula for calculating degree of collaboration as:

$$DC = \frac{NM}{NM + NS}$$

Here: DC=Degree of collaboration;

NM=number of Multiple authored papers; and

NS=Single authored papers.

It is found that the degree of collaboration in JEMF ranged from 0.30 to 0.86 during the publication from 2002 to 2014. Therefore, the collaborative works are remarkably observed in Journal of Emerging Market Finance. In other words, contributions of joint authors are dominant in JEMF, as mentioned in Table 3. As the degree of collaboration exceeds 0.5, it indicates a high degree of collaborative research in JEMF which is already evident from Table 3.

Table No:4

Distribution of the paper per authors and Authors per papers

Year	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Papers Per Author	8.17	8.67	9.7	8.33	8.92	8	7	7.5	7.67	8.5	6.5	5	6.92
Authors Per Paper	1.5	1.67	2.06	1.92	1.85	1.83	2	2	2	1.75	2	2.2	2.08

The table no 4 shows the average of papers per authors and authors per papers published by Journal of Emerging Market Finance. It is inferred that in 2004, 9.7 average paper per author published it is followed by 2006 as 8.92 and lesser in 2013 as 5. It is noticed that Average author per paper resulted in 2.2 in 2013 and followed by 2014 (2.08) and very lesser in 2002 (1.5)

Table No: 4

Total Number of Pages

Year	Total Pages	Average
2002	241	24.10
2003	363	30.25
2004	331	20.69
2005	315	24.23
2006	297	22.85
2007	302	25.17
2008	308	25.67
2009	340	26.15
2010	381	27.21
2011	389	32.42
2012	322	29.27
2013	365	36.50
2014	365	30.42
	4319	26.99

The table no 4 shows the total number of pages published by JEMF. It is inferred that averagely each articles published with 27 pages. It is noticed that in the year 2013, an article published with 37 pages and less in 2004 (21) compared with other year of Journal of Emerging Market Finance.

Table No: 5

Length of papers by year wise

Year	Below 15	16 - 20	21 - 25	26 - 30	31 - 35	36 - 40	41 - 45	46 - 50	Above 51	Total
2002	1	1	1	5	2					10
2003		2	1	4	1	3		1		12
2004	2	7	2	4	1					16
2005		8		1	2	2				13
2006	4	3	1	2	1	1	1			13
2007	2	2	5	1		1			1	12
2008	1	2	2	5		2				12
2009	1	2	6	2	1				1	13
2010		3	3	5	1	2				14

2011		2	1	5	1				3	12
2012		1	3	3	1	2	1			11
2013			2	3			2	2	1	10
2014		2		5	1	2	2			12
Total	11	35	27	45	12	15	6	3	6	160

The table no 5 shows the length of the papers published in JEMF. It is revealed majorities of the articles (45 – 28%) have the length of 26-30pages. Around 35 (22%) of the articles had 16-20 pages and followed by 27 articles (17%) had 21-25 pages. It is noticed that around 42 articles (26%) had above 31 pages and particularly 6 articles of JEMF had above 51 pages.

Table No: 6

Year wise basic metrics

Year	Citations	Cites_Year	Cites_Paper	Cites_Author
2002	183	14.08	20.33	144
2003	161	13.42	10.73	122.83
2004	503	45.73	27.94	242.8
2005	181	18.1	11.31	122.84
2006	219	24.33	12.88	163.75
2007	102	12.75	7.85	72.34
2008	96	13.71	7.38	42.5
2009	90	15	5.63	43.5
2010	44	8.8	2.93	23.66
2011	77	19.25	5.5	41.5
2012	30	10	2.73	20
2013	36	18	3	15.67
2014	8	8	0.67	8
Total	1730	133.08	9.56	1063.39

The basic metrics are quite straightforward and are calculated as follows in Publish or Perish.

- ❖ Total number of citations measures the sum of the citation counts across all papers.

The above table indicates that total citation from 2002 to 2014 was 1730. The above table showed that maximum number of citations 503 produced in 2004 followed by 219 citations in 2006, 183 citations in 2002, 181 citations in 2005, 161 citations in

2003 and 102 in the year 2007 and minimum number of citation 8 produced in the year 2014.

- ❖ Average number of citations per year calculated the average number of citations per author as above, divided by the number of years covered by the result set. The above table indicates that citation per year from 2002 to 2014 was 133.08. The above table showed that maximum number of citations per year 45.73 calculated in the year 2004 followed by 24.33 citations per year in 2006, 19.25 citations per year in 2011, 14.08 citations per year in 2002, and minimum number of citation per year 8 calculated in the year 2014.
- ❖ Average number of citations per paper measures the sum of the citation counts across all papers, divided by the total number of papers. The median and mode are also calculated. The above table indicates that total citations per paper from 2002 to 2014 were 9.56. The above table showed that maximum number of citations per paper 27.94 calculated in 2004 followed by 20.33 citations per paper in 2002, 12.88 citations per paper in 2006, and minimum number of citation per paper 0.67 produced in the year 2014.
- ❖ Average number of citations per author defined for each paper, its citation count is divided by the number of authors for that paper to give the normalized citation count for the paper. The normalized citation counts are then summed across all papers to give the average number of citations per author. The above table indicates that total citation per author from 2002 to 2014 was 1063.39. The above table showed that maximum number of citations per author 242.8 produced in 2004 followed by 163.75

citations per author in 2006, 144 citations per author in 2002, 181 and minimum number of citation per author 8 produced in the year 2014.

TABLE NO: 7

YEAR WISE H, G, HC, HI Index

Year	h_index	g_index	hc_index	hI_index	hI_norm	AWCR
2002	6	9	4	4	6	14.08
2003	7	12	4	4.45	6	13.42
2004	9	18	7	3.86	8	45.73
2005	6	13	5	3	6	18.1
2006	8	14	7	4.92	8	24.33
2007	7	10	4	4.08	6	12.75
2008	5	9	3	2.27	3	13.71
2009	5	9	4	2.08	4	15
2010	4	5	3	1.78	3	8.8
2011	5	8	5	2.27	4	19.25
2012	3	5	4	1.8	2	10
2013	3	6	4	1.29	2	18
2014	2	2	2	2	2	8
Total	24	34	14	12	18	221.17

Metrics

In addition to the various simple statistics (number of papers, number of citations, and others), Publish or Perish calculates the following citation metrics

- ❖ **Hirsch's h-index** proposed by J.E. Hirsch. It aims to provide a robust single-number metric of an academic's impact, combining quality with quantity. The above table indicates that total H index from 2002 to 2014 was 24. The above table showed that maximum number of H index 9 produced in 2004 followed by 8 H index in 2006, and minimum number of H index of 2 produced in the year 2014.
- ❖ **Egghe's g-index** proposed by Leo Egghe. It aims to improve on the h-index by giving more weight to highly-cited articles. The above table indicates that total G index from

2002 to 2014 was 34. The above table showed that maximum number of G index 18 produced in 2004 followed by 14 G index in 2006, and minimum number of G index of 2 produced in the year 2014.

- ❖ **Contemporary h-index** proposed by Antonis Sidiropoulos, Dimitrios Katsaros, and Yannis Manolopoulos in their paper. It aims to improve on the h-index by giving more weight to recent articles, thus rewarding academics who maintain a steady level of activity. The above table indicates that total HC index from 2002 to 2014 was 14. The above table showed that maximum number of HC index 7 produced in 2004 and 2006 followed by 5 HC index in 2005 and 2011, and minimum number of HC index of 2 produced in the year 2014.
- ❖ **Individual h-index (original)** was proposed by Pablo D. Batista, Monica G. Campiteli, Osame Kinouchi, and Alexandre S. Martinez. It divides the standard h-index by the average number of authors in the articles that contribute to the h-index, in order to reduce the effects of co-authorship. The above table indicates that total HI index from 2002 to 2014 was 12. The above table showed that maximum number of HI index 4.92 produced in 2004 followed by 4.45 HI index in 2003, and minimum number of HI index of 2 produced in the year 2014.
- ❖ **Individual h-index (PoP variation):** Publish or Perish also implements an alternative individual h-index called **hI, norm** that takes a different approach: instead of dividing the total h-index, it first normalizes the number of citations for each paper by dividing the number of citations by the number of authors for that paper, then calculates the h-index of the *normalized* citation counts. This approach is much more fine-grained than Batista et al.'s; we believe that it more accurately accounts for any co-authorship effects that might be present and that it is a better approximation of the per-author impact, which is what the original h-index set out to provide. The above table

indicates that total hI, norm index from 2002 to 2014 was 18. The above table showed that maximum number of hI, norm index 8 produced in 2004 and 2006 followed by 6 hI, norm index in 2002,2003,2005 and 2007, and minimum number of hI, norm index of 2 produced in the years 2012,2013 and 2014.

- ❖ **Age-weighted citation rate (AWCR)** measures the average number of citations to an entire body of work, adjusted for the age of each individual paper. The Publish or Perish implementation differs from Jin's definition in that we sum over *all* papers instead of only the h-core papers. The above table indicates that total AWCR index from 2002 to 2014 was 221.17. The above table showed that maximum number of AWCR index 45.73 produced in 2004 followed by 24.33 AWCR index in 2006, and minimum number of AWCR index of 8 produced in the year 2014.

FINDINGS:

- ❖ Journal of Emerging Market Finance published 13 volumes and 38 Issues with 160 research articles during the period 2002-2014. This journal on an average has published 4 research works per issue.
- ❖ The study indicates that maximum number of articles was published in the year 2004 with 16 articles. In the years of 2010, JEMF published 14 articles. In the years 2005, 2006 and 2009 the journal published 13 research articles and in the years 2003, 2007, 2008, 2011 and 2014 JEMF published 12 research articles. Compared with other years, very lesser research articles published in the year 2013.
- ❖ The study indicates that more number of articles was contributed by two author 67 (42%). This is followed by single author with 34% (55) of articles and 22% (35) of articles contributed by three authors. More than three authors contributed 2% (4) of articles.

- ❖ It is found that the degree of collaboration in JEMF ranged from 0.30 to 0.86 during the publication from 2002 to 2014. Therefore, the collaborative works are remarkably observed in Journal of Emerging Market Finance. In other words, contributions of joint authors are dominant in JEMF.
- ❖ It is noticed that in 2004, 9.7 average paper per author published it is followed by 2006 as 8.92 and lesser in 2013 as 5. It is noticed that Average author per paper resulted in 2.2 in 2013 and followed by 2014 (2.08) and very lesser in 2002 (1.5)
- ❖ It is found that averagely each articles published with 27 pages. It is noticed that in the year 2013, an article published with 37 pages and less in 2004 (21) compared with other year of Journal of Emerging Market Finance.
- ❖ It is revealed majorities of the articles one fourth of the articles had the length of 26-30pages. One fifth of the articles had 16-20 pages and followed by 27 articles (17%) had 21-25 pages. It is noticed that around 42 articles (26%) had above 31 pages and particularly 6 articles of JEMF had above 51 pages.
- ❖ It is noticed that total citation from 2002 to 2014 was 1730 and maximum number of citations 503 produced in 2004 followed by 219 citations in 2006 and minimum number of citation 8 produced in the year 2014.
- ❖ The study indicated that citation per year from 2002 to 2014 was 133.08, maximum number of citations per year 45.73 calculated in the year 2004 and minimum number of citation per year 8 calculated in the year 2014.
- ❖ The study indicated that total citations per paper from 2002 to 2014 were 9.56, maximum number of citations per paper 27.94 calculated in 2004 and minimum number of citation per paper 0.67 produced in the year 2014.

- ❖ The study indicated that total citation per author from 2002 to 2014 was 1063.39 maximum number of citations per author 242.8 produced in 2004 and minimum number of citation per author 8 produced in the year 2014.
- ❖ The study indicated that total H index from 2002 to 2014 was 24. maximum number of H index 9 produced in 2004 minimum number of H index of 2 produced in the year 2014.
- ❖ The study indicated that total G index from 2002 to 2014 was 34, maximum number of G index 18 produced in 2004 followed by 14 G index in 2006, and minimum number of G index of 2 produced in the year 2014.
- ❖ The study indicated that total HC index from 2002 to 2014 was 14, maximum number of HC index 7 produced in 2004 and 2006 followed by 5 HC index in 2005 and 2011, and minimum number of HC index of 2 produced in the year 2014.
- ❖ The study indicated that total HI index from 2002 to 2014 was 12, maximum number of HI index 4.92 produced in 2004 and minimum number of HI index of 2 produced in the year 2014.
- ❖ The study indicated that total hI, norm index from 2002 to 2014 was 18, maximum number of hI, norm index 8 produced in 2004& 2006 and minimum number of hI, norm index of 2 produced in the years 2012,2013 and 2014.
- ❖ The study indicated that total AWCR index from 2002 to 2014 was 221.17, maximum number of AWCR index 45.73 produced in 2004 followed by 24.33 AWCR index in 2006, and minimum number of AWCR index of 8 produced in the year 2014.

CONCLUSION

Research is a very complex process. Performance is influenced by many factors such as a researcher's age, position or research domain. Therefore it is extremely difficult to "measure"

the impact of an individual researcher or a research group on the discipline or society. In this bibliometric study of the 13 volumes and 38 Issues with 160 research articles during the period 2002-2014 of Journal of Emerging Market Finance, the numbers of contributions and citations are varying volume wise and the numbers of contribution almost follows an average standard and occupied mostly the subject area of finance, The study shows the high collaborative research trend in financial research in India.

References:

1. Ouimet, Mathieu (2011) Are the h-index and some of its alternatives discriminatory of epistemological beliefs and methodological preferences of faculty members? The case of social scientists in Quebec., *Scientometrics*. Vol. 88 No. 1, pp 91-106.
2. Maharana, Rabindra K (2015) Mapping of Tuberculosis (TB) research in India during 2004-2013: A Bibliometric analysis. *Collection Building*. Vol. 34 No. 3, pp102-111.
3. Pratelli, Luca (2012) Statistical Analysis of the Hirsch Index, *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* Vol. 39, No. 4 pp. 681-694
4. Egghe, L. (2013) Comparative study of four impact measures and qualitative conclusions. *Information Processing & Management*. Vol. 49, No 4, pp 865-870.
5. Taşkın, Zehra (2015) Collaborative Interdisciplinary Astrobiology Research: A Bibliometric study of the NASA Astrobiology Institute. *Scientometrics*. Vol. 103 No.3, pp1003-1022.
6. Delgado-López-Cózar (2012) Google Scholar Metrics: An Unreliable Tool for Assessing Scientific Journals. *El Profesional de la Información*. Vol. 21 No 4, pp419-427.

7. Patra, Swapan Kumar (2014) Google Scholar-based citation analysis of Indian library and Information Science Journals. *Annals of Library & Information Studies*. Vol. 61 No 3, pp227-234.
8. Costas, Rodrigo (2008) Is g-index better than h-index? An exploratory study at the individual level. *Scientometrics*. Vol. 77 No. 2, pp267-288.
9. Malathy, S (2015) Journal of Spacecraft Technology: A Bibliometric Study. *SRELS Journal of Information Management*. Vol. 52 No 2, pp141-151.
10. Maddisetty, Balaji (2014): Directory of Open Access Journals in Physical Education: A Bibliometric Study. *e-Library Science Research Journal*. Vol.2, No 3/Jan. 2014
11. Egghe, Leo and Rousseau, Ronald (2006) An Informetric model for the Hirsch-index, *Scientometrics*, Vol. 69, No. 1, pp 121-129.
12. Egghe, Leo (2006) Theory and practice of the g-index, *Scientometrics*, Vol. 69, No 1, pp. 131-152.
13. Pablo D. Batista, Monica G. Campiteli, Osame Kinouchi, and Alexandre S. Martinez (2005) Is it possible to compare researchers with different scientific interests?, *Scientometrics*, Vol 68, No. 1, pp. 179-189.