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Executive Summary

There currently exists no North American peer-reviewed journal for records and information professionals (RIM) devoted primarily to matters of active and/or semi-active records. Peer-reviewed literature is often cited as a characteristic of a profession. This project reports on research that questions whether there exists an expressed desire for a North American peer-review journal. The study also presents an analysis of the current journal landscape in the RIM and related fields.

This report:
- Discusses the findings of a survey that the authors sent to RIM professionals to determine their interest level for a new peer-reviewed RIM journal published in North America;
- Discusses the findings of an analysis of peer-reviewed journals within the archival, library, and information science fields;
- Discusses the findings of a survey sent to editors of peer-reviewed journals to determine types of publishing models; and
- Recommends future research to expand upon this study’s findings.

Key findings include:
- The majority of respondents indicated a need for a peer-reviewed journal devoted specifically to RIM issues and published in North America;
- Respondents expressed a wide-range of topics/issues that could be addressed by a North American RIM peer-reviewed journal;
- The level of respondent’s willingness to participate in the development of a North American published RIM peer-reviewed journal varied—many respondents indicated they would submit an article to be published in the journal but fewer expressed an interest in serving on the journal’s editorial board;
- Peer-reviewed journal publishing models varied but appear to be gravitating toward an open access model; and
- Most peer-reviewed journals devoted specifically to archival science and RIM related-issues continue to be subscription and/or membership-based.

Based on the findings, the report provides several recommendations for future research:
- Investigate ways to expand the research to include a larger number of RIM professionals and their viewpoints pertaining to a North American RIM peer-reviewed journal;
- Develop focus groups of RIM professionals, educators and/or students to elicit more nuanced data to investigate the ability and desire of RIM professionals to participate in a journal’s creation and maintenance; and
- Explore innovative and emergent journal publishing models that facilitate understanding what potential forms a North American RIM peer-reviewed journal might take.

Records and information management is a field that continues to develop and form its own unique identity. The research presented in this report aims to contribute to this growth by investigating the needs of RIM professionals with regards to their interest level in a potentially new peer-reviewed journal devoted specifically to RIM issues and published in North America.
Project Description

This research project, titled “Records Management and Peer-Reviewed Journals: An Assessment,” aims to determine the interest amongst North American records professionals for a peer-reviewed journal devoted to issues in records and information management (RIM) in the United States and Canada. Currently, the archival community has several peer-reviewed journals, including Archivaria, American Archivist, Archival Science, and Archives and Manuscripts that traditionally focus on subjects pertaining to the creation, management, and preservation of inactive, or archival records, with the some focus on semi-active and active records. The Records Management Journal, published in the UK, is an international records management journal that “publishes material on all aspects of managing the records of organizations.” There currently exists no North American RIM peer-reviewed journal for records professionals (i.e., records managers and archivists) devoted primarily to matters of active and/or semi-active records.

While peer-reviewed literature is often cited as a characteristic of a profession, it remains unclear if records professionals believe a North American peer-reviewed journal devoted to RIM issues is necessary and, if so, who should be responsible for the organization, publication, and distribution of such a journal. This project reports on research that questions whether there exists an expressed desire for such a journal and also presents an analysis of the current journal landscape in the RIM and related fields.

Research Questions

This research project set out to answer two primary research questions and several secondary questions:

- What interest is there among North American records professionals for a peer-reviewed journal devoted specifically to issues pertaining to active and semi-active records?
  - How much would these professionals be willing to pay for such a journal?
What is the desired content for such a journal (i.e., article subjects and topics)?
Would respondents be willing to participate in the journal’s development?

What is the status of peer-reviewed journals in related fields?
What is the range of their distribution?
What are their formats (i.e., only in print, online, or both)?
What is the frequency of their publication?
How are they funded?
How are they sponsored?

Literature Review

Since their inception in the 17th and 18th centuries, peer-reviewed publications and the process of peer-review have received a substantial amount of attention from scholars. Nimer (2009) investigated the extent to which archival professionals access and read archival literature. His article highlights the dominance of the peer-reviewed journal and journal article as important sources of professional education and information in librarianship as well as other disciplines including the sciences and social sciences. Aside from Nimer (2009), the literature involving peer-review focuses less on how professionals access and review this type of publication and more on the strengths and weaknesses of peer-review publications and the process of peer-review itself.

Peer-review is the “process of subjecting an author’s scholarly work, research or ideas to the scrutiny of others who are experts in the same field” (Ware, 2008, p. 4). Contemporary peer review can be either single-blind (where the author is known to the reviewers, but the reviewers not known to the author) or double-blind (where authors and reviewers are hidden from each other). A relatively newer approach, offered up by some critics of the double-blind review process, is a form of open-review in which everyone involved knows the identity of the other(s) and a review report is published alongside the article. A variant of the open-review process allows for readers of the article to also comment on the posted review. Double blind review is the form of peer review most common in the social sciences and humanities disciplines.
Peer-review can serve as a valuable asset to any profession. Harnad (1998) asserts that peer-reviewed scholarship builds the theoretical framework from which a profession grows. It has also been argued that, at least in the hard sciences (e.g., biology and physics), peer-review serves as the cornerstone of these professions’ activities by “adding weight to claims that challenge our current understanding” (Gannon, 2001, p. 743). Benefits of peer review include: “improvement in the quality of published papers; filtering of the output of papers to the benefit of readers; and a ‘seal of approval’ that the published work meets a certain standard” (Ware, 2008, p. 12). It has been argued that peer-review functions as “the main mechanism that research journals use to assess quality” (Bordage & Caelligh, 2001, p. 904). Moreover, it is believed that “peer review ensures the readers of the trustworthiness of the text in front of them, and assures taxpayers that their monies have been put to good use by scientists” (Biagioli, 2002, p. 17).

The peer-review process, however, is not free of criticism. Gould (2012) remarks that “peer review is—at best—a conservative method, an approach that predictably and routinely results in the rejection of some perfectly acceptable works on the basis of flaws present in the work or simply imagined” (p. 286). One of the major concerns regarding peer review is that it is not designed to verify or confirm the author’s data analysis or conclusions—the reviewer must take the author’s word (Morey, Garner, Faruque, & Yang, 2011). As a result, the reviewer may be limited to the extent he/she can analyze the manuscript. Moreover, several studies have detected reviewer bias that adversely affects the review process. For example, a study by Ross et al. (2006) revealed that reviewers favor authors from the United States and other English-speaking countries, while another study discovered the prevalence of institutional bias, that is, reviewers favor publications from prominent scholars and/or high ranking institutions (Ceci & Peters, 1982). Attempting to anonymize the author and his/her institution has been revealed to have a minimal impact on the review process because of the difficulty in
completely masking certain authors (Justice, Cho, Winker, Berlin, Rennie, & PEER Investigators, 1998). Tight (2003) questions the value of having anonymous reviewers. He argues that the anonymity stifles discussion about a manuscript and thus limits its ability to be developed. A major criticism of the peer-review process is its length. A year or more may transpire between the time the author submits a manuscript to be considered for publication and the time the manuscript is accepted to be published (Benos et al., 2007).

Scholars have also cited the challenges that peer-review faces in the digital era. Online publishing can threaten the peer-review process because authors may be more inclined to publish to institutional digital repositories instead of enduring the rigors of peer-review (Gould, 2012, p. 286). McBride (2012) remarks that online publishing may result in the “waning identity of the journal as a venue that articulates a coherent academic and disciplinary agenda” because online articles are “perceived as self-standing units” and not part of a collection (p. 465). To offset these concerns, scholars such as Fitzpatrick (2012) advocate finding a balance between the traditional print culture and new digital culture: “[i]mposing traditional methods of peer review on digital publishing might help a transition to such publishing in the short term […] but it will hobble us in the long term, as we employ outdated methods in a public space that operates under radically different systems of authorization” (p. 18). In fact, some scholars aim to embrace the potential benefits digital publishing has on the peer-review process. For example, publishing online may expedite the process, enhance the quality of the work by increasing the “back and forth” communication between the editor, reviewers, and author; allow the author to reach broader audiences; and increase the reviewer pool (Gould, 2012; Long, 2010).

The aforementioned research investigated the strengths and weaknesses of the peer-review process to better understand its contributions to academic and professional development. Moreover, the authors only explored existing peer-reviewed journals; none of the studies questioned if their
colleagues felt that their profession would benefit from another peer-reviewed journal. However, it does set the stage of existing peer-review discourse and aid in contextualizing the following research project, which aims to determine if North American records and information management (RIM) professionals believe that a North American peer-reviewed journal devoted to RIM issues would be a useful addition to the profession.

**Methodology**

This exploratory research project used two research methods to collect its data: survey methodology and desk research that gathered and analyzed data on existing peer-reviewed journals. First, the authors created an online questionnaire using a survey tool operated by Vovici EFM Continuum and hosted by the University of British Columbia’s (UBC) information technology department (Appendix 1 – Survey for RIM Professionals). The survey was designed with RIM professionals and educators in mind and sought to explore the interest level for a North American RIM peer-reviewed journal. The survey consisted of 30 questions, of which only the first four were mandatory. Most of the questions were close-ended, that is, the respondent had to select one or more of the provided options. Divided into three sections, the survey captured a variety of information, including: demographic data (i.e., educational background, current working status, and professional affiliations); level of interest in the journal; the amount respondents would be willing to pay for such a journal; desired content; and the respondent’s willingness to participate in the journal’s development. It was estimated that it would take a respondent approximately 10 minutes to complete the survey. The completion of this survey was completely voluntary and all responses were anonymized.

---

Information about Vovici EFM Continuum may be found on their website at [http://www.vovici.com/services/vovici-u/index.aspx](http://www.vovici.com/services/vovici-u/index.aspx). In 2013, Vovici was acquired by Verint Systems Inc. ([http://www.verint.com/](http://www.verint.com/)). Dr. Patricia Franks and Dr. Luciana Duranti created a working draft of the survey and provided it to the authors at the outset of this project.
On 15 December 2011, an e-mail containing information about the study and a hyperlink to the survey was sent to four listservs which RIM professionals typically subscribe to: the records management listserv (recmgmt-l), the Association of Canadian Archivist’s listserv (arcan-l), the Society of American Archivist’s Archives & Archivists listserv (archives-l), and the Society of American Archivist’s Student listserv. A second e-mail was sent to these same listservs as a reminder to participate in the survey on 17 January 2012. Approximately nine months later, on 10 September 2012, the authors sent information about the project and the survey’s hyperlink to two additional listservs, the iSchoolsWeb and the International Council on Archives listserv (ICA-l). The authors selected these two listservs based on feedback they received at the ARMA Canada Conference in Nanaimo, B.C. (June 2012), where the authors presented the project’s initial findings. In total, 232 responses to the survey were received.3 Once the survey was closed, the authors downloaded the raw data from the survey tool and saved the data as an Excel spreadsheet, the program used to analyze the data.

The second component of the project involved analyzing existing peer-reviewed journals within the archival, library, and information science fields. The intent of this analysis was to provide a more comprehensive context in which to situate the results of the RIM professional survey. The list of journals examined was drawn primarily from Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory, “a bibliographic database providing detailed, comprehensive, and authoritative information on serials published throughout the world,” however, journals were also identified using the Library and Information Science Abstracts (LISA) and Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts (LISTA) databases (a few journals were also

3 A “response” equates to a respondent answering at least the first four questions of the survey. It is difficult to determine the survey’s response rate, however, the authors acknowledge it appears low given the number of “subscribers” to the listservs solicited. For example, approximately 5,600 subscribe to archives-l; 2,600 subscribe to recmgmt-l; 2,400 to SAA’s student listserv; 1,600 subscribe to arcan-l; and 1,200 to the ICA-l, where a “subscriber” equals an e-mail address and an individual could be subscribed to a listserv with multiple e-mail addresses. Moreover, there is a high probability that there is a large amount of overlap of subscribers to the listservs, that is, individuals subscribing to two or more of the listservs.
identified through recommendations from colleagues). Additionally, several journals were added based on responses to the RIM survey. Search criteria required that a journal be an active, peer-reviewed English-language scholarly journal, published in Canada or the United States.

The initial data set included approximately 156 journals. The authors downloaded metadata about each journal (e.g., subject, format, cost, start year, description, and the frequency of publication) from Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory into an Excel spreadsheet. An examination of this information revealed numerous false-positives, that is, journals that did not satisfy all the identified criteria. These journals were removed from the dataset. The authors also determined that a journal dealing with RIM issues would need to be published more than once a year to stay abreast with constantly evolving issues, such as technological changes, therefore, journals with annual publishing cycles were removed. Only journals with relatively broad mandates and audiences were sought, therefore, several journals that targeted extremely specific audiences or with stringent publication requirements (e.g., B Sides which only publishes articles from the University of Iowa’s SLIS students or alumni) were excluded. Journals, and their accompanying metadata, that were identified outside of the database searches were manually added to the dataset.

---

4 Description of Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory per the University of British Columbia’s Library, available at http://resources.library.ubc.ca/100. According the University of British Columbia’s Library, LISA “currently abstracts over 440 library and information science periodicals from more than 68 countries and in more than 20 different languages. LISA covers the field of librarianship and information science and includes many related areas such as archives and records management, publishing and bookselling, telecommunications, and specific applications of information technology in such fields as medicine and agriculture” (http://resources.library.ubc.ca/800) and LISTA “provides coverage on subjects such as librarianship, classification, cataloging, bibliometrics, online information retrieval, information management and more. LISTA indexes nearly 600 periodicals plus books, research reports, and proceedings. With coverage dating back to the mid-1960s, it is the oldest continuously produced database covering the field of information science” (http://resources.library.ubc.ca/1449).

5 Journals identified as relevant in the LISA and LISTA databases were also identified in the Ulrich’s Periodical Directory allowing for all information on these journals to be downloaded solely from Ulrich’s.
Although one criterion required that journals be published in North America, an exception to this rule was made. This study includes 16 peer-reviewed journals devoted to topics in archives and RIM regardless of geographic location.\textsuperscript{6} Journals identified for inclusion in this group include those that make explicit mention of an archival focus in their scope and/or mandates and those focusing primarily on the management of records and/or information. Including these journals allowed the authors to better understand the current landscape, specifically archival and RIM journals and how certain elements of these journals, such as format, cost, and publication cycle, compare to library and information science peer-reviewed journals. Our final data set included 96 journals.

Metadata from Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory—the journal’s mission statement, initial year of publication, format/means of distribution, business model (e.g., subscription-based, membership, or open access), frequency of print, and cost—aided in answering the research questions. In all cases the accuracy of this information was verified by consulting each journal’s website and updating the spreadsheet accordingly. Data that was not included in Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory or available directly from the journal’s website included the journals’ funding models and circulation numbers. To obtain this information an online survey consisting of three questions was created (Appendix 2—Survey for Editors) using the same survey tool operated by Vovici EFM Continuum and hosted by UBC’s information technology department. In early October 2012, the authors sent e-mails containing a hyperlink to the survey, to journal editors inviting them to participate in the survey—36 editors completed the survey.

\textsuperscript{6} This study identified some of these journals from the proposed journal rankings, a list based on a joint project between Australian archives and records academics, and other international academics. Findings of the project were presented at the Archival Education and Research Institute (AERI) in July 2009 (http://aeri2009.wordpress.com/). The journal rankings and information about the journals may be found at: http://aeri2009.wordpress.com/files/2009/05/archival-journal-ranking-aeri.doc. Tiers for the Australian Ranking of Journals are available at: http://www.arc.gov.au/era/tiers_ranking.htm.
Once the survey was closed the raw data was downloaded to an Excel spreadsheet where it was analyzed.

Findings
This section, divided into two parts, discusses the findings from both surveys and the peer-reviewed journal analysis. The first part addresses the findings from the survey for RIM professionals. This is followed by a review of the findings from the peer-reviewed journal analysis and the results from the survey of the editors.

Survey
This section discusses the findings from the 232 respondents who took the survey designed for RIM professionals. Since only the first four questions were mandatory, the percentages and numbers mentioned reflect only the responses from the respondents who answered the question at issue. Thus, the total number of respondents varies from question to question.

Demographics
Demographically, the survey received an almost even split between respondents living in the United States (45%) and respondents living in Canada (44%). Twenty-six respondents from outside North America also completed the survey. As Figure 1 indicates, there is a fairly equal age distribution among the respondents (with the exception of the 19-25 category).
The next set of demographic questions focused on the respondents’ occupation and education. First, this study asked the respondents to identify if they are a “working professional,” educator, student, or retired. The majority (77%) of respondents identified themselves as working professionals, with a much smaller percentage of respondents stating they are students (7%) and educators (6%). Twenty-two respondents selected multiple occupations, for example, working professional and educator. The finding that respondents have multiple professional roles is also reflected in their job titles.

When asked to provide their professional title, 33% of the respondents listed themselves as records managers and 23% listed themselves as archivists. Twenty respondents (10%), however, stated that they hold both titles. This was a recurring trend in the data, as nearly half of the respondents (47%) listed themselves as having two or more position titles, for example librarian/archivist, records manager/archivist/access-privacy professional, archivist/educator, and archivist/information analyst. In addition to these working professionals, a small number of students (7%), educators (11%), and retired respondents (3%) also completed the survey. The data also indicates that many of the respondents, regardless if they are working professionals or educators, have been working in the field for more than

---

7 Defined as someone who was not a student, educator, or retired.
ten years. For working professionals, the 190 responses ranged from 1 to 43 years with a mean of 16.5 years; and for educators, the 38 responses ranged from 1 to 40 years with a mean of 11.2 years.

In terms of education, the survey asked the highest level of education the respondent had earned. Over two-thirds of the survey’s respondents (67%) hold at least a master’s degree, 17% hold a bachelor’s degree, 9% have earned PhDs, and 4% of respondents have an associate’s degree. Of the remaining respondents, one has a J.D., three have some college course work, and two respondents have none of the degree options listed. In addition to formal education, 42% of the respondents stated that they hold at least one professional certification, such as being a certified records manager (CRM) or certified archivist (CA). The majority of respondents (54%) indicated they are certified records managers, with a small percentage of respondents (19%) being certified archivists. These were not the only certifications listed, as respondents also indicated having the Information Access and Protection of Privacy certificate (IAPP), Document Imaging Architect certificate (CDIA+), and/or the Information Professional certificate (CIP) (for a complete list of these certifications see Table 1).
Table 1: Respondents’ Certifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate Name</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Health Information Management (CHIM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in Records Management and Archive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Archival Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Attendance in 8th European Conference on Digital Archiving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Archival Conservator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Archivist (CA)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Archivist level A (Dutch)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Document Imaging Architect (CDIA+)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Information Professional (CIP)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Quality Engineer (ASQ)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Records Manager (CRM)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Library and Information Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma of the specialist 'historian - archiviste'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Content Management (ECM) (AIIM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Information Management (EIM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Records Manager Master (ERM) (AIIM)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Access and Protection of Privacy Certificate (IAPP)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITIL Foundation Certificate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law License</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegal Certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Archivist, Archives &amp; Records Association (Ireland &amp; UK)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections Certificate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To better understand which resources respondents consult for their information needs, the survey asked respondents to identify which peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed publications they read on a regular basis. Of the 160 respondents who provided information about which peer-reviewed journals they read, *Archivaria* (59%) and *American Archivist* (54%) were listed most frequently. This data was not surprising since nearly a third of the survey’s respondents belong to the Society of American Archivists (SAA) (31%) and a quarter belong to the Association of Canadian Archivists (ACA) (22%)—organizations that distribute these publications with membership. In addition to these two journals, respondents listed 37 different peer-reviewed journals, most of which publish on archival or records...
management issues (see Figure 2 for the most frequently cited peer-reviewed journals after *Archivaria* and *American Archivist*). Finally, of the 160 respondents who listed reading at least one peer-reviewed journal regularly, 83 respondents listed two or more journals and 39 respondents listed three or more journals (for a complete list of peer-reviewed journals that respondents listed, see Appendix 3 – Peer-Reviewed Journals Respondents Regularly Read).

One hundred and twenty-five respondents mentioned that they read at least one non-peer reviewed publication. When asked to identify which non-peer reviewed journals respondents read on a regular basis, 74 different publications were listed, with over three-quarters of the respondents who responded to this question (77%) listing ARMA’s *Information Management Journal*. Similar to *Archivaria* and *American Archivist*, the percentage of respondents who read the *Information Management Journal* is supported by the finding that 51% of the respondents stated they are members of ARMA and as such would receive the publication as part of their membership. No other non-peer-reviewed publication received as much attention; AIIM’s *Informatics* (which is no longer in print) was the second most cited
publication with 17% of the respondents who answered the question listing the journal (for a complete list of peer-reviewed journals that respondents listed, see Appendix 4 – Non-Peer-Reviewed Publications Respondents Regularly Read).

This set of data indicates that respondents on average consult a wide variety of sources in relation to their roles as RIM professionals—both peer- and non-peer-reviewed. Respondents listed over 115 different publications ranging from popular press magazines and organizational newsletters to regional publications and A+ peer-reviewed journals.\(^8\) Moreover, despite the vast majority of the survey’s respondents being from either the United States or Canada, the publications listed by the respondents span the globe, appearing in multiple languages. While a large number of the listed publications address archival and RIM issues (e.g., *American Archivist*, *Archivaria*, etc.) many of the publications respondents provided are geographically or domain specific (e.g., *South African Journal for Archivists*, *NARGARA*, *Law Technology News*, etc.). The list of publications also indicates a need on the part of records professionals to address current issues in information technology and information science (e.g., *JASIST*, *Computer World*, etc.). The diverse range of publications and the topics they address are also reflected in the responses respondents provided to what content they would like to see covered in a new RIM peer-reviewed journal.

Respondents were asked what type of content they would expect to see covered in a new RIM peer-reviewed journal. The survey listed 18 different options, including a space for the respondent to provide his/her own response. Respondents were not limited in the number of choices they could select. The results indicate a wide-variety of interests that any new RIM peer-review journal could address (Figure 3). Of the 229 respondents who answered and identified at least one topic, 97% of the respondents selected Records Management. Emerging Technologies (84%) and Legal Issues (81%) were

---

\(^8\) See above: p. 12, footnote 6.
the second and third most selected topics with Risk Management (77%), Business Process Analysis (73%), Regulatory Issues and Standards (73%), and Classification (71%) not far behind in popularity. Research Methods received the lowest percentage (34%), but this does not come as a surprise due to the small number of educators who responded to the survey, and who, arguably, may be most interested in this topic. The wide variety of topics that respondents expressed interest in may be summarized by one respondent’s apt response: “All of the above.”

![Figure 3: Respondents’ Journal Content Preference](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Topics</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Process Analysis</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Forensics</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Technologies (e.g., social media)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Issues</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Information &amp; Privacy</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/Information Management</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Issues</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Information Management</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Management</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Issues and Standards</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project Findings</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Need for a North American RIM Peer-Reviewed Journal

One of the primary questions this project sought to answer was if RIM professionals believed there is a need for a peer-reviewed journal devoted to RIM issues in North America. The survey specifically asked this question. Of the 232 respondents that answered this question, nearly three quarters (73%) stated “yes” with only 5% stating “no” and the remaining 22% “not sure” (Figure 4).

![Figure 4: Respondents Who Believe a North American RIM Peer-Reviewed Journal is Needed (number of respondents in parentheses)](image)

A closer examination of the responses reveals that all demographic groups supported the idea of the journal. For example, the highest percentage of “yes” responses came from RIM professionals in Canada (79 out of 101 or 78%), followed by respondents from outside North America (20 out of 26 or 77%). The majority of respondents from the United States believed that the journal is needed, but at a slightly lower rate, with 71 out of 105 (67%) saying “yes” to the idea of the journal (Figure 5).
Additionally, given the fairly equal age distribution rate among the respondents, the data indicates that 80% of respondents between the ages of 26 and 45 indicated a need for the journal, while 73% of respondents over the age of 46 responded the same way. This data indicates that a new peer-reviewed RIM journal may potentially have a sustainable audience of RIM professionals into the future.

Of the 190 working professional respondents who provided their number of years of experience, 73% indicated that the journal was needed. Additional analysis of this data indicates a positive attitude toward the journal across all age groups. For example, of the 75 respondents who had worked in the RIM profession for 10 or fewer years, 81% answered “yes” to the question that asked if they thought there was a need for a peer-reviewed RIM journal. This percentage increases to 84% for those respondents with 11-20 years of experience. The numbers, however, drop when considering those respondents with 21-30 years of experience (55%) and 31-40 years in the profession (53%) (Table 2). These figures indicate that younger RIM professionals see a greater need for the journal than those respondents who have been in the profession for more than 31 years.
Table 2: Response Rate of Working Professionals Who Thought there is a Need for a North American RIM Peer-Reviewed Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years as a Working Professional</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceived Benefits

The survey inquired how a North American RIM peer-reviewed journal might benefit RIM professionals personally and how it might benefit the RIM profession as a whole. The majority of respondents saw the journal as being a greater contributor to the growth and development of the RIM profession than of benefit to respondents individually. Of the 232 respondents who took the survey, 80% indicated that the greatest benefit of the journal would be its ability to bridge the gap between research and practice. The data also shows that respondents believed that one of the strengths of the journal would be its ability to function as a platform for vendor-neutral research and information. A lower percentage of respondents indicated that the journal would help to increase the profile of the RIM profession (63%) and serve as a means to access new research (60%).

Respondents did not see the journal benefitting them as much as individual professionals. Forty-one percent of 232 respondents believe the journal would function as an opportunity to share their activities, research, issues and experiences with professionals, educators, students and researchers through published articles, while only 29% perceive the journal as a means to receive scholarly feedback on their writings from peers in academia and the profession. These low percentages may be explained by the observation that most of the respondents may not be in positions that require them to publish...
for career advancement—a conclusion supported by the finding that only 27% of the respondents see the journal as an opportunity to fulfill academic and professional requirements.

Contrary to the perceived benefits of the journal, some respondents argued that the journal was unnecessary to them personally or to the RIM profession. Some of the reasons given for this rationale included: 1) peer-reviewed journals devoted to RIM issues already exist (e.g., Records Management Journal, Archivaria, and the American Archivist); 2) the journal’s publication cycle may be unable to keep pace with some of the dynamic issues facing records professionals (e.g., technology); 3) the potential of the journal to be dominated by academics would detract from the practical value for working professionals; and 4) as one respondent stated, the lack of sufficient “hours in the day to keep up with the literature that is already out there.”

In addition to the perceived benefits of the journal, the survey also inquired if respondents would be willing to contribute to the journal’s development, in the form of submitting an article to the journal, serving as a peer-reviewer, and/or by serving on the editorial board. The data indicates that while respondents feel the journal is needed they may be less inclined to contribute to its content or participate in its development (see Table 3). For example, 41% of the 229 respondents who answered this question indicated they would be willing to submit an article to the journal, with 42% not sure and 17% indicating they would not submit an article. When asked if willing to serve as a peer-reviewer, 39% of the 227 respondents who answered this question indicated that they would be willing to serve as a peer-reviewer, 28% stated “no” they would not serve as a peer-reviewer and the remaining respondents (33%) were not sure if they would be a peer-reviewer for the journal.
Commitment to the journal continued to wane when the survey inquired if respondents would be willing to serve on the editorial board, only 24% of the 225 respondents who answered this question stated “yes,” over a third (36%) stated “no,” and 40% were “not sure.” The relatively low numbers could indicate that more information is required on the part of the respondents in order to make an informed decision on their desire and/or ability to contribute to the content and/or participate in the development of such a journal.

In sum, the data indicates that the majority of the RIM professionals who took the survey believe that the journal would be a valuable contribution to the profession because it would make strides to bridge the gap between theory and practice. Additionally, respondents hesitated to contribute to the journal’s development with less than half the respondents indicating that they would submit an article to the journal. Moreover, respondents raised some concern about how the journal would fit amongst the current environment of publications already addressing RIM issues (as previously mentioned and will be explored in more detail below, there are 16 peer-reviewed journals devoted to archival/RIM related issues).

These findings raise some interesting questions. Foremost, are the existing journals sufficient for the RIM profession and the information needs of RIM professionals? Or would RIM professionals benefit from another peer-reviewed journal? The data from our survey indicates that some RIM professionals believe that their information needs are not being met and another peer-reviewed journal would be of
benefit to the profession. If a new journal is developed, the survey also indicates that the journal would need to carefully straddle the line between theory and practice to suit the needs of both working professionals who often seek more practice-oriented information and educators/researchers who often seek more theoretical-based information/findings.

**Peer-reviewed Journal Analysis**

This section of the study gathered data on peer-reviewed journals in archives/RIM and related fields in an attempt to answer a variety of sub-questions including the range of distribution, format types, frequency of publication, and funding models. The data was analyzed to establish a context in which to situate the earlier findings of interest amongst North American RIM professionals. The journal survey analysis, editor survey and literature review on the value and status of peer review will aid in providing a situational analysis for a potential North American RIM journal project.

This study examined 96 peer-reviewed journals, 80 in the broader scope of library and information science and 16 in the more specific area of archival science/RIM related issues. The initial inclusion criteria required that a journal be an active, peer-reviewed English-language scholarly journal, published in Canada and/or the United States. These criteria were further broadened to include journals that focus on archival science and RIM related subject matter beyond solely a North American context in order to provide as comprehensive a picture as possible on the status of existing journals in library science, archival science, and RIM-related subject areas.

The 96 journals that the study identified are published in a variety of geographic locations throughout the world. The majority of these journals are published in the United States (84%); Canada

---

9 During the final stages of this report, the authors were made aware of a relatively new journal, *Archive*, which “focuses on the use and theory of archives and special collections in higher education” ([http://www.archivejournal.net/home/about/](http://www.archivejournal.net/home/about/)). This peer-reviewed, open access journal has been publishing online since Spring 2011 and offers an “open review” process unique to journals in this area.
(5%), with Great Britain (4%), Australia (2%) Germany (1%) and The Netherlands (1%) accounting for a much smaller share of the market. When considering only the archival science/RIM related peer-reviewed journals the geographic distribution shifts substantially. Of these 16 journals, eight originate in the United States, four in Great Britain, two in Australia and one in each of Canada, and The Netherlands.\(^{10}\) This global distribution of the professional archival/RIM literature could potentially influence the type of publishing model adopted by a new journal. For example, an open access model delivered via the web could reach both a North American and broader international audience comprehensively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>All Journals</th>
<th>Archival Science/RIM Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Peer-Reviewed Journals’ Country of Origin**

**Business Model**

This study identified several peer-reviewed journal business models: subscription based, membership based, open access,\(^{11}\) and a combination of the subscription/membership model. As shown

\(^{10}\) The country of origin indicates the country in which the journal is published, however, a number of journals indicate in their mandates that they serve a much broader audience – often internationally – than the country from which they originate.

\(^{11}\) Open access journals are scholarly journals that offer their content freely online without any charge to the reader or author.
in Figure 6, the majority of journals (76%) this study identified have a membership,\textsuperscript{12} subscription, or a combination of the two model. The remaining 24% of the journals are open access journals.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
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\caption{Journals' Business Models}
\end{figure}

There is a growing movement within government and the academic community to make access to research findings and data more openly accessible.\textsuperscript{13} As will be discussed in more detail below, the majority of respondents indicated they would be unwilling or unable to pay more than $20 per issue. Thus, a potential new journal project should investigate the feasibility and opportunity to publish under an open access model. However, when only considering the business models of the archival science/RIM related peer-reviewed journals, only two of these journals are open access (as shown in Table 4).\textsuperscript{14} Both of these journals began publishing in 2006 and are amongst the newer of the archival science/RIM

\textsuperscript{12} Membership meaning that the journal is automatically delivered to members of an association as a benefit of membership (e.g., Association of Canadian Archivists members receive Archivaria).


\textsuperscript{14} The two open access archival/RIM peer-review journals are: The International Journal of Digital Curation (IJDC), freely available online, is published by UKOLN at the University of Bath and is a publication of the Digital Curation Centre, http://www.ijdc.net/index.php/ijdc. The IJDC’s Open Access Policy reads: “This journal provides immediate open access to its content on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge” and SLIS Student Research Journal published by San Jose State University School of Library & Information Science is freely available online.
related peer-reviewed journals examined; potentially a reflection of the contemporary movement to make scholarship more widely and freely accessible.\textsuperscript{15}

**Table 4: Publishing Models of Peer-Reviewed Journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Open Access</th>
<th>Subscription and/or Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Journals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Science / RIM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey of editors further revealed information about the sources of the journals’ funding. As Figure 7 indicates, of the 37 respondents to the editor’s survey, 65% indicated their journals receive revenue from subscription fees, 35% of the journals generate revenue from associations, just over 5% receive grant funding and 32% of the journals receive “other” sources of funding. Of the 13 journals that receive funding through an association, just over half of them (7) also receive funding from subscriptions. The “other” sources of funding indicated by respondents include advertising (33%), departmental or institutional support (33%), and consultancy income (8%). Three respondents indicated their journals receive no funding and are solely volunteer run.

\textsuperscript{15} Also, see footnote 9 for information on Archives, an open access journal established in 2011.
Journal Format

The results of the analysis of the 96 journals revealed a mix of journal delivery formats, which include print only, online only, and a combination of the two (what this study labeled as “hybrid”). At the time of this study, 68% of the journals this study examined were available both online and in print, with 26% available only online and 6% available as print only (see Figure 8). As shown in Figure 9, when the focus is placed solely on the archival science/RIM related peer-reviewed journals there is a similar pattern—a high number of journals in multiple formats. As Figures 7 and 8 indicate, archival science/RIM related peer-reviewed journals have a higher percentage of print-only journals and a smaller percentage of online only journals.
The survey of RIM professionals inquired about the respondent’s preference in a journal’s format. As Figure 10 illustrates, 83% of respondents preferred a journal with some type of hybrid publishing model (i.e., digital & print; web & digital; web & digital & print; or web & print).\(^{16}\) This finding is in line with the current variety of journal formats available.

**Figure 10: Respondents’ Format Preferences**

**Frequency of Print**

Of the 96 journals analyzed, frequency of print fell primarily into two categories – more than half of the journals (56%) are published quarterly with the next most recurring frequency being semi-annually (28%).

\(^{16}\) The survey distinguished between different digital formats – including those residing solely on the web and those delivered to subscribers in digital format but not necessarily residing on the web.
These numbers coincide with the preferences for journal frequency indicated by the respondents. As shown in Figure 12, the majority of respondents (54%) indicated a preference for a quarterly publication; semi-annually being the second most frequent preference (39%). Several respondents also provided other preferences with regard to the journal’s print cycle. For example, one respondent indicated that a RIM journal published “anything less than monthly” would be out of date in its content, while several respondents indicated a preference for a monthly or quarterly publication and one respondent indicated an e-publishing or “continuous” model.
Responsibility for the Journal

The survey inquired who respondents believed should be responsible for producing a peer-reviewed RIM journal. As shown in Table 5, when combining the number of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses, the majority of respondents (76%) believe that “a team of professionals across organizations” should be responsible for the journal. Sixty-four percent of respondents believe that “a team of academics across universities” should be responsible for the journal. Additionally, 64% of respondents believe that ARMA International should be responsible for the journal, but fewer respondents (42%) believe that “any RIM-related organization” should take the lead on such a journal. A private organization (e.g., a publishing company) received the lowest positive response rate, 11%, of the available options. In other words, over half of all respondents (54%) indicated that they either “Disagree” or “Strongly” disagree that a private organization should be responsible for the journal’s development and publication. This last finding contradicts the data on existing peer-reviewed journals this study examined, the majority of which were not associated with a membership model, but were published by private publishers (e.g., Taylor and Francis, Springer, etc.). This disagreement points toward what would be a requirement for a broader examination of the privately published journals in the area of archival science/RIM related issues: how many of these were established by an association but later...
acquired by a private publisher (e.g., *Records Management Journal*)? Gaining an understanding of the motivations and factors that contributed to such decisions would undoubtedly influence who should/could be responsible for producing a new journal and the publishing model undertaken.

**Table 5: Respondents’ View of Who Should Undertake the Production of a Peer-Reviewed RIM Journal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Entity</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARMA International</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any RIM-related association</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Department/ Faculty (e.g., iSchool)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Organization (e.g., a publishing company)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Team of Academics Across Universities</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Team of Professionals Across Organizations</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subscription Costs**

The study investigated the costs associated with peer-reviewed journals. Subscription costs vary from journal to journal, as do the ways in which a journal may ascribe its costs. For example, a journal may have different rates for educational institutions, individual, and students. Moreover, journals may have different rates for students and/or individuals residing in different countries. Additionally, journals typically have different prices based on different formats. For example, the majority of journals examined for this study may be divided into two pricing categories: Institutional Rates and Individual Rates. These rates often have three different costs associated with them: Print & Online; Print Only;

---

Online Only.\textsuperscript{18} Table 6 indicates the minimum, maximum, and average cost for the journals that provided this information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscription Model</th>
<th># of Journals Examined</th>
<th>Least Expensive Journal ($)</th>
<th>Most Expensive Journal ($)</th>
<th>Average Cost of the Journals Examined ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print &amp; Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2,924</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey also explored the amount respondents would be willing to pay for a RIM peer-reviewed journal. As shown in Figure 13, over half of all respondents (61\%) stated they would be willing to pay between $5-$20/issue for a RIM peer-reviewed journal. When the respondents’ preferences in cost are calculated on a quarterly print cycle, the average cost that respondents may be willing to pay ranges between $44-$120/annually. A quarterly print cycle was chosen for the purposes of modelling this calculation as it was the most popular print cycle indicated by the survey respondents.

\textsuperscript{18} Not every journal reviewed for this study listed a price for each of these categories, as demonstrated in the variations in the “# of Journals” column.
Figure 13: Amount Respondents are Willing to Pay for a Peer-Reviewed RIM Journal

Where Table 6 shows the minimum and maximum costs of all the journals this study identified, Table 7 shows the available personal subscription costs for the peer-reviewed journals with only quarterly print cycles. The average costs of what a respondent is willing to pay for a subscription is comparable to the average annual cost of a peer-reviewed journal. There is, however, a large gap between the high-end of what respondents may be willing to pay and the subscription costs for the most expensive journals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscription Model</th>
<th># of Journals Examined</th>
<th>Least Expensive Journal ($)</th>
<th>Most Expensive Journal ($)</th>
<th>Average Cost of Journals Examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print &amp; Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between what respondents would be willing to pay and the actual subscription costs is substantial enough to warrant further examination for a potential new journal. The large
disconnect between desired cost and actual cost should be explored if the publisher’s goal is to maximize access to peer-reviewed research and practices based information in the RIM field.

**Limitations**

This study has a number of limitations that must be considered. Foremost, the response rate for both surveys was low. In particular, the RIM survey lacked a substantial number of responses from educators and students. Although the response rate for the editor’s survey was considerably higher, only one-third of editors contacted replied. The minimal number of responses received from the editors greatly limited the study’s ability to compare data between this survey and the larger data set of journal information. Additionally, the cost models calculated need to take into consideration that subscription costs were not available for all journals examined. The majority of metadata about the journals examined was extracted from Ulrich’s database. While this metadata was augmented by searches conducted in LISA, LISTA and direct investigation into the journal’s websites, a number of relevant journals may have inadvertently been missed by the authors.

**Future Research**

Preliminary results of the findings were presented at three sessions at two separate ARMA conferences (ARMA Canada and ARMA International) and the attendance at all of these sessions was notably low. Therefore, future research into the possibility of a peer-reviewed RIM journal should investigate ways to reach a larger part of the profession (e.g., contacting local RIM/ARMA organizations at the civic level – eliciting feedback/information in their newsletters).

Any future journal, whether for RIM professionals or any other type of professional, also needs to consider investigating the potential of engaging an open access journal model. As the landscape of academic and professional journals is currently undergoing substantial reexamination in light of the pressures of the open access movement, consideration of this option is warranted. Additionally, as there
is a noted gap in current journal subscription rates and the rates respondents are willing to pay for such a journal, an open access model should be explored for this reason also. The open access model has the potential to exponentially increase readership, disseminate new research findings and innovations in practice more broadly, positively contribute to the RIM profession broadly and be easily accessed by professionals internationally.

An exploration of innovative and emergent journal models would aid in better understanding the potential forms a new journal might take. Mosley (2011) observes that in professions such as library management, both peer-review journals and non-peer-review journals (i.e., trade publications) are necessary. The former reach those interested in more abstract and theoretical research, while the latter address best practices and problem-solving articles that appeal to working practitioners. Mosley also suggests that there is no reason why a journal could not contain both types of articles (peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed). Feedback received by the researchers at the ARMA Canada conference reinforced this idea as it was suggested a “hybrid” style journal that contained both peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed content should be explored. For example, the *International Journal of Data Curation* is an open access web-based journal that publishes both peer-reviewed papers and non-peer-reviewed articles in the same issue. Such a model could potentially aid in addressing the concerns expressed regarding the need for a balance between theory and practice as well as meet the needs of practicing professionals, researchers and educators. Current technologies support a variety of journal formats and delivery options that should be creatively explored and considered.

More qualitative data would add depth to this report’s findings. For example, focus groups of RIM professionals, educators and/or students would elicit more nuanced data on the desired journal specifics and ability/desire to participate in a journal’s creation and maintenance. Interviews with existing RIM journal editors and/or editorial boards could aid in identifying any issues and/or challenges.
at the individual journal level that are currently being encountered and inform a potential project moving forward. Contacting journal publishers would add additional data to expand and inform the journal analysis. This research project was simply one small step in a much larger process—a step designed to generate discussion and additional research about the possibility of another peer-reviewed journal being added to the RIM profession.

**Conclusion**

This research project sought to investigate the interest amongst RIM professionals for a peer-reviewed journal and present an analysis of the current journal landscape in RIM and related fields. Gathering data from two online surveys and an analysis of peer-reviewed journals within the archival, library, and information science fields, a number of findings surfaced.

The findings from the survey distributed to RIM professionals suggest that the majority of respondents believe a North American RIM peer-reviewed journal would be a positive addition to the profession. A high number of respondents indicated they saw the potential benefit of such a journal as a means to bridge the gap between research and practice. The majority of respondents also indicated that such a journal would help raise the profile of the RIM profession and serve as a means to access new research. While the majority of respondents saw such a journal benefiting the profession, less than half of the respondents believe that the journal would benefit them personally as a RIM professional, either to share their research or as a means to receive scholarly feedback.

While the majority of respondents saw a need for the journal, fewer than half of respondents indicated a desire to contribute an article, even fewer indicated their ability to peer-review, and just under one quarter indicated an ability to serve on the editorial board. Respondents also raised a number of questions that would need to be addressed before the development of such a journal is undertaken,
such as how the journal would fit into the current landscape of existing archival science and RIM-related peer reviewed journals.

The publishing model (e.g., open access, subscription, etc.) and format (e.g., online, print, web-based, etc.) of a North American RIM peer-reviewed journal needs to be further explored. The RIM survey’s findings indicate respondents desire a combination of print and online formats.

The cost of the journal also needs extensive investigation. The data indicates a disconnect between current journal costs and what respondents indicated they would be willing and/or able to pay. The contemporary journal publishing landscape is currently undergoing reflection and change in the face of evolving technologies and the ever-increasing call for open access to information and publicly funded research. Any new journal entering the current landscape would need to consider the sustainability of a non-open access model.

Overall, this project’s findings indicate the possible development of a North American RIM peer-reviewed journal is a discussion worth continuing and exploring. One of the overarching intentions of this project was to initiate a dialogue with the expectation that future efforts and research will help further the ideas explored in this report.
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Appendix 1 – Survey for RIM Professionals

Co-Investigator
Donald Force, BA, MA, MLS, MIS
PhD Candidate, School of Library, Archival and Information Studies
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia, CANADA
Tel: XXX.XXX.XXX (office)
Email: xxxx@xxxx.xx

Co-Investigator
Elizabeth Shaffer, BA, MAS
Doctoral Student, School of Library, Archival and Information Studies
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia, CANADA
Tel: XXX.XXX.XXX (office)
Email: xxxx@xxxx.xx

Faculty Supervisor
Dr. Luciana Duranti
School of Library, Archival and Information Studies
The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia, CANADA
Tel: XXX.XXX.XXX (office)
Email: xxxx@xxxx.xx

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey. The following questions are designed to collect data about the level of interest among records professionals for a peer-reviewed journal devoted to issues in records and information management (RIM), its potential content, and who should be responsible for its organization, publication, and distribution.

A peer-reviewed journal (also known as a refereed journal) publishes articles that have been critically assessed by other scholars in the author’s field. Peer review is the accepted method for ensuring that information is of the highest quality. A peer-reviewed journal will have:

- a copy of a reviewer’s assessment relating to the article; or
- a statement in the journal certifying that contributions are peer reviewed; or
- a statement by the journal editor certifying that contributions are peer reviewed.

The survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

The completion of this survey is voluntary and all the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential; only anonymized aggregated data will be made public. Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records. If the survey is completed, it will be assumed that consent has been given to disseminate the data it contains in anonymous and aggregated form.

This online survey is hosted by a Canadian institution (UBC) and is subject to Canadian laws, in particular, the British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPPA), which allows authorities to access the records of the university. Only we, the co-investigators, and
UBC Information Technology Services ([http://it.ubc.ca/contact.html](http://it.ubc.ca/contact.html)) have access to the raw survey data. Should you have any questions or wish to receive further information about this study, please do not hesitate to contact either co-investigator. If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a study participant, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598 or, if you prefer, send an e-mail to RSIL@ors.ubc.ca.

Consent to Participate in a Research Survey
- I have read and understand the subject information.
- I have had sufficient time to consider the information.
- I am 19 years of age or older.
- I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the research project, its aims and objectives.
- I understand that all of the information collected will be kept confidential and that the result will only be used for scientific objectives.
- I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and that I am completely free to refuse to participate or to withdraw from this study at any time.
- I understand that I am not waiving any of my legal rights as a result of agreeing to participate in this study.
- I have read this form, and by clicking “Next Page” I freely consent to continue my participation in this study OR click HERE ([Google.ca](http://www.google.ca)) to exit survey.

Part I - Demographic Information

*If a question is not applicable, please skip it. A question marked with an asterisk (*) is mandatory.*

1) What is your current location?*

- United States
- Canada
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify

____________________________________________________________________

2) Please indicate your age category:*

- 19-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- >56

3) What is your highest degree earned?*

- Associate’s
- Bachelor’s
4) What is your current occupation? (select all that apply):*

- Working Professional
- Educator
- Student
- Retired
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify

5) If a working professional, please supply:

- Your Professional Title (e.g., records manager, archivist, etc.):
- Please identify any relevant professional certifications you hold (e.g., Certified Archivist, Certified Records Manager, etc.):
- Number of years as a professional:

6) If an educator, please supply:

- Your Professional Title (e.g., professor, instructor, etc.):
- Number of years as an educator:

7) If a student, please indicate the level of the educational program in which you are enrolled:

- Certificate
- Undergraduate
- Master's
- Ph.D.
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify
8) To what professional organizations do you belong? (select all that apply):

- I do not belong to any professional organizations.
- ACA (The Academy of Certified Archivists)
- ACA (Association of Canadian Archivists)
- AIIM (Association for Information & Image Management – also known as the Enterprise Content Management [ECM] organization)
- ARMA (Association for Records Managers and Administrators)
- ICA (International Council on Archives)
- NAGARA (National Association of Government Archives & Records Administrators)
- SAA (Society of American Archivists)
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify
____________________________________________________________________

9) Please list any peer-reviewed journals that you subscribe to or regularly read that pertain to archives, records and/or information management (e.g., Archivaria, American Archivist, etc.):
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

10) Please list any non-peer reviewed journals that you subscribe to or regularly read that pertain to archives, records and/or information management (e.g., Journal of Information Management, Infonomics, etc.):
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

11) Have you in the past or do you currently contribute to archives, records and/or information management journals?

- Yes
- No

12) If you answered 'yes' to question #11, please identify the type(s) of journals to which you have or currently contribute:

- Peer-reviewed
- Non-peer reviewed
- Both
Part II – Administration of Peer-Reviewed Journal

*If a question is not applicable, please skip it. A question marked with an asterisk (*) is mandatory.*

13) Do you think there is a need for a peer-reviewed records and information management journal?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

14) How would you personally benefit from such a publication? (select all that apply):

- Increased awareness of current research and findings in RIM.
- Increased knowledge of specific RIM practices.
- Opportunity to share my activities, research, issues and experiences with professionals, educators, students and researchers through published articles.
- Opportunity to receive scholarly feedback on my writings by peers in academia and the profession.
- Opportunity to fulfill the academic and professional requirements to publish in scholarly journals.
- Not Sure
- Do not see any benefit
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify
______________________________________________________________________

15) How would such a journal benefit the records and information management profession as a whole? (select all that apply):

- Bridging the gap between research and practice in the RIM profession.
- Supporting the development of better practices.
- Focusing the professional and scholarly discourse on records management issues and providing it with depth.
- Increasing the profile of the profession.
- Providing access to information about cutting edge scholarship and research for practitioners and students alike.
- Not Sure
- Do not see any benefit
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify
______________________________________________________________________

16) What are the reasons you believe a peer-reviewed journal is *not* needed? (select all that
apply):

- Existing peer-reviewed journals in other fields satisfy the demand of both authors and readers.
- Existing non-peer reviewed journals in records and information management and other fields fulfill the needs of the RIM profession.
- Do not believe that the contents of peer-reviewed / scholarly journals are relevant to working professionals.
- Such a journal would not reach a wide enough audience to have an impact.
- Too expensive compared to the net benefit.
- Not Sure
- I believe a peer-reviewed journal is needed.
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify

______________________________________________________________________

17) If a new records management peer-reviewed journal were published, would you subscribe to it?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

18) If you answered 'yes' to question #17, what is the highest price you would be willing to pay? *Note: Annual subscription price would depend on cost per issue and number of issues.*

- $5-$10 per issue
- $11-$20 per issue
- $21-$30 per issue
- $31-$40 per issue
- $41-$50 per issue
- More than $50 per issue
- Not sure

19) If a new records management peer-reviewed journal were published, would your organization subscribe to it?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

20) If you answered 'yes' to question #19, what is the highest amount you believe your organization would be willing to pay? *Note: Annual subscription price would depend on cost per issue and number of issues.*

- $5-$10 per issue
- $11-$20 per issue
- $21-$30 per issue
- $31-$40 per issue
- $41-$50 per issue
21) What format would you prefer for the journal?

- Web only
- Digital only (electronic publication delivered by e-mail)
- Print only
- Web + Digital
- Web + Print
- Digital + Print
- Web + Digital + Print

22) What publication schedule would you prefer?

- Annual
- Semi-annual
- Quarterly
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify

____________________________________________________________________

23) What would you like the journal to emulate in terms of style, tone, and philosophical approach?

- A *Harvard Business Review* for records and information management
- *American Archivist* or *Archivaria* Journal with more emphasis on current practice and theory
- The *Journal of Information Science* with a focus on records
- Conference proceedings (e.g., *ASIST*, *IEEE Proceedings*, etc.)
- Not Sure
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify

____________________________________________________________________

Part III – Content/Publishing of Peer-reviewed Journal

*If a question is not applicable, please skip it. A question marked with an asterisk (*) is mandatory.*

24) What type of content would you expect to see covered in a records and information management journal (select all that apply):

- Archives
- Business Process Analysis
- Classification
- Computer Forensics
 Emerging Technologies (e.g., social networking, web 2.0, open source, etc.)
 Ethical Issues
 Freedom of Information & Privacy
 Information Technology
 Knowledge/Information Management
 Legal Issues (e.g., case law, e-discovery, etc.)
 Personal Information Management
 Preservation
 Records Management
 Regulatory Issues and Standards
 Research Methods
 Research Project Findings
 Risk Management
 Security
 Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify

_____________________________________________________

25) Would you be interested in submitting articles for peer review to be published in this journal?

☑ Yes
☑ No
☑ Not sure

26) Would you be willing to serve on the Editorial Board?

☑ Yes
☑ No
☑ Not sure

27) Would you be willing to serve as a peer-reviewer? Note: Peer reviewers would be identified as experts in the content/topic under review.

☑ Yes
☑ No
☑ Not sure

28) Who do you believe should take responsibility for a peer-reviewed records and information management journal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARMA International</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any RIM-related</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Press</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29) Would you be willing to contribute to the development of a peer-reviewed records and information management journal (e.g., creating a business case)?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

30) Additional comments/suggestions:

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this survey. We appreciate your time and cooperation.
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Co-Investigator
Donald Force, BA, MA, MLS, MIS
PhD Candidate, School of Library, Archival and Information Studies
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia, CANADA
Tel: XXX.XXX.XXX (office)
Email: xxxx@xxxx.xx

Co-Investigator
Elizabeth Shaffer, BA, MAS
Doctoral Student, School of Library, Archival and Information Studies
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia, CANADA
Tel: XXX.XXX.XXX (office)
Email: xxxx@xxxx.xx

Faculty Supervisor
Dr. Luciana Duranti
School of Library, Archival and Information Studies
The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia, CANADA
Tel: XXX.XXX.XXX (office)
Email: xxxx@xxxx.xx

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey. The following questions are designed to collect data about the funding sources and range of distribution of peer-reviewed journals in the area of archival, library, and information sciences.

The survey should take approximately 5 minutes to complete.

The completion of this survey is voluntary and all the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential; only anonymized aggregated data will be made public. Please keep a copy of this consent form for your records. If the survey is completed, it will be assumed that consent has been given to disseminate the data it contains in anonymous and aggregated form.

This online survey is hosted by a Canadian institution (UBC) and is subject to Canadian laws, in particular, the British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPPA), which allows authorities to access the records of the university. Only we, the co-investigators, and UBC Information Technology Services (http://it.ubc.ca/contact.html) have access to the raw survey data. Should you have any questions or wish to receive further information about this study, please do not hesitate to contact either co-investigator. If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a study participant, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598 or, if you prefer, send an e-mail to RSIL@ors.ubc.ca.

Consent to Participate in a Research Survey
• I have read and understand the subject information.
• I have had sufficient time to consider the information.
I am 19 years of age or older.
I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the research project, its aims and objectives.
I understand that all of the information collected will be kept confidential and that the result will only be used for scientific objectives.
I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and that I am completely free to refuse to participate or to withdraw from this study at any time.
I understand that I am not waiving any of my legal rights as a result of agreeing to participate in this study.
I have read this form, and by clicking "Next Page" I freely consent to continue my participation in this study OR click HERE (Google.ca) to exit the survey.

1) Please indicate all sources of funding for the journal (select all that apply):
- Subscription Fees
- Grants
- Professional Associations (e.g., Association of Canadian Archivists; American Library Association; Association of Information Science and Technology, etc.)
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify ______________________________________________________________

2) What is the approximate current circulation (i.e., number of subscribers) of the journal? You may provide one total number OR provide a break-down of the subscribers.

Individual & Institutional Subscribers: ________________________________
Individual Subscribers: ________________________________
Institutional Subscribers: ________________________________

3) Additional comments

__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this survey. We appreciate your time and cooperation.
Appendix 3 – Peer-Reviewed Journals Respondents Regularly Read

American Archivist
Anales de Documentacion
Archival Issues
Archival Science
Archivalische Zeitschrift
Archivar
Archivaria
Archives
Archives and Manuscripts
Archivi
Ariadne
ASLIB Proceedings
Bibliotheek & Archiefgids
Boletin de la ANABAD
Cataloging and Classification Quarterly
Comma (International Journal on Archives)
D-Lib
Flash
Gazette des Archives
Imprese e storia
Information Management Journal
InterActions
International Journal of Digital Curation

International Journal of Information Management
International Sound and Audiovisual Association Journal
JASIST
Journal of Archival Organization
Journal of the Association for Information Systems (JAIS)
Journal of Documentation
Journal of the American Health Information Management Association (AHIMA)
Journal of the Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Branch of the International Council on Archives
Journal of the Society of Archivists (UK)
Journal of the South African Society of Archivists
Libraries & the Cultural Record
Managing Information
Records Management Journal (UK)
Sagacity
South African Journal for Archivists
Appendix 4 – Non-Peer-Reviewed Publications Respondents Regularly Read

AIIM White Papers
American Libraries
ARANZ "Newsletter"
Arbido (Switzerland)
Archiveënblad
Archival Outlook
Archivi
Archivi & Computer
Arkivnytt
ASIST Bulletin
BC Studies
Blue Shield
Boletim of Brazilian Association of Archivist
Boxes and Arrows Publications
Business Archives (UK)
Campus Technology
Canadian Government Executive
Canadian Policy Brief
CFO
CILIP Update
CIO magazine
College of Statistic Scientific Review
Computerworld
Der Archivar
Earley and Associates Publications
EContent
E-Doc Magazine
Enterprise Management
Faculty of Information Quarterly
FARO (Belgian professional journal)
Fierce CIO
French Scientific Review for "Bibliologie"
Global Policy Brief
Government Information Quarterly
Government Information Technology News
IBM Market Intelligence
ICA bulletins
ICOM bulletins
Infonomics (AIIM)
InfoPro (ARMA)

Information and Records Management Society Bulletin (iRMS Bulletin)
Information Management Daily
Information Management Journal
Information Outlook
Information Week
IQ (RIM Professionals Australasia Quarterly magazine)
Irish Archives
iRMA Information and Records Management Annual
Journal of Business Analytics
Knowledge Management
Knowledge Management World (KM World)
La Gazette des Archives
Law Technology News
LegalTech
LTN Daily
Marketscope (Gartner)
META (local Belgian professional journals)
Museum Archivist
NARGARA
newsletters from local and regional archivists group
NFPA magazine
NIRMA News Letter
Off the Record
Outlook
Peer to Peer
Progressive Librarians Guild Journal
Redmond
Schema et Schematisation
Southwest Archivist
Tabula
TechRepublic
The Economist
The Real Story
Washington Policy Brief
Washington Technology
ZD Net
The ARMA International Educational Foundation is the non-profit, (501(c)3, affiliate of ARMA International, the primary professional association for the records and information profession in the world.

Mission
The ARMA International Educational Foundation supports education and research initiatives that promote the advancement of both information managers and the information management profession. Recorded information is the lifeblood of the modern organization, but rarely is it treated as a critical asset, primarily because there is little quality research to create the comprehensive body of knowledge required to support information management as a profession. The AIEF purpose is to answer that need by soliciting funds for this research and then providing a vehicle through which conclusions can be tested, documented and communicated to the information management community.

If you found value in this publication, please consider making a financial contribution to the Endowment Fund of the Foundation. This can be accomplished by visiting the Foundation’s web site, www.armaedfoundation.org, or by contacting

Foundation Administrator
ARMA Int’l Educational Foundation
1609 Terrie Drive
Pittsburgh PA 15241
USA

Additional information about the Foundation can be found at The National Database of Non-profit Organizations

GuideStar

Comments about this publication and suggestions for further research are welcome. Please direct your inquiry to the Foundation Administrator.