

## **World Englishes from a Citation Index Perspective**

Beril T. Arik

*Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA*

Engin Arik

*Dogus University, Turkey, Istanbul 34722 Turkey*

### **Abstract**

This study investigated the bibliometric characteristics of publications on World Englishes (WE) covered in the Social Sciences Citation Index and the Arts & Humanities Citation Index of the Web of Science (WoS) between 1975 and 2013. We found that there were 153 publications including 86 articles and 52 book reviews. WE was mentioned for the first time in 1989, but 96.07% of publications on WE in WoS were published between 2005 and 2013, suggesting a rapid increase in interest on the topic in recent years. The top three research areas of WE publications were *linguistics*, *education and educational research*, and *literature*. Out of 153, 129 of the publications (84.31%) had a single author. The top five journals covering WE publications were *World Englishes* (35.94%), *TESOL Quarterly* (7.84%), *English World Wide* (7.18%), *Anglia* (3.92%), and *Journal of Sociolinguistics* (3.26%). Publications came from a range of countries including the USA, England, China, Australia, Singapore, Germany, and Brunei. A WE publication cited 33.84 publications and received 3.71 citations on average, but 90 publications (58.82%) did not receive any citations. B. B. Kachru was the most frequently cited author (190 times) followed by Jenkins (99 times) and Seidlhofer (81 times). We predict the number of WE publications will continue to increase in WoS.

*Keywords:* Bibliometric analysis, World Englishes, Social Science Citation Index, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, Applied linguistics

### **Introduction**

“Publish or perish” is perhaps one of the most prominent mottos of present day academia. An equally important motto can be “publish, get indexed, and get cited.” Citation indices therefore provide comprehensive coverage and storage of scientific publications from a single field to all fields of academic disciplines. Publications, especially in prominent citation indices, and number of citations received become a very important factor in job hunting for new graduates, for those seeking tenure, and in applications for (inter)national grants (see Lawrence, 2002, 2003, 2008 for a critique; Owens, 2013; Reich,

2013). Web of Science (WoS) is perhaps the most comprehensive and reliable index to provide bibliometric information about timely published journals. Those journals have referee systems with higher impact factors than those outside of WoS coverage (e.g., Russ-Eft, 2008). World Englishes (WE) is a relatively young field of inquiry and has been burgeoning since the 1990s. One of the purposes of the current study is to investigate some of the general trends in the field of WE based on bibliometric data—more specifically, the information WoS indices provide. Although WoS indices do not include all the publications related to WE, they include publications that have high quality and visibility.

Another advantage of indices such as the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) and the Arts & Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI) of WoS, is the increased availability of bibliometric data that comes with them. This makes bibliometric analysis especially appealing for researchers who are interested in disciplinary trends and scholars who wish to publish in WoS journals alike. While bibliometric analysis allows researchers to see, reflect on and, if seen as necessary, change the trends in a field, it also provides a synthesis and/or summary of increased amounts of information for decision makers. Bibliometric analysis is especially informative for new members of the community who might be less experienced about the practices of their disciplines. Last but not least, this kind of meta-analysis makes comparison with other disciplines and between different time periods within the discipline possible.

The present study is the first to investigate bibliometric indicators of WE in WoS. Research has shown that bibliometric studies are very relevant to the social sciences and humanities, including language-related fields; one such piece of evidence was by Nederhof et al. (1989), who investigated scientific publications from the fields of social history, general linguistics, general literature, Dutch literature and Dutch language, experimental psychology, anthropology, and public administration, showing their importance as indices for the social sciences and humanities. Another study (Nederhof & Noyons, 1992) was conducted on publications and citations in general linguistics and general literature in A&HCI from a set of linguistics departments in the Netherlands, Italy, and the USA. Results of this study showed that bibliometric indicators are reliable to assess the research performance of linguistics departments.

Some previous studies focused only on (general) linguistics. Nederhof (2011) examined language and linguistics research outputs and found that there were two types: Language and Linguistics publications and Literature publications, the latter of which give more importance to publications targeting the general public. He also suggested that both journal articles and books should be considered when analyzing the bibliometric characteristics of these fields. Another study (Arik, 2015) investigated bibliometric characteristics of linguistics in SSCI between 1900 and 2013 and A&HCI between 1975 and 2013. The authors found that there was an increase in the

number of linguistic publications in parallel to the expansion of WoS coverage. They also found that linguistics is a prominent research area in both indices. As for the *Language Linguistics* category of WoS, linguistics was ranked about no. 63 in SSCI and no. 9 in A&HCI, whereas as the *Linguistics* research area of WoS, it was ranked about no. 22 in SSCI and no. 8 in A&HCI.

Some previous studies have focused on specific disciplines in language sciences. Radev, Joseph, Gibson and Muthukrishnan (2009) analyzed the bibliometric characteristics of the field of computational linguistics in publications by the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL). Within their analysis, they provided citation patterns such as the networks of paper citations, author citations, and author collaborations. Another study (Arik, 2014) investigated scientific publications on sign languages in SSCI between 1900 and 2013 and A&HCI between 1975 and 2013, and showed that there were 2,460 scientific publications, with the earliest appearing in 1902. Nevertheless, 86.26% of the publications on sign languages appeared in WoS very recently, between 1990 and 2013.

Some other studies investigated the characteristics of publications in journals in language and linguistics. For example, Egbert (2007) discussed the relevance of common journal quality factors such as citation patterns, rejection rates, timely publication, and accessibility, focusing on the fields of *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)* and *Applied Linguistics*. She then invited about 300 of the *TESOL* members to participate in a survey about journal quality measures in *TESOL* and *Applied Linguistics*. Only 31 people responded. Results showed that, surprisingly, when it came to their journal preference, participants considered “relevance to context” (21 mentions) followed by review process (8 mentions) and quality of articles (5 mentions), rather than bibliometrics (such as citation frequency; only 2 mentions) to be more important deciding factors.

Another study (Meara, 2014) investigated the bibliometric characteristics of 201 articles on vocabulary acquisition published in *the Modern Language Journal* between 1916 and 2010 (see also Meara, 2012). He focused on citation patterns in these articles to identify some historical tendencies in the field of vocabulary acquisition. On the basis of the findings from the citation maps, he argued that this research area could be divided into four periods: reliable word lists for modern language teaching (1916-1950), cognitive psychological and sociolinguistic approaches to vocabulary acquisition (1951-1980), start of modern research focusing mostly on reading research (1981-2000), and a new approach influenced by Paul Nation’s work (2001-2010).

Following these works in closely related fields, the main goal of the present study is to report some of the bibliometric measures regarding WE as represented in WoS. In order to find out some general trends we examined publications related to WE that were published in SSCI and A&HCI between 1975 and 2013 for two reasons: 1) A&HCI covers publications from 1975 to present; and 2) there are no publications on WE before 1975 in SSCI. More

specifically, we examined the *number of publications* over the years, *authors*, *journals*, and *universities* that publish WE publications, and *research areas* and *WoS categories* that include WE publications. In addition, we looked at the *languages* and *countries* of WE publications in SSCI and A&HCI. Finally we investigated some of the *citation patterns* in WE publications indexed in WoS.

## **Methods**

In order to present a bibliometric analysis of WE as represented in WoS—more specifically in SSCI and A&HCI—we applied the following procedure. SSCI covers publications since 1900, whereas A&HCI covers publications since 1975. We accessed WoS at <http://apps.webofknowledge.com/> through an R1 university library in the US on April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2014, and searched for articles using the keyword “World Englishes”. In this way, we accessed scientific publications that had “World Englishes” not only in their titles, but also in their abstracts and keywords. There were no results for the time period before 1975; therefore, we set the time interval between 1975 and 2013. 2014 was excluded because the records were not complete at the time of our data collection. In order to further examine the change in the number of publications over the years, we repeated the same search over eight five-year periods: 1975-1979, 1980-1984, 1985-1989, 1990-1994, 1995-1999, 2000-2004, 2005-2009, and 2010-2013. After compiling a list of WoS publications about WE, we analyzed the data for *number of publications*, *WoS categories*, *research areas*, *authors*, *journals*, *conferences*, *universities*, *document types*, *languages*, and *countries/territories*. In addition, we investigated the *citation patterns* that emerged from the data. For these, we exported the data to Excel, including all information available in the WoS database, selected cited references, and finally received citations for each publication before analysis. We report our findings below.

## **Results**

### ***Number of Publications***

We found that “World Englishes” was used as topic in 153 publications in SSCI and A&HCI within the time period we investigated (1975-2013). The distribution of these publications by five-year periods is given below. Table 1 shows that world Englishes was mentioned for the first time in a WoS indexed publication in 1989. This article, by Bader (1989), was a book review on *Discourse across cultures: Strategies in World Englishes (1987)*, which was published in the *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching (IRAL)*, followed by only a few publications published between the years 1995 and 2004. We observed an exponential increase in the number of publications that focused on WE between 2005-2009 and 2010-2013. In these

time periods, 55 and 92 publications respectively appeared in SSCI and A&HCI. This rapid increase in WE publications can be explained by the fact that flagship WE publications such as *World Englishes* joined WoS in the second half of the 2000s (See Table 6).

Table 1  
*Number of WE publications in WoS over the years*

Year	Number of Publications	Percentage
1975-1979	0	0
1980-1984	0	0
1985-1989	1	.65
1990-1994	0	0
1995-1999	1	.65
2000-2004	4	2.61
2005-2009	55	35.94
2010-2013	92	60.13
SUM	153	100

### WoS Categories

WoS categorizes scientific publications under a limited number of categories such as *linguistics*, *history*, *sociology*, *educational research*, etc. The distribution of the publications in the dataset according to WoS categories is given in Table 2.

Table 2  
*Distribution of WE publications according to WoS categories*

WoS Categories	Number of Publications
Linguistics	128
Language Linguistics	108
Education Educational Research	30
Literature	14
Sociology	4
Communication	2
Cultural Studies	2
Humanities Multidisciplinary	2

Since the publications could be cross-listed under more than one category, the sum of the publications in the table below exceeded the number of

publications in our list. The distribution of publications according to WoS categories displayed an overwhelming preference for *linguistic studies*, with 236 publications in this category. Other frequent categorizations for WE publications in WoS were *literature* (14) and *educational research* (30). According to these findings, WE publications from communication, sociology, or cultural studies perspectives were almost negligible.

### ***Research Areas***

A bibliometric measure closely related to WoS categories is *research areas*. In our query, we looked at research areas that produced at least five WE-related publications. The results are given in Table 3. Note that the publications could be cross-listed under more than one research area. Parallel to the results regarding WoS categories above, the top three research areas were *linguistics* (138), *education and educational research* (30), and *literature* (14). In accordance with the results of WoS categories, analysis of the research areas showed that the WE framework has influenced and has been influenced by three primary disciplines: linguistics, education, and, to a lesser degree, literature.

Table 3  
*Research areas for WE publications in WoS*

Research Areas	Number of Publications
Linguistics	138
Education Educational Research	30
Literature	14

### ***Authors***

Out of 153 publications in the data set, 129 (84.31%) had a single author. One publication (Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur 2011) had the highest number of authors, (4 authors) (Table 4). The author/publication ratio was 1.18 on average: 1.25 for articles; 1 for book reviews; 1.4 for editorial material; and 1.6 for review articles. Note that one document was also considered as *Correction*; therefore, we omitted it here.

Table 4

*Author/publication ratio according to the document types*

Document type	Number of publications	Author/publication
Article	85	1.25
Book review	52	1
Editorial material	10	1.4
Review article	5	1.6
	152 (TOTAL)	1.18 (AVERAGE)

When we looked at the top 10 authors that made WE publications in our dataset from WoS, we found that the most prolific WE authors in WoS were: Deterding with seven publications, Collins with five publications, Bolton and Seargeant with four publications each, followed by Gorlach, Jenkins, Braj Kachru, Yamuna Kachru, Aya Matsuda, Paul Matsuda, Phillipson, and Wee with three publications each (Table 5). Note that all of Deterding's publications were book reviews.

Table 5

*The most prolific authors who publish WE publications*

Rank	Author	Number of Publications
1	D. Deterding	7
2	P. Collins	5
3	K. Bolton	4
3	P. Seargeant	4
5	M. Gorlach	3
5	J. Jenkins	3
5	B. B. Kachru	3
5	Y. Kachru	3
5	A. Matsuda	3
5	P. K. Matsuda	3
5	R. Phillipson	3
5	L. Wee	3

## Journals

We also examined the journals listed in SSCI and A&HCI that covered the WE publications in our dataset. We chose journals that had at least three publications about WE given in Table 6 below. Not surprisingly, around one third of the publications in our list were from the journal *World Englishes* (55). This journal was followed by *TESOL Quarterly* with 12 publications, *English World Wide* with 11, *Anglia Zeitschrift fur Englische Philologie* with

six, and *Journal of Sociolinguistics* with five publications. *Applied Linguistics*, *Language and Education*, and *System* with 3 WE publications between 1975 and 2013. Table 6 provides a list of these journals and information about their publishers and impact factors according to the Journal Citation Reports 2012 via WoS <http://apps.webofknowledge.com/>, accessed through Purdue University Libraries.

Table 6  
*Journals that publish WE publications*

Journals	In WoS since	Number of Publications	Percentage	Publisher	Issue/Year (2013)	Impact factor (JCR 2012)
World Englishes	2008	55	35.94	Wiley	4	.333
TESOL Quarterly	1967	12	7.84	Wiley	4	.792
English World Wide	2009	11	7.18	John Benjamins	3	.682
Anglia Zeitschrift fur Englische Philologie	1975	6	3.92	de Gruyter	4	ns
Journal of Sociolinguistics	2003	5	3.26	Wiley	4	1.087
Applied Linguistics	1981	3	1.96	Oxford U. Press	5	1.50
Language and Education	2008	3	1.96	Routledge	6	.55
System	1982	3	1.96	Elsevier	4	.69

### Conferences

Since conferences and conference publications are as important as journals for being potential venues for WE scholars, we examined the conferences that published WE publications in their proceedings listed in WoS. The conference titles listed on the WoS website were *the International Conference on World Englishes*, *the Annual Meeting of the International Association for World Englishes* and *the Symposium on Intelligibility and Cross Cultural Communication in World Englishes*.

### Universities

We also examined the affiliations of scholars with WE publications. Our findings showed that the top universities were City University of Hong Kong,



University of Illinois, and Nanyang Technological University with nine, seven, and six publications, respectively.

Table 7  
*The affiliations of the scholars who published WE publications*

Ranking	Universities	Country	# of Publications
1	City University of Hong Kong	PRC-Hong Kong	9
2	University Illinois	USA	7
3	Nanyang Technological University	Singapore	6
4	National University Singapore	Singapore	5
4	University Brunei Darussalam	Brunei	5
4	University New South Wales	Australia	5
7	Open University	UK	4
8	Arizona State University	USA	3
8	Copenhagen Business School	Denmark	3
8	North West University	USA	3

### Document Types

Of the 153 publications in our dataset, we found that 85 were articles, 52 were book reviews, 10 were editorial materials, 10 were proceedings papers, five were reviews, and one was a correction (Table 8). The results showed that around half of the publications were articles and approximately one third of the publications were book reviews. In other words, the most common types of publications related to WE were articles and book reviews.

Table 8  
*Document types for WE publications*

Document Type	Number of publications	Percentages
Article	85	55.56
Book review	52	33.99
Editorial material	10	6.54
Proceeding paper	10	6.54
Review	5	3.27

### Languages and Countries

When we looked at the languages of the WoS publications in our list, we found that with the exception of one article, which was in Spanish, all of the WE publications were published in English (152). In addition to the languages

of the publications we also examined their countries of origin. Not surprisingly, the USA was the leading country with 38 publications. It was followed by England (17), China (14), Australia (12), Singapore (11), Germany (8), and Brunei (6) (Table 9). The results illustrated that almost half of the publications came from inner and outer circle countries according to Kachru's (1985) model, while the other half originated from expanding circle countries like China. Below are the countries that contributed more than 5 publications to the list.

Table 9  
Countries publishing WE publications

Country	Number of Publications
USA	38
England	17
China	14
Australia	12
Singapore	11
Germany	8
Brunei	6

### Citation patterns

We also analyzed the data to investigate to what extent the WE publications covered in WoS were cited by other publications by looking at the "total times cited in" section in the WoS databases. Of the 153 scientific publications, 90 (58.82%) did not receive any outside citation. The publications that received the two highest citation counts were a 106 times cited article by Pennycook (2003) and a 93 times cited review article by Jenkins (2006). The average number of citations each publication received was 3.71. If we omit those two highly cited publications, the average number of citations would be 2.44. Furthermore, we analyzed the data to investigate to what extent the WE publications in WoS cited other publications. We found that the average number of cited references was 33.84. The top 2 publications giving the most references were review articles - Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey (2011) and Bhatt (2001) - which both cited 170 publications.

Since these citation patterns fluctuated greatly depending on the document type, we analyzed the data accordingly (Table 10). We found that for articles, the average number of received citations (4.51) dropped to 3.30 when we excluded the highest cited article, Pennycook (2003). In addition, the average number of cited references (47.90) dropped to 47 when we excluded the outlier, Kachru and Smith (2009), which referenced 124 publications. We also found that book reviews did not receive any citations with the exception of Todd (2008), which was cited once; conversely, book reviews cited 4.65

publications on average, or 4.23 publications when we excluded the outlier Sandhu (2013), which cited 26 publications. An examination of the citation patterns in editorial materials showed that they received 3.7 citations on average. If we excluded Matsuda (2003), which was cited 14 times, editorial material would have received 2.55 citations on average. The data also showed that review articles received 29.2 citations on average. Yet, excluding Jenkins (2006), which received the highest number of citations (93), this number dropped to 13.25. The review articles referenced 118.8 publications on average. If we excluded the review article which cited the least number of references, Banerjee (2008) with 6, the number increases to 147 publications cited on average.

Table 10

*Received citations according to document types (except one Correction)*

Document types	Number of publications	Author/ publication	Average			
			Received citation	Received citation except outlier(s)	Cited references	Cited references except outlier(s)
Article	85	1.25	4.51	3.30	47.90	47
Book review	52	1	.01	0	4.65	4.23
Editorial material	10	1.4	3.7	2.55	26.9	17.22
Review article	5	1.6	29.2	13.25	118.8	147
TOTAL	152	1.18	3.71	2.44	33.84	32.03

When we examined the number of citations in the 153 WE publications, we found that B. B. Kachru was the most frequently cited author (190 times), followed by Jenkins (99 times) and Seidlhofer (81 times) (Table 11).

We then examined the scientific publications most frequently cited in the publications covered by WoS (Table 12). Closer examination of the data revealed that there were 22 publications cited 10 or more times. Among them, the most frequently cited were Kachru (1992) (26 times), Kachru (1985) (24 times), and Jenkins (2000) (20 times). Among the 22 publications were 14 books, seven articles, and one book chapter. Note that in this analysis we considered each publication with a single date and edition. For example, we considered Crystal (1997) and Crystal (2003) as two different publications, even though they were different editions of the same book. The same was true with Jenkins (2003, 2006, 2009) and Kachru (1982, 1985, 1992). Moreover, Seidlhofer (2001) appeared as Seidlhofer (2003) in WoS even though the publications cited it as Seidlhofer (2001). The reason for this could be that the issue in which Seidlhofer (2001) was published appeared in 2003 in WoS.

Table 11

*The most frequently cited authors in the references*

Rank	Author	Number of Citations
1	B. B. Kachru	190
2	Jenkins	99
3	Seidlhofer	81
4	Smith	58
5	Pennycook	52
6	Bolton	44
7	Kirkpatrick	42
8	Canagarajah	41
9	Y. Kachru	32
10	Graddol	28
10	Mestherie	28

Table 12

*The publications cited 10 or more times in the scientific publications covered by WoS*

Rank	Author	Year	Times Cited	Type
1	Kachru	1992	26	Book
2	Kachru	1985	24	Book chapter
3	Jenkins	2000	20	Book
4	Jenkins	2006	18	Article
5	Kachru	1986	16	Book
6	Seidlhofer	2004	15	Article
7	Mesthrie and Bhatt	2008	14	Book
7	Seidlhofer	2003*	14	Article
9	Graddol	2006	13	Book
9	Jenkins	2003	13	Book
9	Jenkins	2007	13	Book
9	Kirkpatrick	2007	13	Book
9	Phillipson	1992	13	Book
9	Schneider	2007	13	Book
15	Crystal	1997	12	Book
16	Kachru	2005	11	Book
17	Seidlhofer, Breiteneder and Pitzl	2006	10	Article
17	Widdowson	1994	10	Article
17	Smith and Nelson	1985	10	Article
17	Platt, Weber and Lian	1984	10	Book
17	McKay	2002	10	Book
17	Bamgbose	1998	10	Article

We also expanded our examination to the number of publications that were cited 5 or more times in the publications covered by WoS, finding a total number of 59 publications. Of them, 32 were books, six were book chapters, and 21 were articles (Table 13).

Table 13  
*Document types of the WE publications cited 5 or more times*

Document type	Number	Percentage
Book	32	54.24
Article	21	35.59
Book chapter	6	10.17
Total	59	100

In addition to the bibliometric data in SSCI and A&HCI indices, we also investigated the conference proceedings citation index for social sciences and humanities (CPCI-SSH), finding 20 proceedings related to WE. Four of the 20 proceedings received no citations by a WoS publication. The top 3 most frequently cited conference proceedings were Jenkins' (2009) *English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes* (cited 16 times); B. B. Kachru's (1997) *World Englishes 2000: Resources for Research and teaching*, (cited 14 times), and Seidlhofer's (2009) *Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as lingua franca* (cited 12 times). The 20 proceeding papers were cited 103 times in total. For the conference proceedings, the average citation per item was 5.15.

When we examined the Book Citation Index for Social Sciences and Humanities in WoS, we found that there were 43 books about WE between 1975-2013. These 43 books were cited 208 times, but of the 43, 29 received no citations. Average citations per item in the case of books were 4.84. The top three books in terms of number of citations received were: *World Englishes: The Study of New Linguistic Varieties* by Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008) (74 citations); Johnson's (2009) *Second Language Teacher Education: A sociocultural perspective* (60 citations); and Kachru and Smith's (2008) *Cultures, Contexts, and World Englishes* (21 citations).

## **Discussion and Conclusion**

In this study, we investigated WE publications as indexed in SSCI and A&HCI. Considering the beginnings of WE in the 1980s, it is rather surprising that the number of WE publications in WoS did not increase until 2005 (with 96.07% of publications on WE in WoS being published between 2005 and

2013). This presumably suggests an increasing interest in WE in very recent years. Looking at the trend indicated by our data, it is reasonable to expect an increase in the number of WE publications in the near future.

Our findings showed that most WE publications can be categorized as linguistic, educational research, or literature publications, with an overwhelming influence of linguistics. A more evenly distributed contribution from disciplines other than linguistics might be more preferable since greater multidisciplinary may be more fruitful for WE. According to our findings, the WE publications from communication, sociology, or cultural studies perspectives were almost negligible. However, we predict that WE will have more of an influence in these fields in the future.

The very recent increase in the number of WE publications is not only related to the emergence of WE as a relatively new field, but also a result of the expansion of WoS coverage. (Masked reference a) showed that SSCI, but not A&HCI, have gradually increased over the years, especially from 2005 onwards. It is worth noting, however, that linguistics coverage in general has also expanded in both SSCI and A&HCI, including the journal *World Englishes*, which has published more than one third of all WE publications in SSCI since 2008.

The number of publications about WE is still limited (153) compared to other fields such as linguistics or sign languages. For example, (masked reference a) showed that in the Linguistics research area, SSCI covered a total of 109,469 publications while A&HCI covered a total of 193,619 publications between 1900 and 2013. Additionally, (masked reference b) found that SSCI and A&HCI covered 2,460 scientific publications on sign languages between 1900 and 2013; Comparatively, WE publications seem very scarce in number.

Our research also illustrated some of the most prolific WE scholars (such as Deterding and Collins) and universities (the City University of Hong Kong and the University of Illinois). In addition, we uncovered some of the most WE-friendly publication venues for WE scholars (journals such as *World Englishes* and *TESOL Quarterly*). The WE publications in WoS seem to be predominantly written in English and from inner and outer circle countries according to Kachru's (1985) model.

We found that the most common types of WE publications in WoS were research articles and book reviews, and were most of the time written by a single author. Compared to natural science publications, publications in the humanities tend to have fewer authors (Sula, 2012), and WE is not an exceptional case. Sula (2012) suggested that when analyzing authorship patterns in the humanities, acknowledgment sections of publications could also be considered, because many authors acknowledge colleagues that may have contributed to their work to some extent. Following this suggestion, future research may take acknowledgments into account when investigating scholar networks in WE.

We also found that publications which were cited 10 or more times included 14 books, seven articles, and one book chapter. These citation

patterns have been already observed in the social sciences and humanities (e.g., Hellqvist, 2010; Larivière, Archambault, Gingras & Vignola-Gagné, 2006; Linmans, 2010; Nederhof, 2006; Nederhof, van Leeuwen & van Raan, 2010), suggesting that an analysis of citation patterns in WE publications should cover books and book chapters in addition to journal articles.

We hope our bibliometric analysis can be useful for WE researchers, teachers, and students alike. However, it might be wise to not make hasty generalizations based on these findings alone, since our study only focused on WoS publications. This is a common limitation of bibliometric studies in the social sciences and humanities (e.g., Archambault & Larivière, 2010). For example, Georgas and Cullars (2005) analyzed citation patterns in linguistics publications indexed in Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA) of ProQuest and found that they were similar to those in social sciences or humanities or natural sciences. Therefore, analyzing WE publications covered in LLBA might shed further light on the bibliometric characteristics of WE.

The past and present of the WE field can also be further examined by closely investigating the specific journals that frequently publish WE studies (such as *World Englishes*, *TESOL Quarterly*, and *English World Wide*) as well as the authors that most frequently publish WE studies and are frequently cited (such as B. B. Kachru, Jenkins, and Seidlhofer, among others). Another potential venue for investigation is to look at future trends in WE publications over time. For example, it would be interesting to examine if WE publications could move from one research area or WoS category to another, if countries other than the USA might take the lead in publication, if publications appear in languages other than English, or if more journals publish WE studies to overcome *the language barrier* (van Leeuwen, 2013).

## References

- Archambault, É., & Larivière, V. (2010). The limits of bibliometrics for the analysis of the social sciences and humanities literature. *World Social Science Report* 2010, 251-254. Available at: [unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001883/188333e.pdf](http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001883/188333e.pdf)
- Arik, E. (2014). Sign language research in Web of Science. *Journal of Scientometric Research*, 3(3), 143-149. DOI: 10.4103/2320-0057.153583
- Arik, E. (2015). A bibliometric analysis of linguistics in Web of Science. *Journal of Scientometric Research*, 4(1), 20-28. DOI: 10.4103/2320-0057.156018
- Bader, Y. (1989). Discourse across cultures - Strategies in World Englishes - . *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 27(3), 255-256. DOI: 10.1515/iral.1989.27.3.253
- Bamgbose, A. (1998). Torn between the norms: innovations in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 17(1), 1-14. DOI:10.1111/1467-971X.00078.

- Banerjee, S. (2008). Dialects, world Englishes and education: Understanding literacy from a global perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(1), 149–155. DOI: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00217.x
- Bhatt, R. M. (2001). World Englishes. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30, 527-550. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.527
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57(4), 586–619.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Egbert, J. (2007). Quality analysis of journals in TESOL and Applied Linguistics. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(1), 157-171. DOI: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00044.x
- Georgas, H., & Cullars, J. (2005). A citation study of the characteristics of the linguistics literature. *College & Research Libraries*, 66(6), 496-515.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English Next: Why global English may mean the end of English as a foreign language*. London, UK: British Council.
- Hellqvist, B. (2010). Referencing in the Humanities and its implications for citation analysis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 61(2), 310-318. DOI:10.1002/asi.21256
- Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). OPINION: Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach. *College English*, 73(3), 303-321.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2003/2006/2009). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 157–181. DOI: 10.2307/40264515
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: attitude and identity*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 200–207. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01582.x
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching* 44, 281-315. DOI: 10.1017/S0261444811000115
- Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk, H. G. Widdowson, & Y. Cantù (eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press,



- Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1982/1985/1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1997). *World Englishes 2000: Resources for research and teaching*. In L. E. Smith, & M. L. Forman (eds.), *World Englishes 2000*. Honolulu: Univ Hawaii Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the canon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kachru, Y., & Smith, L. E. (2008). *Cultures, contexts, and World Englishes*. London: Routledge.
- Kachru, Y., & Smith, L. E. (2009). The Karmic cycle of world Englishes: some futuristic constructs. *World Englishes* 28(1), 1-14.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Larivière, V., Archambault, É., Gingras, Y., & Vignola-Gagné, É. (2006). The place of serials in referencing practices: Comparing natural sciences and engineering with social sciences and humanities. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 57(8), 997-1004. DOI: 10.1002/asi.20349
- Lawrence, P. A. (2002). Rank injustice. *Nature* 415, 835–836. DOI:10.1038/415835a
- Lawrence, P. A. (2003). The politics of publication. *Nature* 422, 259–261. DOI:10.1038/422259a
- Lawrence, P. A. (2008). Lost in publication: how measurement harms science? *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*, 8, 9-11. DOI:10.3354/esep00079
- Linmans, A. J. M. (2010). Why with bibliometrics the Humanities does not need to be the weakest link Indicators for research evaluation based on citations, library holdings, and productivity measures. *Scientometrics*, 83(2), 337–354. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-009-0088-9
- Meara, P. M. (2012). The bibliometrics of vocabulary acquisition: An exploratory study. *RELC Journal*, 43(1), 7–22. DOI:10.1177/0033688212439339
- Meara, P. M. (2014). Vocabulary research in The Modern Language Journal: A bibliometric analysis. *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*. Epub ahead of print. DOI: 10.7820/vli.v03.1.meara
- Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 719-729.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: An introduction to the role of English as an international language and its implications for language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Mesthrie, R., & Bhatt, R. M. (2008). *World Englishes The study of new linguistic varieties*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Nederhof, A. J. (2006). Bibliometric monitoring of research performance in the Social Sciences and the Humanities: A review. *Scientometrics*, 66(1), 81–100. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-006-0007-2
- Nederhof, A. J. (2011). A bibliometric study of productivity and impact of modern language and literature research. *Research Evaluation*, 20(2), 117-129. DOI:10.3152/095820211X1294137187650
- Nederhof, A. J., van Leeuwen, T. N., & van Raan, A. F. J. (2010). Highly cited non-journal publications in political science, economics and psychology: a first exploration. *Scientometrics*, 83(2), 363-374. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-009-0086-y
- Nederhof, A. J., & Noyons, E. C. M. (1992). International comparison of departments' research performance in the humanities. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 43(3), 249-256. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199204)43:3<249::AID-ASI7>3.0.CO;2-I
- Nederhof, A. J., Zwaan, R. A., De Bruin, R., & Dekker, P. J. (1989). Assessing the USAefulness of bibliometric indicators for the humanities and the social and behavioural sciences: A comparative study. *Scientometrics*, 15(5-6), 423-435. DOI: 10.1007/BF02017063
- Owens, B. (2013). Research assessments: Judgment day. *Nature* 502, 288-290.
- Pennycook, A. (2003). Global Englishes, rip slyme, and performativity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 513–533. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00240.x
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Platt, J. T., Weber, H., & Lian, H. M. (1984). *The new Englishes*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Radev, D. R., Joseph, M. T., Gibson, B., & Muthukrishnan, P. (2009). A bibliometric and network analysis of the field of computational linguistics. Available at: [clair.si.umich.edu/~radev/papers/133.pdf](http://clair.si.umich.edu/~radev/papers/133.pdf) (accessed 1 April 2014).
- Reich, E. S. (2013). Science publishing: The golden club. *Nature* 502, 291-293. DOI:10.1038/502291a
- Russ-Eft, D. (2008). SSCI, ISI, JCR, JIF, IF, and journal quality. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 19(3), 185-189. DOI: 10.1002/hrdq.1235
- Sandhu, P. (2013). Intelligibility in world Englishes. Theory and application. *Journal of Language Identity and Education*, 12(2), 155-159. DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2013.775888
- Schneider, E. W. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties Around the World*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing A conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a Lingua Franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 133–158. DOI:10.1111/1473-4192.00011

- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209–239. DOI:10.1017/S0267190504000145
- Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 236–245. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01592.x
- Seidlhofer, B., Breiteneder, A., & Pitzl, M. L. (2006). English as a Lingua Franca in Europe: Challenges for applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 3–34. DOI:10.1017/S026719050600002X
- Smith, L. E. (1987). *Discourse across cultures: strategies in world Englishes*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Smith, L. E., & Nelson, C. L. (1985). International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes*, 4(3), 333–342. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-971X.1985.tb00423.x
- Sula, C. A. (2012). Visualizing social connections in the humanities: Beyond bibliometrics. *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 38(4), 31-35. Available at: [www.asis.org/Bulletin/Apr-12/AprMay12\\_Sula.html](http://www.asis.org/Bulletin/Apr-12/AprMay12_Sula.html)
- Todd, L. (2008). The handbook of World Englishes. *Journal of Linguistics*, 44(1), 248-253. DOI: 10.1017/S002222670700504X
- van Leeuwen, T. (2013). Bibliometric research evaluations, Web of Science and the Social Sciences and Humanities: a problematic relationship? *Bibliometrie-Praxis und Forschung*, 2(8), 1-18. Available at: [www.bibliometrie-pf.de/article/view/173](http://www.bibliometrie-pf.de/article/view/173)
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377–389. DOI:10.2307/3587438

### Note on Contributors

Beril T. Arik is a PhD candidate in the Second Language Studies/English as a Second Language program at Purdue University. She has an MA from the same program. Currently she is working on her dissertation, which explores the interactions between identity and literacy practices in the graduate school context. She is interested in ecological approaches to second language acquisition and second language writing. Email: [btezelle@purdue.edu](mailto:btezelle@purdue.edu)

Engin Arik has a PhD in Linguistics from Purdue University. He is currently assistant professor of psychology at Dogus University. He is interested in language typology, including sign and spoken languages, expressions of space-time, bibliometrics of social sciences, and current issues in higher education. E-mail: [enginarik@enginarik.com](mailto:enginarik@enginarik.com)