

# A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION IMPACT: PROFESSIONALISM or NOT – A CRITICAL TWENTY-FIVE YEAR REVIEW

By: John Bolton, MA, MLS

## Introduction:

During the late 1980's and into the early 1990's, the field of activity known as Records Management, later to become Records and Information Management or RIM, experienced a debate concerning whether or not RIM was, or could be at some later time a "profession," similar to that of groups such as doctors, engineers or lawyers. This debate manifested itself in the literature of the time by asking and responding to some question along the lines of: "Is RIM a Profession?" That literature defined the term "professional," outlined what fundamental requirements were necessary to qualify a field of study as professional, and did as well try to identify where records management was, at that point in history, along the road to achieving the status of being a true profession (see Pemberton and Pendergraft, 1990). Moreover, from that literature a reader could be lead to believe that RIM, if not exactly a profession at that point in time, was at least close to reaching that goal. Plus, while no firm timeline for the goal was stated, that literature talked vaguely in terms of years or a few decades for the goal to be achieved.

An example of how significant the term "professional" had become by the late 1980's period can be seen by examining the January, 1988 issue of the *Records Management Quarterly* published by the Association of Records Managers and Administrators (ARMA International or ARMA). That particular volume issue contained the "Cumulative Index to the Records Management Quarterly 1967-1987," which included a listing of all their published articles by subject matter. On examination, while there was no specific subject heading for the term "Professionalism," the index did reference thirty articles under the term "Professional Organizations," as well as, forty-one articles under the "see also" subject term "Information Professions." At first glance these numbers may not seem significant however, to counter them the very important records management subject terms of "Disposition" referenced only nine articles, while the term "Vital Records Management" referenced only twenty-four articles.

This example is not offered as overwhelming proof that the records management world at that time was deeply embroiled in some identity struggle, but rather as just a simple mechanism to point at where some of the "thinking" was during that period. Pemberton (1993) said that a discipline was a field of study and a profession was something elevated by society. So, given a duration of over twenty-five years has passed since the late 1980's, the question is, "Did it happen?" Did RIM move forward? Did records management or RIM, reach the lofty goal of a true "profession?" One that is equal in public recognition, with that of an engineer or physician. This paper offers an attempt at addressing these questions through an in depth examination of information content published by ARMA.

## **Background:**

During that late 1980's the author both joined the ARMA International organization, and became interested in the topic of whether or not RIM could reach the goal of a true profession. At that time, the author worked for a civil engineering company as their Librarian/Records Manager. While in that position the company bid on a large and complex engineering opportunity. That opportunity was to require adherence to the ISO 2000 Quality Control standards which were very specific concerning documentation, its capture, control and maintenance. In bidding for that work, the company applied for some insurance, and added the author's name and qualifications (a Master's degree in Library and Information Studies, plus partial completion of the CRM designation requirements), along with various kinds of engineers, as the professionals who would carry out all the work related duties during the project. While all the engineers and the company accountant were accepted under the terms of the insurance underwriter, it was to the embarrassment and chagrin of the author that he was refused insurance because his education and CRM credentials did not qualify in what the insurance people considered to be a "professional." This factor was not the reason why the company did not win the project but it did cause the company to view their Librarian/Records Manager as "office" staff, rather than part of the organization's "professionals."

This bit of personal history is told to help "set the stage" so to speak. The author would believe that over his career he was a professional. That he conducted himself as a professional, and produced professional level work. Further, having achieved the CRM designation, and managed to have some of his work published, the author, like many of his RIM colleagues, had a deep interest in seeing his chosen field of endeavor attain that lofty goal of a true profession. The experience became a personal driver to try and help the RIM profession reach its goal. Thus, this personal experience forms some of the background to why this work was undertaken.

Beyond that personal story, there were four other drivers behind this paper. Or, said differently, there were four questions that the author felt were unanswered, and shouldn't be. These four questions are as follows.

**Question 1: Why would people working in RIM feel that the field of study should have a "peer-reviewed journal" for the publishing of scholarly works; but, that they would gain no particular benefit from the availability of such a professional journal?**

This question gains its origin from an ARMA International Education Foundation research survey (see Force and Shaffer, 2013). That survey asked ARMA members for their opinions concerning whether or not RIM should have a peer reviewed journal. While the survey found data to support the idea that a peer-reviewed journal should exist, it also found the disturbing news that those surveyed also felt that they would personally gain nothing from the existence of such a professional journal. These two findings appear to be at opposite ends of the pole, and pose more questions around why. This work is an attempt, to a degree, to take a kick at addressing the AIEF findings.

**Question 2: Why did a RIM audience seem shocked at the use of content analysis as an approach to analyzing published RIM materials? Or, stated differently, had the RIM audience ever been exposed to this level of professional media analysis, and if not, why?**

In April 2014, the author gave a presentation to a RIM (ARMA Vancouver Chapter) audience in Vancouver, British Columbia. That presentation was developed to speak to the topic of the “Information Landscape.” As part of the presentation a graphic was offered which the audience found interesting and to a certain extent shocking. The graphic identified some characteristics of shifting content type found in ARMA RIM publications. While the specific graphic does not bear on this work, the approach used in developing the graphic does. That approach was “content analysis,” a mechanism used in analyzing media. Since the Vancouver audience seemed taken aback by the graphic produced via content analysis, the author was left wondering why.

**Question 3: What has happened to RIM? Or, what was/is the status of RIM in its march towards reaching the goal of a profession?**

The third question concerns “time and status.” As stated above during the 1980’s and 1990’s, RIM experienced a discussion on the topic of whether or not the goal of “profession” was or could be achieved. Given that a period of a quarter of a century had passed one was left to wonder, what happened? If RIM achieved the goal, had there been some sort of announcement? And if we hadn’t made it; why not? Since the author believed he had been paying attention, no announcement came to mind. Thus, while the word “professional” was certainly being used in the RIM industry and literature, the author wondered if that community had been under some sort of false impression. This idea of a false impression was prickly to accept, so the outstanding question(s) needed to be answered.

**Question 4:** Given what the author understood and had experienced over twenty-five years, he was unsure about RIM’s status as a profession, and in fact, was of the impression that the boat not only hadn’t sailed, it had never really left the dock. **So, was the author right or wrong in this impression?**

Also as background to this work a need exists for an explanation about what the nature of a profession is, and how one gets that status. According to Greenwood (1966), certain elements are necessary to distinguish professionalization. These include: the development, presence and research for new **Systematic Theory**; a sense of **Autonomy**, i.e. only a doctor is trained to perform surgery; **Community Sanction**, i.e. doctors are recognized everywhere as being highly educated and dedicated to their Hippocratic Oath to provide healing to the sick; that a **Code of Ethics** exist which members adhere to, and which some “professional body” oversees, monitors and deals out penalties where breach of code is found; and last a **Culture** needs to exist, i.e. the body should have a language which it uses commonly, an approach to how it works, plus an attitude to how it operates and presents itself. Millerson (1964) felt that a profession could also be described by saying it was a **non-manual occupation**, had a **recognized occupational status**, had a **well defined area of study or concern**, **provided a definite service**, and came, to individuals, after **advanced training and education**. Here, for this work and for RIM people in general, this idea of an advanced training and education are key factors. Here is why.

Greenwood (1966) also suggested that, *“because understanding of theory is so important to professional skill, preparation for a profession must be an intellectual as well as practical experience.”* And he went on to say, *“orientation in theory can be achieved best through formal education in an academic setting.”* So from this we are led to understand that education to a higher degree level is basically a prerequisite for becoming a professional. But where is this “higher degree level” of education in our RIM world? Frankly, it basically does not exist. Clearly, undergraduate and graduate (Masters and in some cases Doctoral) level degrees do exist, but they are not in RIM. Rather those degrees are in Library Science (sometimes called Library and Information Science), Archival Studies, and degrees in Information Technology or Computer Sciences.

Berenika Webster (1999), wrote in the *ARMA Information Management Journal* that, *“Records Management is undergoing the process of professionalization by acquiring some of the (needed) characteristics, i.e. formal education to a degree level, existence and strengthening of professional organizations, foundation and development of professional literature, increased research activity supplying the discipline with new theoretical frameworks, and new knowledge to deal with issues of technological development.”* While Webster’s words made for good positive oriented reading and which could have lead a reader at the time to believe that movement towards professionalization was being made, things were happening and the goal of becoming a profession was within reach, the examples in support of her argument were actually weak. The existence and availability of formal advanced degree programs she mentioned did not really exist beyond a couple of remote examples (i.e. UK and Australia). Further, while she offered the existence of ARMA, as well as some other RIM oriented organizations those bodies weren’t in fact “strengthening.” For example, ARMA’s membership has not really increased over the last twenty-five years, and the Records Management Association of Australia (RMAA) joined with a smaller Southeast Asian group to help remain operational. There is no question that the body of RIM literature has increased, but where, regardless of the AIEF and its work, is the body of research activity supplying the discipline with its own distinct new theoretical frameworks that were mentioned? Plus, while it is agreed that new knowledge has come along to deal with issues of technological development, RIM was likely not the primary supplier of that knowledge. Therefore, where was this advancement, this process towards professionalization that Webster spoke of?

When Webster wrote her 1999 article she credited Dr. J. Michael Pemberton (with Lee O. Pendergraft, 1990) for his early work published by ARMA where he described what it took to be a profession as well as describing what RIM would need to accomplish to reach such a goal. But, in 1990, some nine years before Webster’s article was published, Pemberton spoke at the ARMA conference in San Francisco. At that time he, *“criticized RIM practitioners dislike of matters theoretical, and claimed that without theoretical foundations, there could be no meaningful research effort, and without research we have only hearsay, conjecture, anecdote, and possibly propaganda.”*

These questions, along with the author’s personal experiences and interests, formulated the background leading to the research outlined in this work. Ultimately, the reporting of the findings and conclusions from the research was conducted via a PowerPoint presentation by the author at the ARMA Canada conference, held in Calgary, Alberta, Tuesday, May 26, 2015, Session T-24 (see Bolton, 2015). That presentation to a group of ARMA Canada members raised an interest by some of those people in taking

some action that would bring about change. Specifically, their interest was aimed at improving the level of Canadian authorship and content through some mechanism. The mechanism subsequently formulated was to be a website, (to be) hosted by ARMA Canada, providing a place where future scholarly RIM oriented materials could be posited, cited and referenced by future users.

### **Methodology:**

The methodology applied in conducting the research discussed in this work had four components. These included a background search of relevant RIM literature, gathering data to support an investigation of the outstanding questions, analysis of the gathered data, and finally the identification and formulation of observations, findings and conclusions resulting from that analysis. The original reporting of those observations, findings and conclusions was, as mentioned above, conducted via a conference PowerPoint presentation leading eventually to this paper (see Bolton, 2015).

In reference to the author's conduct of the literature search it is important for the author to acknowledge that the review of literature was not exhaustive. And, for the purpose of the original 2015 Calgary conference presentation, the author conducted only sufficient literature search to provide evidence and credence to support the theme of his presentation. At the time, an exhaustive literature search was unwarranted since the work was not undertaken to be exhaustive and or scholarly in the sense of post graduate effort. Nevertheless, the author did use the Internet to conduct a search of any posted work, and searched the ARMA publications for anything of a relevant or similar nature. To that end, not much of a similar nature was found. Which, to a certain extent addresses one of the outstanding questions concerning why a Vancouver RIM audience seemed a bit shocked with the approach presented. The literature search seemed to support their being shocked because they were so unfamiliar with the idea and/or application of content analysis in their RIM world. Certainly it was not because that Vancouver audience was uneducated and/or unsophisticated. It appeared to be just something new to them. It probably seemed weird and highly unusual to them, although, their eyes did seem to get bigger as the findings were discussed.

**(NOTE:** During the literature search the author did discover a research paper by Nelson Edewor [2013], which was a content analysis of a Nigerian Library and Information Science Journal. An interesting and somewhat similar type of research work, although of a reduced level of complexity.)

As for the data gathering and analysis approach performed, the author relied on the use of "content analysis" which is a form of bibliometrics. According to Krippendorff (1989), Content Analysis is, "*a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their content.*" While Elo and Kyngas (2008), considered content analysis to be, "*an approach to distil words and communications into fewer content related categories or units.*" Basically the concept is that the content of a larger work or works can be understood by first identifying its make-up or components, and then recording details about those components. In a library situation this is somewhat like separating various works by subject matter, sciences from history, or fiction from reference materials. In this way the Librarian can conduct counts, recognize storage requirements, understand usage from circulation data, and possibly recognize

gaps in a particular collection. In this case, content analysis is used to dive deeper into understanding the nature of the ARMA publication offerings via examination of its published content.

The information content that was reviewed, captured and later analyzed came from the three RIM oriented publications that basic paid membership in the ARMA organization provides. These are: *The Records Management Quarterly (1988-1998)*, *The Information Management Journal (1999-2008)*, and the *Information Management Magazine (2009-2012)*. While ARMA has published other RIM oriented materials including such things as standards, books, guidelines, notes and seminars, these three specific publications are, the author would submit, recognized as the main RIM offerings to its membership. Certainly, by their publication they have been the most regular offerings to the membership by the ARMA International organization.

Further, a twenty-five year span, of these publications was selected as a sample set of a size it was hoped would be reasonably sufficient to offer a glimpse into the content published. A smaller sample size was rejected because it was felt, by the author, to be insufficient to reveal any trends that might exist or have taken place over the years. A span longer than twenty-five years might have also been better at revealing any such trends; however, as it will be explained later, due to editorial changes, i.e., changes to the use of electronic issues and of not printing citations/references, extra burdens appeared that hampered exploring beyond the twenty-five year mark. Thus, the sample set for exploration started in 1988 and ended with the full 2012 publication volume issues.

As stated above, the questions under consideration in this work concerned the professionalization of RIM. To explore this idea using the content of the ARMA publications, it might have been possible to count every single appearance of the word professional, and/or similar derivations of that word, found in those publications. However, this approach would, without the use of a computer and electronic versions of all the publications, have been very onerous.

Even if all the occurrences of the word professional had been counted, it could only have been ranked against other RIM words if they had also been counted. This approach might have revealed information through their rankings and comparisons, and might have been very interesting. Such an endeavor could be of interest to a graduate student working on a doctoral thesis, but for this work it was much too involved. Nevertheless, some approach was required. Since the idea of this work was to explore whether or not the goal of professionalism had arrived in the field of RIM, it was considered that answers might be found in three other publication content areas. These areas included characteristics about the authors, the RIM subject content, and the advertising content. So to help in the gathering of content data a form (see Fig. 1) was created.

The first area of interest was gaining some understanding of the authors who were being published by ARMA. Who were these authors? Where did they come from? What credentials did they have? What work did they do, and who employed them in that work? Plus, how often were they being published? In gaining an understanding of the authors it was felt some knowledge might be gathered to show trends in the spread of RIM knowledge, the advancement of RIM education, the international nature of the ARMA membership and influence, as well as some indicator(s) of professionalization.

The next area of content consideration concerned what were those authors writing about which ARMA felt was worthy of publication. In exploring this content, data was gathered concerning specific RIM content subject areas of interest. In other words, what were those matters of RIM operations, procedures, policies, technology, management and scholarly interest that ARMA felt were important and of value to its membership? Here, without any analysis, it was felt, that the content should show a generally wide spread offering of subject matter with some short term trends due possibly from issues and/or changes significant at a particular time in history. Moreover, it was also hoped that the subject content would indicate some movement or direction that gave indication of professionalization. Here the idea wasn't whether or not content had been prepared by the authors in a professional manner, or whether it appeared professionally published, i.e. it looked polished. The idea was, did the content show any indication that could be seen to clearly state, "this is work produced and published by a true profession." Something that was very different from the tabloid offerings found at the supermarket checkout counter.

The last of the three areas concerned what else was ARMA publishing for its readers. This last area was considered to be advertising. Here the desire was to collect information to reveal not only what products and services were being advertized, but by who and what if any trends or inferences might be seen from that information. From the outset it was considered that products and services offered by various vendors and utilized by people working in the RIM field should stand out above any other content. This idea seemed reasonable because such products and services, i.e. filing/labeling equipment, storage equipment (i.e., boxes and shelving), technology hardware and software, shredding, off-site storage, disaster recovery and consulting services, were all pretty much every day factors in the life of any person working in RIM. Thus, it was felt these things should really show significance from examination of the data. It was also thought that through these things some evidence might appear in support of a movement towards professionalization; although, it wasn't clear if or how this evidence might appear.

Ultimately, as the methodology for this work evolved a number of approach rules for data gathering were clarified. These were:

- Authors included ARMA Editors.
- Articles included: Editor's comments and notices, letters to the Editor, research, case studies, reviews of books and other media, notices, awards, postings, RIM related comments, opinions and/or discussions.
- Publication information such as publisher name and address, subscription fees, instructions to authors and advertising are not articles.
- Advertising for laws/statutes/regulations were considered – LEGAL.
- Standards also included guidelines, technical papers and best practices.
- Only citations, not bibliography references were counted.
- If an author cited a work more than once in the same paper, it was only counted as one citation source.
- Notifications of events, training, conferences and/or seminars are counted as advertising.

- Advertising that promoted ARMA were considered as EVENTS.

### **Analysis:**

**Authors by Gender:** The RIM world is, by pure observation at any conference, composed mostly of women. The author has no hard facts on how this observation would be supported by a percentage; however, again by pure observation coming from over twenty-five years working in the field, the estimate would be at least a 75/25 split between females and males participating in RIM. The female side might even be higher than the 75 percent. So, given this observation, it is revealing that the content data found the percentage of male authors to be **63** percent over that of **37** percent for female authors (see Fig. 2). While striking, this finding is almost a complete reversal of the percentage of actual RIM participants. The finding doesn't necessarily pose any concern, except that it does seem interesting. One can only surmise that the males of RIM industry are possibly more vocal in expressing their views.

Historically, RIM has been a business of women file clerks and assistants. Managers were typically, or at least often male. Some of those males were prolific authors who worked very hard at describing the world of RIM and teaching people about it. A few of those males, such as Ira A. Penn, were strong voices in our business who spoke often and with conviction. Their words and writings helped foster interest in RIM and build the body of literature. Now, history, as we know in the early 2000's has changed somewhat. The field has many more female managers, teachers, consultants and experts. Given this, it might have been expected that the data show some trend of growing strength in female authorship building up through the years of the survey. But, no such trend appeared. The data shows an improvement in the female authorship from about 2002, but no definitive shift between the number of males and females. So, does this reveal that RIM is dependent on gaining its insight mostly from males?

It would appear, from the content data that some "balance of power" between the males and females developed within the RIM world. This may seem to be a grandiose statement; nevertheless, the numbers over the twenty-five year time span are pretty consistent, thus showing a balance of a kind. The females of the industry may not be happy with this finding, but there it is. Maybe real gender change in the RIM field has yet to take place? Maybe it will only take place at some later date? Maybe it won't change at all? Only time, and/or effort extended by the female participants in RIM will tell. As for the males, considering they form a small segment of the population, they seem to be doing quite well.

**Authors by Country:** It is not surprising that the content data shows that **88** percent (see Fig. 3) of the authors came from the United States of America (USA). ARMA does have members from around the world, but its main membership has always been from the USA. Canada has been considered a "region" of the larger ARMA organization, and "ARMA Canada" has acted to a certain degree as an autonomous group within ARMA, running its own Canadian national conference on an annual basis. Canadian membership in ARMA has been recognized as being approximately one tenth of the whole. (NOTE: A membership figure of **1650** was provided by ARMA Canada, September 15, 2015.) So, if ARMA's total

membership was about ten thousand, and Canadians made up a tenth or one thousand of those members, we could reasonably expect that our authorship percentage should fall at or near the ten percent mark. The data however showed that this is not the case, as Canadian authorship was barely 6 percent, only slightly beating out that of the United Kingdom/Europe at 4 percent. (At a Canadian membership level of 1650, the expected mark should be about 16%, and not the dismal 6%. Regardless, as the numbers show, the overwhelming voice of America has and continues to be staggering.)

In Canada, while the bulk of the population lives fairly close to the border with the USA, there is a general belief that life is different, and that the way things are done is different. Given recognition of this general feeling, it might have been thought the percentage of Canadian authorship would be somewhat higher, as those Canadian authors outlined a “Canadian approach” or discussed a “Canadian issue” of interest and benefit to the Canadian ARMA members. Given that the data shows such a low participation by Canadian authors, possibly no such Canadian approach or issues were present. Or, was it that Canadians weren’t authors of anything worthy of publication by ARMA, or that they just were too busy to bother with offering their advice, opinions and efforts. Again, some strong words, but if Canadians do not want to be dominated by their USA cousins, then it would appear they need to be doing something more.

**CRMs and PhDs (Professionalism Factor):** In 1993, Ira Penn wrote that, *“Less than five percent of all the practitioners in the field have chosen to become CRMs. Of those who are CRMs, a considerable number have complained about having to keep up-to-date to remain certified. Although the CRM program has been in effect for some 17 years, a significant percentage of those who have purported to be leaders of the profession during that time have neither pursued the credential nor encouraged others to seek it.”* One might imagine that such a statement coming from one of the unquestioned leaders in the RIM field would surely have raised alarms, and caused a stir, especially if RIM was experiencing a movement towards professionalization.

Thus, one of the interests of this work concerns whether or not the presence of advanced education had increased over the twenty-five year period as Webster’s work suggested that it should. Further, there was also an interest in finding some proof that RIM had experienced a movement toward professionalization through its membership gaining that advanced education in the form of doctoral degrees and at least the Certified Records Manager (CRM) designation. At the outset of this work it was felt that surely if RIM had moved along the road of professionalization that movement might be verified through the credentials claimed by the authors being published. It was felt the data should show some upward trend in these two credentials being stated by the authors. Clearly, such a trend if present could have been evidence that more and more RIM workers had made the effort to gain those credentials probably for several factors such as a desire to gain a higher education, a desire to be professional, as a mechanism to gain recognition, or even because those higher credentials were required to obtain employment. Unfortunately, no movement was evident in the data. In fact, (see Fig. 4) the percentage of doctoral degrees held by authors was only 18 percent, and the CRM designation was only at 32 percent.

It should be noted here that of the recorded 1257 authors, many were repeats. So, while any particular survey year might have four authors with PhDs, in fact they could have been the same author (Pemberton for example). Each published presence of a particular person's name as an author, was recorded for this work. Those recordings totaled to 1257. The percentages of **18%** PhDs and **32%** CRMs are derived from the 1257 total. If this work had actually eliminated all the duplication amongst the authors, the final percentages would be **much** lower. (For example, the adjusted number for CRMs would be approximately 10%.)

With such findings as these no movement toward professionalization could be found in the data. Webster was not correct in her implications for the future. For the most part the level of authors holding CRMs and/or PhDs over the twenty-five year span was steady. What information can be determined from this is unknown without other research activity. However, one might consider that the wider body of RIM workers did not see the need for such advanced education. It would also seem that the credentials did not become a requirement for employment, nor for publication, at least in the ARMA offerings. Further, the low level of PhDs suggests that there was also a low level of research work being done leading to the development of new theoretical advancements.

**(NOTE:** To truly understand why advanced degree programs in RIM are basically not available one must read the literature of the 1980's and early 1990's coming from the Library and Archival schools. Fundamentally, the educators at those graduate schools argued that records management work was just an extension of archival work. That if a student received a foundation in RIM knowledge, via a single general introductory course; they could gain all the other skills and knowledge of records and information management through a graduate program of either Library Science or Archival Studies. Thus, while this may have been protectionism of the existing programs, such thinking pretty much killed the development of full advanced degree curriculum in RIM. For further reading on this, see for example: Eugenia K. Brumm (1992) and Tyler O. Walters (1995).)

**Authors by Type of Work:** When an author has their work published it is typical that a small biography about that author is usually also published. In approximately fifty words those biographies usually list for example, the author's credentials, their RIM background, the positions they've held within ARMA, the number of years of ARMA membership and they self identify what their daily work is. At the outset of this work it was felt that the collection of this employment information, of a non-privacy impact nature, should offer a glimpse at which sectors of the RIM world were most active in authorship. It was not surprising when the data found that **31** percent of authors came from the Consulting sector of RIM (**see Fig. 5**). Consultants have long been an active force in the RIM world and the numbers give support to the fact that those consultants have much to say from their years of effort within the industry. It was also good to see that **26** percent of the authors claimed employment as every day RIM managers, administrators, technicians and analysts. Although, it was thought that that number was somewhat low.

While Teachers (university/college professors/lecturers) made up **12** percent of the authors, the surprise came in the size of the authorship from the employment group identified as Editors and Lawyers. That

group made up a shocking **24** percent of the authorship. (**NOTE:** At the outset of this work data concerning authors who were lawyers was counted separately. However, while John Montana, a lawyer, was a frequent author, few others self identified from that profession. So, lawyers were grouped with Editors, and as such do influence slightly this particular sector of the authors.)

When the content analysis began it was recognized that Ira Penn, who was the Editor of the *Records Management Quarterly (RMQ)*, offered an editorial comment at the front of every volume issue. At first these comments were not counted as “articles.” However, after reviewing several volumes it became apparent that Penn, who at the time was employed in the RIM sector, was also employed by ARMA as Editor of the RMQ (even if that employment was done on a voluntary basis). While speaking as the ARMA Editor, he was acting on behalf of the larger organization and addressing himself to the RIM community on a different level (or playing field) than he would have been as purely a RIM sector worker. Certainly people would have sat up and listened to Penn no matter who his employer was since he was a strong and well known voice and expert in the records management field. Nevertheless, once recognized that Penn had two employers, since he was often published by ARMA on his own merits, the editorial comments he made had to be considered to be separate articles and counted along with the others. In making this content recognition a startling observation was seen.

After Ira Penn, J. Michael Pemberton took on the mantle of ARMA Editor in October 1998. At that time Pemberton stated that the ARMA publication, i.e. at the time the *RMQ*, was “*a member benefit... and the field’s primary professional journal.*” He went on to explain that while a “*magazine format permits a focus on new information, a journal’s chief concern is knowledge transfer.*” In the next year, Pemberton, and ARMA, changed the name of the RMQ to the *Information Management Journal (IMJ)*. Pemberton wanted ARMA, and RIM, to have a professional journal, where analytical and theoretical research could be published, as one mechanism to help move RIM towards professionalization. This idea however did not materialize for Pemberton because the “journal” name only lasted for ten years before once again ARMA made an editorial change and switched it to the *Information Management (IM)* magazine. Actually, while the *IMJ* name lasted ten years it was really only a couple of years before ARMA had actually shifted its editorial focus. This happened in 2002 when it began publishing a new section called “Up Front” in each volume issue. The purpose of the new section was “awareness.” Clearly, as Pemberton suggested, this was a step away from “knowledge transfer,” and towards a “focus on new information.”

In the RMQ years each one of Penn’s editorial comments could have touched on a single key issue of the day, or contained several RIM oriented comments. Penn’s editorial comments, usually covering a single printed page, were each counted as a single article. In contrast, the Up Front sections contained many very different items of news to RIM readers. The Up Front section replaced the “editorial comment” section, and many of the news and/or interest items published in that section were captured from the Internet, from vendors, or for example from government web sites that offered information about new laws, regulations, legal matters under consideration by the courts, as well as changing RIM retention schedules. Any of these items might cover one or more pages of print, but often two or three different items were offered on one page. Regardless of their printed arrangement or size, as with Penn’s single comment counting as one article, here each and every different item had to be counted as a separate

article offered under the name of the ARMA Editor. Because of this, when the Up Front section began (in 2002) a dramatic shift took place (see Fig. 5) as the number of RIM sector authors dropped, and the number of offerings from the ARMA Editors rose significantly. It should be noted that these ARMA Editors were not of a RIM background, practical experience or advanced education, but rather of the world of publishing and writing. The 2002 change was significant also in that rather than one page of Penn's comments, there were now as many ten or more pages given to this news type content.

Other findings from this employer data revealed that 1 percent of the authors stated they worked as Vendors, 4 percent said they worked as Information Technology people and 2 percent said they worked as Archivists. These findings seemed quite reasonable and they did not appear in any way to offer any trend either up or down. Nothing really could be discerned from these findings other than what they were.

**Employment by Employer Type:** As in the analysis section above, biography data was collected concerning who employed the authors (see Fig. 6). While understanding what work the authors claimed they did on a regular basis, it was felt that gaining an understanding of who employed them in their work might be interesting. It was felt that such data might reveal one or more sectors of RIM that were drivers in the industry. At the outset the feeling was that the RIM, and possibly the Consulting sectors should show the greatest involvement. What the data did show provided some validation of this feeling, plus something more.

Figure 6 shows the RIM sector had a total of 26 percent of the activity (12 percent from the Public sector side and 14 percent from the Private sector side). While this 26 percent was thought to be a bit low, when combined with the 32 percent from the Consulting sector the total of 58 percent of authors being actively working in RIM was felt to be a good. It was also felt that a showing of 16 percent of authors being employed by universities/colleges, along with fairly steady activity over the twenty-five year period, showed at least a consistent interest in RIM and that RIM education was at least not waning; although, the last seven years of the data did show a slight downward trend in that interest.

The most interesting finding can be seen in the data concerning ARMA as an employer. Prior to 2002, as discussed above, ARMA had but a single Editor. From 2002 forward that number rose, as the data clearly shows (see Fig. 6). This finding is a reflection of the finding in the previous section concerning the type of work authors stated they did.

**Authors by Rank:** It was mentioned above that some authors were published more than once. As the data gathering progressed, and several names were appearing repeatedly, it was decided that data specific to the number of occurrences of any author would be recorded. When these occurrences were tabulated a ranking of the most prolific authors published was developed (see Fig. 7). The ranking shows the top twelve published authors, with each having more than seven articles published over the twenty-five year period. While there were several authors who had more than one article published,

and up to as many as five, a gap appeared between the level of five and seven, so seven articles became the lowest cutoff point for this ranking, and it revealed a dozen different authors. Of that dozen, there were no Canadians. All were from the USA, except for one author from the United Kingdom, i.e. Ann Morddel from London, England. (**NOTE:** Several Canadians, including this author, have had more than one article published by ARMA. For example, Carolyn Minton from Vancouver had several reviews published, and Monique Attinger from Toronto had five articles published. However, no Canadian within the reviewed time span made the leap into the top ranked authors.)

The highest ranking author was Dr. J. Michael Pemberton with 59 articles to his credit. Ira Penn and John Phillips came in a close second with 51 articles, down to Julie Gable in the twelfth rank position with 7 articles. All of the names appearing on this ranking are well known and highly respected names in the RIM industry; all except for one person that of Nicki Swartz. Nicki Swartz was/is an ARMA employed editor, and not an actual expert in the RIM field. Although, twelve RIM oriented articles she wrote were published.

When Nicki Swartz's name appeared on the list it raised a question. The question concerned what would happen to the rankings if all of the items coming from the 2002 editorial change or Up Front postings were added up under her name? As data concerning this question was reviewed a second name, that of Amy Lanter (also an ARMA employed Editor and a freelance writer) appeared. So, after recalculating the data and counting all the items published by these two persons, including those from the Up Front sections, an adjusted ranking of the authors was produced (**see Fig. 8**). In this adjusted situation, while Pemberton manages to remain in the top spot, Nicki Swartz bumps Ira Penn and John Phillips from the number two position, and Julie Gable is bumped off the list and replaced by Amy Lanter as the tenth ranked author.

Nicki Swartz's and that of Amy Lanter's rankings on these lists came as a result of their editorial and writing work, and not because of their years of experience doing RIM work in any day-to-day real world records management situation. This finding was seen as shocking, especially when linked with the fact that the general size of the volume publication issues had reduced by almost half from an average size of 73.4 pages per issue in the *RMQ* years, to an average of 48.5 pages per issue in the *IM* magazine years. These writers with their offerings were taking up a dramatic portion of each publication. Was this a sign that workers in RIM were losing interest in publishing and therefore not doing any work to submit any articles? Or, was something else happening?

**Article Content:** Content analysis is an approach for breaking-down, or synthesizing, something into smaller buckets or areas. In the case of the published content of the articles five such buckets areas were considered as reasonably fundamental or characteristic of RIM. These five areas were: articles concerning Information Technology, RIM Programs, Professional Development, Legal and Standards. Each is addressed separately below, but overall the data showed that 84 percent of the articles contained information of a professional development nature (**see Fig. 9**). In and of itself this finding might give some support to Pemberton's desire that ARMA be educating its membership.

For an article to be counted as falling under the Information Technology (IT) area, its content must have been about the installation, configuration, or customization of a software or hardware for implementation use within the RIM industry. It needed to be technical. An article that spoke about comparing software functionality for its purchase selection, or about the best use of a piece of software for certain situations, organizations, or records/information was considered to be an article geared towards educating readers and therefore of a professional development nature. For an article to be IT, it truly had to be about the computer science of that technology. While many articles had titles or short introductions that suggested their content was of an IT nature, in fact, on closer examination of the article content the data revealed that only 4 percent of all the articles fell into the IT area. At first glance this finding appeared low; however, since the focus of the ARMA publication has been RIM and not computer science, the finding is felt to be not unreasonable.

Article content of a RIM Program nature had to be about actually operating some component of RIM in a day-to-day sense. Such an article might speak about operating an offsite storage facility. Not the establishment of that offsite facility, but its operation. An article concerning the establishment of such a site would fall under educating readers and therefore professional development. The line between the two may seem thin, however, the idea here was to gain an understanding of the underlying purpose of any article and/or its real focus, regardless of what its title and short intro blurb might suggest. Thus, in this area of RIM Program, 5 percent of the articles were counted.

Some 6 percent of the articles were considered to be within the Legal area. Here, an article must have been specifically about a new law or regulation, and not about the implications of that law in the RIM world. Again, the line here is thin, however, where an author wrote about how best to apply a law, or how to gain RIM program recognition because of the presence of a particular law, those articles were educating readers and fell under the area of Professional Development. So, in reality, a finding of 6 percent might be actually high, given the focus of the ARMA offerings is not a legal review or debate.

For an article to fall within the Standards area it had to be solely about a standard, and not about how a standard could be used to audit a RIM operation/program. The narrow line presents itself again, but if an article spoke about how a standard was developed or used to the benefit of an organization, it was teaching, and thus fell under the Professional Development area. Since ARMA as an organization has long stated its belief that Standards are important and valuable tools to the RIM industry, and because ARMA has a “standards development” committee, in one form or another, and has actively pursued, commented on and developed standards and technical papers dealing with RIM related subjects, the author felt that investigating this particular area of the published content might be interesting. For many years the author was an active participant on that ARMA standards development committee, and has been published by ARMA on the subject, (i.e. Bolton, 2011). So, at the outset the feeling was the data should show a clear level of representation for this particular area. However, the data showed no such interest. Article content about standards only represented 1 percent of the total.

Thus, as mentioned above, the data showed that a whopping 84 percent of the article content was focused towards Professional Development. Given that the nature of a membership organization such as ARMA includes some element in developing its members and in educating them, this finding might not

be unusual. Here it should be mentioned that bias, by the author in reading article content and in determining an area for that content could have influenced the overall numbers somewhat. This factor could be a topic of future research, as could another more refined research approach. Nevertheless, for the purpose of this work, the finding is what it is.

**Advertising Content:** To look at the published content concerning advertizing two different views of the content data were gathered. The first of these was data characteristic of subject, i.e. Equipment (i.e., file folders, shelving, shredders, and storage boxes); Micrographics (i.e., film, cameras, and readers); IT (i.e., RIM software and hardware); Services (i.e., storage, auditing, shredding, and disaster recovery); Events/Awards (i.e., conferences, postings and acknowledgements); Books/Training; Standards; Job Ads; and Other (see Fig. 10). At the beginning of the research a subject area for Legal was also considered; however, no data was found to support this particular content area. The second view concerned data about who was behind or sponsoring and paying for the advertizing content. To understand this content view better, seven possible groups were developed; i.e. ARMA, Vendors, AIIM (Association of Information and Image Management), Consultants, Schools (universities/colleges), ICRM, and that of Other (see Fig. 11). It was necessary to consider ARMA as a sponsor for some of the content because it advertised its own conferences, printed materials for purchase, training, and at least during the RMQ years ARMA often published announcements concerning organization Board of Directors membership, awards, and other member recognition news.

Analysis of the data (see Fig. 11) found that **71** percent of the advertising content was sponsored by Vendors. This was certainly not a shocking discovery. The author had no expectations concerning this finding, but generally believed at the outset that the data would show something close to this figure, if not higher. Consultants sponsored **4** percent of the advertising, which seemed a bit low, but considering that most consultants probably operated at the local level, paying to advertise in an international level publication was probably not within practical viability. One interesting finding was that ARMA showed that it paid for **21** percent of the content. As well, the data showed that ARMA's sponsorship of advertising was trending upwards in the last years of the investigation. Given that the size of the ARMA publication offering was decreasing in its average number of pages per issue, this increase in advertising by ARMA could be evidence of the general state of the North American economy (i.e. fewer Vendors purchasing advertising), or it could be that sponsors were finding other ways to distribute their advertising (i.e., Internet) and that ARMA was left to fill its own publication pages. Regardless, these two findings appear to point to a convergence, and do not bode well for the future. This is one particular observation that should be watched.

A somewhat disturbing finding is the low level of advertising sponsorship by the ICRM, that of a meager **1.5** percent. Since a purpose of this work was to examine for evidence of professionalization, it was thought at the outset that, as Webster suggested, availability and interest in advanced RIM education was going to trend upwards. Acquiring the CRM designation from the ICRM was one of the key possible avenues for gaining this advanced education. So, if RIM had been moving towards professionalization, certainly more and more RIM workers would have obtained their CRM, and the data should have shown

a strong sponsorship from the ICRM because its members were growing, interest in the CRM designation was growing and more money would have been available to advertise the benefits of obtaining the professional designation. However, the data shows many years with no ICRM advertising at all and overall a remarkably weak level of sponsorship. This finding probably would not have made Ira Penn very happy. **(NOTE: RIM is currently experiencing a push in the area of “information governance.”** That push includes training and certification somewhat similar to that of the CRM. An examination conducted in the future might be interesting to see how this push fairs. This author will venture the opinion that, in the long run, it will fair no better than the CRM. Only time and someone else’s efforts will prove that the author was wrong.)

Data concerning the breakdown of advertising content by subject areas showed various levels of activity; but nothing was seen as remarkable (see Fig. 10). The largest subject area found was that of IT at **36** percent. But this was certainly not remarkable given the huge explosion of RIM related software available in the marketplace, not to mention the impact of managing “e-records.” Service oriented advertising showed **17** percent, and RIM Equipment showed **14** percent. One particular observation is in the area of advertising for books and Training. Overall this area showed a **15** percent finding. Through, most of the investigation years, such advertising was for books with some limited advertising for educational seminars/sessions. However, a significant jump in the volume of advertising appears in the later years. That advertising mostly sponsored by ARMA, concerned training in the topic of governance. While no clear conclusion can be made from this observation, it was interesting, and is one that could be watched closely to see what happens in the future. In other words, will training in governance replace the CRM, will such training actually make the difference in moving RIM towards professionalization, or will interest in governance fade over time to be replaced by something else?

**Citations and Information Impact:** According to Hoang, Kaur and Menczer (2010), “*data from citation analysis can be used to determine the popularity and impact of specific articles, as well as gauge the importance of an author’s work.*” When an author quotes the words of another, or uses that person’s thoughts to explain and/or argue their own point or position, that author must cite the original source otherwise they commit plagiarism. Depending on the situation and rules of that situation, at a minimum the citing of another’s work should include reference to that person’s name, maybe the year in which they made their original comment, and typically where that comment was found, i.e. where it was published. In making such a reference to the other’s work, an author gives some measure of weight to that other person. This does not necessarily mean that the one author has to agree with the other author, only that they recognize that the other person did some work in a particular area of study/research, and that good, bad or indifferent, that work is a worthy of recognition at for its existence. The more times a particular person’s words are cited, the greater that person’s recognition, if not to the whole world in general, at least within some community of interest such as RIM. When a particular publication, a journal or newspaper is cited often, it too gains in recognition. To measure and rank publications by their citations, an “information impact factor” for those publications can be calculated. Thus, for any year, the higher the number of citations that refer to a particular publication, i.e. the Journal of Medicine, the higher it is felt the information impact of that publication is. In other

words, a publication with a high information impact is viewed as having greater significance, and its content is viewed as being read more and having greater weight and influence.

It should be noted that there is an organization, i.e., Thomson Reuters (Social Science Citation Index), that conducts the work of gathering citation data from publications and counting that data to derive information impact factors for those publications and for publishing their findings. Not all journals, magazines and published materials are examined by the Thomson Reuters organization. While the ARMA publication offerings are not identified amongst those publications that are measured, of curious interest though is the fact that from Nigeria, the “*African Journal of Library Archives and Information Science*” is indexed by Thomson Reuters.

To gain an understanding of the information impact of the ARMA publication offering, i.e. the three publications under review, all the citations identified in the published articles were counted. This counting however met a problem when in 2009 ARMA made an editorial decision to stop printing the citations in the publication issues, and rather only offered them in an electronic version of the articles. Each electronic article had to be called up individually which added greatly to the time necessary to gather the data. In examining a few of these electronic articles the number of citations being offered did not appear to raise or lower in any way different from citations printed on paper. So, given the extra time and effort involved to gather the electronic data, and because no apparent difference was observable, the author stopped gathering citation data at the end of the 2008 volume year.

In gathering the citation information the data was separated into different source type buckets (see Fig. 12). These buckets were; i.e., Journals, Books, Conference Proceedings, Vendor white papers and etc., Government publications, Standards, and offerings found on the Internet websites/pages and blogs. (See Also: Nelson Edewor, 2013). From this data it was not surprising to find that 52 percent of the citations came from Journals, while 23 percent came from Books, and another 10 percent came from Government materials. This spread of citation sources seemed to be a reasonable offering. The author also did not find it too unreasonable that 4 percent came from Conferences, 3 percent from Vendors, 3 percent from Standards, and 5 percent from the Internet. Although, use of the Internet as a source does raise other issues such as the demise of printed materials, information validity, and growing reliance on software and hardware to display, locate and retrieve information.

Now we come to the final finding of this work. The data revealed that the ARMA publication offerings had an overall information impact of 9.39 percent. This was calculated in the following manner:

Total number of citations	= 2075
Total number of citations identifying an ARMA publication as its source	= 195
<b>Citation Information Impact Factor</b> (195 / 2075 x 100)	= <b>9.39 %</b>

While this information impact factor might not seem low, it is. It marks and gives some evidence to what readers are really feeling about the content they are offered in their membership publication. Certainly, since the ARMA publication is provided to every member of the organization, and on the surface one

could view it as something of worth within that community, would it be unreasonable to think that the people in that organization would quote from it, often? Remember, Pemberton told us that the focus of the ARMA publications was professional and to offer education. So, if the ARMA Editors have viewed its articles as worthy of the audience they are working for, is that audience not to view those articles as worthy? Clearly, since in twenty-one years of published articles only 195 out of 2075 citations came from an ARMA source (i.e., the three publications), that audience does not appear to view the information materials as being very worthy, or else wouldn't they would have quoted them more often? This observation may in fact support the finding of the AIEF survey which reported that those surveyed did not believe that the articles published in a reviewed journal would be of value to them personally. Was this feeling due to the fact that they were already viewing their ARMA publication as not having much value to them? Did the members receiving the publications view the contents as mediocre and/or "dumbed down" to the point of being useless? These are somewhat harsh and yet very interesting questions and they are questions which this author hopes are looked at and addressed through other future efforts.

### **Conclusion:**

Within the RIM community, at least in the United States and Canada, a belief appeared to exist, at least to some extent that a state of professionalism existed for the field of RIM. Not that that state had been verified in any manner, or formally named by any group or person. Rather, its existence manifested itself via common use of the word "professional." Possibly its existence was due because there was no challenge to its existence. Possibly it was even due to a general desire by the RIM community to hold the belief. The research outlined in this paper took the position that, if such a state of professionalism existed, some verifiable proof should be available to openly discover and state.

In this work some basic findings were revealed. These included:

- Authorship was shown to be 88% American, with Canadian authorship at 6%. This mark barely beating out that of the UK and Europe at 4%.
- Authorship was 63% male. (Given an ARMA membership that is probably in reality closer to a split of 75/25 favoring the female side, this fact clearly identifies how weak the female voice seems to be.)
- Consultants made up 31% of the authors.
- At 24%, authors who are/were ARMA Editors (with the addition of a few lawyers) almost outstripped actual RIM workers at 26% of the authors.
- The average size of the ARMA publication shrank over time from:
  - Records Management Quarterly = **73.4** pages per issue
  - Information Management Journal = **70.4** pages per issue
  - Information Management Magazine = **48.5** pages per issue
- The credentials information offered by authors revealed no growth in CRMs or PhDs.
- Data showed no trend in the level of advanced analytical research activity. And,

- A “*freelance writer*” was among the top ranked authors.

So, in response to the outstanding questions mentioned above, did RIM achieve the rank of a true profession? Was our unspoken belief in reality a fact? Let’s review the evidence. When it comes to the development, understanding and use of “systematic theory” RIM has the life-cycle concept, but beyond this little if anything else exists. One theory does not provide much weight to the goal of gaining true professionalization.

When it comes to the idea of “community sanction,” ask yourself if your CEO could describe the difference between the work of a RIM person and that of an IT person, Librarian or Archivist. Are there community boundaries on the field of RIM that are definable and which allow for a demarcation between US and THEM? It would be, except in the unusual case, probably unlikely that such a CEO could adequately make such a differentiation or in describing any line of demarcation between the roles. Is this so important? Possibly not, except that RIM workers often carry a heavy load of responsibility in their respective organizations and would like, probably, to be recognized, and adequately compensated for that load. Even potentially to the extent of being covered by professional insurance if the need arose. Therefore, since RIM work and workers are not viewed clearly as different from that of others, of being distinct, the answer is no! RIM does not command any level of community sanction sufficient to be considered as a true profession.

Within the CRM community a Code of Ethics exists to be adhered to by its certified members. However, no such code of ethics exists for the wider RIM community through ARMA or any other RIM organization. This lack, plus the absence of any mechanism, policies and procedures to really monitor actions and penalize for inappropriate code violations means there is no backbone to the RIM body. A lawyer being disbarred loses not only his career, but his livelihood, good name and reputation. What happens to a RIM consultant (or any RIM person) that takes the wrong path? The response is nothing, or very little of consequence. Oh, if caught they might lose their job, or get a reprimand, but in the sense of real hard consequences, little ability for impact exists. Thus, RIM does not really meet this requirement for being a true profession.

What about a “culture?” Does RIM have a recognizable culture? Again, the answer is no, or at best it is weak. A language that RIM workers recognize and use on a daily basis and in their literature does exist; however, that language isn’t truly RIM’s alone. In fact it is shared with several other groups, particularly that of IT as RIM wanders farther down the “e-record” road. As for RIM having a different and definable approach and an attitude all its own, the answer is again no, or at least to be fair, if they do exist, let someone identify and prove that existence through a separate effort of research.

Ultimately, has this work found that RIM gained professionalization, or as Pemberton mentioned has it found us for far too many years simply regurgitating and churning on hearsay, conjecture, anecdote and propaganda? The content articles examined appear to lean on practical expertise and observation and not on verifiable proof; which doesn’t make them wrong it only tends to reveal them, in their repeated nature, as weak. Beyond the life-cycle theory little new theoretical work appears to have been accomplished, or at least published in the ARMA offering; an offering that has experienced a shift in its

authorship from those that actually do RIM work, to those who simply talk about RIM work. And, with the low level of citation given to the work presented in that ARMA offering, the impact of that information on its readers appears remarkably weak. Which finding seems to coincide with that of the AIEF survey that found responders felt a reviewed journal would offer them little of value. Was that feeling of nothing due in fact because people were just tired of the rhetoric? Who knows? Therefore, no evidence was found via this work to verify any initiative, or even effort, to really move RIM towards any goal of becoming a true profession. One can only assume that regardless of those in our past that stated we had a chance to reach the goal of becoming a true profession, they were either wrong, or that somewhere along the line interest in the whole idea was lost or abandoned. Maybe, rather than lost, it was realized to be a myth, a dream, and therefore, not given any credence. It may have been easier to believe in the myth, than to fight for the reality.

As for the ARMA organization and its role, well nothing really can be said. The data supports no evidence, trend or conclusion either plus or minus. Economics have clearly played a part as is obvious in publication issue size, style and publication mechanism changes, i.e., printed to electronic. There were also editorial shifts. When Pemberton took the reins as Editor, there was an attempt to shift the publication towards a journal with the aim of moving the content to something more scholarly and analytical. However, within three years that dream was dismissed. Did ARMA feel that its readers and membership weren't worthy of a journal? Did they realize that the contents of a journal would be too high level and possibly beyond the reading and comprehension of its average reader? Again, who knows? There was no discernible change that could be identified as the point where ARMA was making an effort to grasp the brass ring of professionalization or in killing any existing efforts for truly reaching professionalization.

Ira Penn (1993) wrote that RIM was lacking in leadership and needed some major philosophical changes. He recognized that the low number of CRMs in the field as being pathetic and he went on to say that the fault shouldn't be blamed on others as, "the downtrodden must take some responsibility for their own plight." So, in the end, what is left to say? Well, to borrow an old expression, "the future is what you make of it." Therefore, if RIM wants to be a true profession it has a lot of work to accomplish to get there. Or, at a minimum, there could at least be work done to help us RIM folks better understand why we can't reach the goal, and how we can better prepare and conduct ourselves in the world we have to survive in. Such work could be undertaken at the PhD thesis level or purely as research work conducted by RIM person's with an interest in discovery. Clearly, more could be heard both from the female and Canadian voices. Through the effort and publication of suck work RIM's literature base increases, our recognition increases, our community is better defined, and our RIM world is better positioned for us today and for the future.

## References:

1. Pemberton, J. Michael and Pendergraft, Lee O. "Toward a Code of Ethics: Social Relevance and the Professionalism of Records Managers." *Records Management Quarterly* 24(2), (1990): 3-11, 15.
2. Pemberton, J. Michael. "A Profession Without Professional Literature." *Records Management Quarterly* 27(3), (1993): 52-55.
3. Force, Donald C. and Shaffer, Elizabeth. "Records Management and Peer-Reviewed Journals: An Assessment." ARMA International Education Fund. 2013.
4. Pennix, Gail B and Fischer, Marti. "Cumulative Index to the RMQ 1967-1987." *Records Management Quarterly* 22 (1), (1988): 27-122.
5. Greenwood, Ernest. (1966) "The Elements of Professionalization" in Vollmer, H.M. and Mills, D.L. (Eds), *Professionalization*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
6. Millerson, G. (1964) *The Qualifying Associations. A Study in Professionalization*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
7. Webster, Berenika M. "Records Management: From Profession to Scholarly Discipline." *The Information Management Journal* 33(4), (1999): 20-30.
8. Pemberton, J. Michael. "Records Management: Planet in an Information Solar System." (paper presented at the ARMA International 35<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference, San Francisco, November, 1990).
9. Bolton, John. "A 25 Year Content Analysis of RIM Information Impact." (paper presented at the ARMA Canada Conference, Calgary, May 25-27, 2015).
10. Edewor, Nelson. "An Analysis of a Nigerian Library and Information Science Journal: A Bibliometric Analysis." (2013) *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. University of Nebraska, Lincoln. October, Paper 1004. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1004>.
11. Krippendorff, Klaus. "Content Analysis." (1989) [http://repository.upenn.edu/asc\\_papers/226](http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/226)
12. Elo, Satu and Kyngas, Helvi. "The Qualitative Content Analysis Process." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 62(1), (2008): 107-115.
13. Penn, Ira A. "Records Management: Still Hazy After All These Years." *Records Management Quarterly* 27(1), (1993): 3-8, 20.
14. Brumm, Eugenia K. "Graduate Education in Records Management: The University of Texas at Austin Model." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 33(4), (1992): 333-337.
15. Walters, Tyler O. "Rediscovering the Theoretical Base of Records Management and Its Implications for Graduate Education: Searching for the New School of Information Studies." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 36(2), (1995): 139-154.
16. Pemberton, J. Michael. "From the Editor: RMQ: The Next Generation." *Records Management Quarterly* 32(4), (1998): 2.
17. Bolton, John M. "RIM Fundamentals: Standards: Providing a Framework for RIM." *Information Management Magazine* 45(3), (2011) 30-35, 51.
18. Hoang, D; Kaur, J. and Menczer, F. "Crowdsourcing Scholarly Data." (paper presented at the Websci. 10: Extending the Frontiers of Society On Line. Raleigh, NC. April 26-27, 2010).

**FIGURE 1: Data Gathering Form (Blank)**

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_ VOL: \_\_\_\_\_

**CONTENT:**

Information Technology	RIM Program	Professional Development	Legal	Governance	Standards
------------------------	-------------	--------------------------	-------	------------	-----------

Total # of Articles: \_\_\_\_\_

Citations: ARMA: \_\_\_\_\_ AIM: \_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Journal	Book	Conference	Vendor (WP)	Government	Standard	Internet (Blog)
---------	------	------------	-------------	------------	----------	-----------------

Number of Articles with Citations: \_\_\_\_\_

**AUTHORS:** Male: \_\_\_\_\_ Female: \_\_\_\_\_ CRMs: \_\_\_\_\_ PhDs: \_\_\_\_\_

Country:

USA	Canada	UK & Europe	Australia & Asia Pacific	Other
-----	--------	-------------	--------------------------	-------

Profession:

RIM Practitioner	Consultant	IT	Vendor	Teacher/Professor	Archivist	Other
------------------	------------	----	--------	-------------------	-----------	-------

Employer:

ARMA	Public Sector	Private Sector	Consulting Agency	School	Vendor	Other
------	---------------	----------------	-------------------	--------	--------	-------

**ADVERTISEMENTS:** ARMA: \_\_\_\_\_ Vendor: \_\_\_\_\_ AIM: \_\_\_\_\_ Consultants: \_\_\_\_\_ Schools: \_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Equipment	Microfilm	IT - HW/SW	Services	Legal
Events	Books	Standards	Job Ads	Other

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**FIGURE 2: Authors by Gender**

Authors by Gender																								Total	%		
Authors	44	45	51	50	36	50	39	52	50	53	57	48	40	58	88	55	56	70	46	51	38	49	34	48	49	<b>1257</b>	
Female	11	18	16	10	5	13	11	9	13	17	12	14	16	17	33	33	31	30	28	27	15	20	11	30	26	466	<b>37</b>
Male	33	27	35	40	31	37	28	43	37	36	45	34	24	41	55	22	25	40	18	24	23	29	23	18	23	791	<b>63</b>
Years	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012		100

**FIGURE 3: Authors by Country**

Authors By Country																								Total	%		
USA	39	41	40	42	34	42	34	45	40	51	52	49	34	47	90	51	52	67	48	49	41	56	34	47	54	1179	<b>88</b>
Canada	3	3	7	1	1	6	2	4	5	1	4	1	6	11	4	8	4	0	1	4	0	0	2	4	1	84	<b>6</b>
UK - Eur	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	1	2	0	4	6	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	40	<b>4</b>
AU - Pac	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	19	<b>1.4</b>
Other	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	<b>0.6</b>
Years	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	1338	100

**FIGURE 4: Authors with CRMs and PhDs**

Authors with CRMs																										Total	%
Authors	44	45	51	50	36	50	39	52	50	53	57	48	40	58	88	55	56	70	46	51	38	49	34	48	49	1257	
<b>CRMs</b>	12	13	13	11	11	16	10	20	15	13	12	16	15	21	25	17	21	15	16	21	7	26	17	18	22	403	<b>32</b>
Years	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012		

Authors with PhDs																										Total	%
Authors	44	45	51	50	36	50	39	52	50	53	57	48	40	58	88	55	56	70	46	51	38	49	34	48	49	1257	
<b>PhDs</b>	13	12	9	11	9	14	9	11	11	11	18	11	8	11	10	3	5	14	5	3	8	4	6	5	7	228	<b>18</b>
Years	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012		

**FIGURE 5: Authors by Their Type of Work**

Authors By Profession																										Total	%
<b>RIM</b>	15	23	21	23	16	20	17	15	21	25	29	18	11	12	7	5	3	11	7	3	1	3	3	17	10	336	<b>26</b>
<b>Consultant</b>	12	13	13	11	11	16	10	20	15	13	12	16	15	21	25	17	21	15	16	21	7	26	17	18	22	403	<b>31</b>
<b>IT</b>	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	3	2	2	6	1	2	7	5	4	2	4	46	<b>4</b>
<b>Vendor</b>	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	2	1	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	18	<b>1</b>
<b>Teacher</b>	13	9	8	8	5	8	6	7	8	8	9	6	9	11	11	6	7	12	3	2	7	2	1	2	1	162	<b>12</b>
<b>Archivist</b>	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4	4	4	6	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	34	<b>2</b>
<b>Ed / Lawyer / Other</b>	2	4	9	4	2	5	3	8	6	6	6	6	4	11	40	24	24	25	16	23	21	17	10	15	17	308	<b>24</b>
Years	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	1307	100

**FIGURE 6: Authors by Employer Type**

Authors By Employer Type																							Total	%			
<b>ARMA</b>	11	8	9	12	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	26	19	21	18	16	18	11	13	7	10	13	248	<b>19</b>
<b>Public Sector</b>	6	5	7	9	9	14	9	14	13	13	15	11	1	2	2	4	2	8	2	2	3	0	0	5	5	161	<b>12</b>
<b>Private Sector</b>	6	10	10	7	7	7	8	3	5	10	14	8	7	10	11	5	1	12	6	5	6	6	6	15	9	194	<b>14</b>
<b>Consulting Agency</b>	13	14	13	11	10	15	10	21	15	13	12	14	14	17	28	18	24	16	22	18	11	26	15	18	27	415	<b>32</b>
<b>University</b>	12	12	11	9	4	10	7	8	8	8	10	8	9	13	16	7	11	18	6	6	7	3	1	2	1	207	<b>16</b>
<b>Vendor</b>	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	4	5	3	7	8	10	3	4	1	3	0	5	5	6	8	2	1	80	<b>6</b>
<b>Other</b>	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	3	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	20	<b>1</b>
<b>Years</b>	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	1325	100

**FIGURE 7: Authors by Rank**

Author	No. of Articles	Rank
<b>J. Michael Pemberton, PhD, CRM</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Ira A. Penn, CRM</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>John T. Phillips, CRM</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>John Montana</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>David O. Stephens, CRM</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Robert L. Sanders, PhD, CRM</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Donald S. Skupsky, CRM</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>April Dmytrenko, FAI</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Kenneth Hayes</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Anne Morddel</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Nicki Swartz *</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Bruce W. Dearstyne, PhD</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Julie Gable, CRM</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>

**FIGURE 8: Authors by Rank – Adjusted Ranking**

Author	No. of Articles	Old Rank	Adjusted Rank
J. Michael Pemberton, PhD, CRM	59	1	1
Nicki Swartz *	12 (55)	9	2
Ira A. Penn, CRM	51	2	3
John T. Phillips, CRM	51	2	3
John Montana	41	3	4
David O. Stephens, CRM	40	4	5
Robert L. Sanders, PhD, CRM	34	5	6
Donald S. Skupsky, CRM	30	6	7
April Dmytrenko, FAI	21	7	8
Kenneth V. Hayes	20	8	9
Amy Lanter *	18	-	10
Anne Morddel	15	9	11
Bruce W. Dearstyne, PhD	9	11	12

**FIGURE 9: Article Content**

RIM Content Analysis																							Total	%			
Info Tech	6	7	3	5	1	2	5	5	6	3	3	2	3	3	5	0	4	4	1	3	1	3	4	0	2	81	<b>4</b>
RM Program	7	7	14	7	7	6	2	4	5	7	4	7	4	3	6	2	0	2	2	0	1	2	3	1	1	104	<b>5</b>
Prof Dev	32	22	22	26	21	35	26	29	29	34	43	36	26	40	104	103	139	142	131	162	109	166	104	132	157	1870	<b>84</b>
Legal	3	8	4	6	5	4	2	9	5	6	4	5	4	4	6	4	1	9	5	2	4	8	6	9	12	135	<b>6</b>
Standards	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	2	3	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	27	<b>1</b>
Years	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2217	25 Yr Avg

**FIGURE 10: Advertising Content**

Advertisements by Subject Content																								Total	%		
Equipment	11	16	23	21	13	21	17	22	24	21	22	19	6	7	22	33	30	42	39	36	24	8	1	7	1	486	14
Micrographics	13	13	5	0	4	2	2	7	8	12	16	5	3	1	15	7	7	6	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	132	4
IT	18	22	24	27	24	38	30	37	44	35	37	55	44	56	154	126	96	108	77	47	28	27	21	36	39	1250	36
Services	37	26	21	28	15	17	9	13	9	13	8	10	6	14	40	27	36	47	43	46	29	29	13	13	24	573	17
Events/Awards	25	31	34	35	19	28	18	25	14	26	14	9	4	10	22	11	22	11	7	15	11	13	9	7	10	430	13
Books/Training	22	11	19	18	15	16	10	7	5	5	6	8	6	10	16	12	14	18	18	20	24	63	39	64	74	520	15
Standards	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	10	0
Job Ads	6	5	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	37	1
Other	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
Years	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	3448	100

**FIGURE 11: Advertising by Sponsor Type**

Advertisements by Publisher Type																								Total	%		
ARMA	26	29	29	34	20	34	20	23	18	23	14	11	7	10	17	20	26	31	16	26	22	53	34	60	54	657	21
Vendor	82	65	71	80	65	86	59	81	86	85	88	93	62	78	240	199	218	204	126	123	79	65	34	60	70	2499	71
AIIM	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	7	6	5	4	0	0	0	36	1
Consultant	8	22	20	11	3	4	3	5	4	1	0	2	0	7	9	0	1	1	7	5	7	14	2	2	0	138	4
School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	3	0	8	18	0.5
ICRM	5	8	6	5	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4	5	6	56	1.5
Other	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	4	0	2	3	0	8	1	1	6	1	6	44	1
Years	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	3448	100

**FIGURE 12: Citation Data and Information Impact**

Citations By Source Publication Type																							Total	%			
<b>Journal</b>	29	78	47	37	16	89	42	77	50	31	45	10	39	59	46	64	86	55	85	81	24	0	0	0	0	1090	<b>52</b>
<b>Book</b>	36	49	16	5	10	17	10	28	13	20	17	2	29	21	16	60	30	21	23	29	26	0	0	0	0	478	<b>23</b>
<b>Conference</b>	6	0	0	4	1	2	5	5	11	3	0	1	1	6	2	3	5	8	8	4	3	0	0	0	0	78	<b>4</b>
<b>Vendor (WP)</b>	3	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	10	16	7	15	3	0	0	0	0	64	<b>3</b>
<b>Government</b>	7	9	5	0	4	7	3	16	8	5	0	0	6	12	1	12	25	28	23	28	13	0	0	0	0	212	<b>10</b>
<b>Standard</b>	0	0	4	1	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6	0	9	13	7	5	0	0	0	0	56	<b>3</b>
<b>Internet (url)</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	22	10	15	32	6	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	97	<b>5</b>
<b>Years</b>	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2075	100

Total Number of Articles = 2217

Total Number of Articles with Citations = 257 ( 257 / 2217 x 100 = 11.6% )

Total Number of Citations = 2075

Total Number of ARMA Journal Citation References = 195

ARMA Publication Citation Impact: 195 \ 2075 x 100 = 9%

