



COLLNET Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management

ISSN: 0973-7766 (Print) 2168-930X (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tsim20>

A bibliometric analysis of dance performance reviews in the dance category of the Web of Science

Xiaoru Wang & Yuh-Shan Ho

To cite this article: Xiaoru Wang & Yuh-Shan Ho (2019) A bibliometric analysis of dance performance reviews in the dance category of the Web of Science, COLLNET Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management, 13:1, 79-90

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09737766.2018.1550036>



Published online: 26 Jun 2019.



Submit your article to this journal



View Crossmark data

A bibliometric analysis of dance performance reviews in the dance category of the Web of Science

Xiaoru Wang
Yuh-Shan Ho

Dance performance reviews (D. P. reviews) are one document type in the Arts & Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI). In this paper we analyze D. P. reviews in Web of Science from 1992 to 2016 in terms of their languages, publication outputs, authors and, journals. The results show the reviews were written in seven languages in all (though mainly English), most were published by a single-author, and that most authors preferred to publish their works in the same journal. The most productive authors were Jack Anderson, a member of advisory board of *Dance Chronicle*, and Jonathan Gray who was the editor of *Dancing Times*. The leading topic was ballet, and Swan Lake, Sleeping Beauty, Romeo and Juliet, and Cinderella were typical topics for D. P. reviews. In recent years the most popular topics were Triple Bills, Double Bills, and Mixed Bills.

Keywords: Arts & Humanities Citation Index, Dance Performance Reviews, Web of Science Core Collection

Xiaoru Wang
Department of Dance
College of Music
Fujian Normal University
Fuzhou 350007
China

wangxiaoru1216@163.com

Yuh-Shan Ho*
Trend Research Centre
Asia University
No. 500, Lioufeng Road
Wufeng
Taichung County 41354
Taiwan, R.O.C.

ysho@asia.edu.tw

*Correspondence Author

1. Introduction

Many bibliometric analyses of publications in various Web of Science categories have been published in the last decade, including categories in the Science Citation Index Expanded (SCI-EXPANDED) [1,2], the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) [3,4]; and the Arts & Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI) [5]. Bibliometric investigations have also been carried out using the Web of Science for various document types, such as proceedings papers [6,7], reviews [8,9], book reviews [10,11], and art exhibit reviews [12].




Figure 1

Search criteria for dance performance reviews

Although not in the main stream, A&HCI has also been used for bibliometric studies, including the international presence of studies of Catalan literature [13], publications in the field of dance [5], and art exhibit reviews [12], journals such as *Journal of National Folklore* [14], and arts and humanities literatures in a country, for example Turkey [15], Spain [16], and Estonian [17].

Dance performance reviews (D. P. reviews) in A&HCI provide reviews of solo dance recitals, complete dance productions, dance programs consisting of several works, and other types of performance (<http://wokinfo.com/media/pdf/wos5-22-external-release-notes.pdf>).

In this study, we report on the characteristics of D. P. reviews in A&HCI from 1992 to 2016. We investigated the characteristics of these D. P. reviews including their languages, publication outputs, authors, and journals.

2. Methodology

The information on D. P. reviews in the Web of Science category of dance used in this study is based on the Arts & Humanities Citation Index database of the Clarivate Analytics' Web of Science Core Collection (database updated on 28 July 2017). The Web of Science category of dance included eight journals: *Ballet Review* (USA), *Dance Chronicle* (USA), *Dance Magazine* (USA), *Dance Research* (UK), *Dance Research Journal* (USA), *Dancing Times* (UK), *Research in Dance Education* (UK), and *Tanz* (Germany). Search criteria was illustrated in Fig. 1. A total of 35,515 documents were published in these eight journals in the category of dance from 1992 to 2016. Document of dance performance review was the most popular (28% of 35,515 documents). We selected for analysis only 9,938 of these reviews.

In the Web of Science, the corresponding-author is designated as the 'reprint author'; but in this study we use the term 'corresponding-author'. In single-author D. P. reviews we coded the single-author as both the first-author and the corresponding-author [18]. We recorded the total number of times a D. P. review was cited from its date of publication to the end of 2016 under the heading TC_{2016} [19,20]. We downloaded all the records and numbers of citations for each D. P. review for each year into spreadsheet software, and we manipulated these data using Microsoft Excel 2016 [21].

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Languages

The language used in publications is one of the main concerns in bibliometric studies. The 9,938 D. P. reviews published over the 25-years of study were written in seven languages. English, the most popular language, comprised 89% of the total D. P. reviews, followed by German (10%). Other languages that were less used were as follows: French (36 reviews), Spanish (7), Italian (3), and one each of Danish and Dutch.

Furthermore, the 1,013 D. P. reviews that were written in German were published in only two journals, namely *Tanz* (Germany) with 1,012 D. P. reviews and *Dancing Times* (UK) with the only one [22]. Similarly, reviews entitled 'Other Dances' [23] in *Ballet Review* and 'Dutch dance days' [24] in *Tanz* (Germany) were published only in Danish and Dutch respectively.

Seven languages were used in *Tanz* (Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish), five in *Dancing Times* (English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish) and two in *Ballet Review* (Danish and English). English was the only language used in *Dance Magazine* for publications of D. P. reviews.




Figure 2

Number of dance performance reviews and citations per publication by year.

Table 1
Characteristics of dance performance reviews in A&HCI, 1992-2016.

Year	<i>TP</i>	<i>TP*</i>	<i>AU*</i>	<i>AU*/TP*</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR/TP</i>	<i>PG</i>	<i>PG/TP</i>
1992	332	332	332	1.0	807	2.4	513	1.5
1993	409	403	403	1.0	772	1.9	576	1.4
1994	328	322	322	1.0	815	2.5	414	1.3
1995	517	517	522	1.0	1077	2.1	664	1.3
1996	954	939	939	1.0	1219	1.3	1124	1.2
1997	434	428	431	1.0	813	1.9	530	1.2
1998	289	288	288	1.0	748	2.6	394	1.4
1999	270	270	270	1.0	787	2.9	360	1.3
2000	485	472	474	1.0	951	2.0	637	1.3
2001	441	439	439	1.0	787	1.8	658	1.5
2002	521	521	521	1.0	850	1.6	665	1.3
2003	409	407	407	1.0	636	1.6	499	1.2
2004	171	168	170	1.0	248	1.5	252	1.5
2005	194	186	189	1.0	209	1.1	404	2.1
2006	212	204	210	1.0	236	1.1	410	1.9
2007	268	256	266	1.0	288	1.1	514	1.9
2008	334	331	340	1.0	357	1.1	680	2.0
2009	286	276	286	1.0	320	1.1	551	1.9
2010	434	421	431	1.0	532	1.2	770	1.8
2011	403	371	374	1.0	500	1.2	610	1.5
2012	437	419	425	1.0	452	1.0	569	1.3
2013	478	420	439	1.0	583	1.2	768	1.6
2014	392	343	357	1.0	393	1.0	681	1.7
2015	494	443	460	1.0	513	1.0	784	1.6
2016	446	417	424	1.0	411	0.92	647	1.5
Total	9938	9593	9719		15304		14674	
Average				1.0		1.5		1.5

TP: total number of dance performance reviews; *AU*: number of authors; *NR*: number of references cited; *PG*: total page count; *: not including anonymous dance performance reviews.

3.2 Publication Output

Figure 2 shows the distribution of the 9,938 D. P. reviews from 1992-2016 and their citations per publication. Obviously there was a publication peak 1996 with 954 D. P. reviews. 466 of these D. P. reviews were published in *Dance Magazine*, 341 in *Dancing Times*, and 147 in *Ballet Review*. J. Anderson was the highest contributor in 1996 with 105 D. P. reviews (11%).

Ho and Ho [5] proposed that the following indicators should be used in studies such as these: the total number of publications (*TP*), the number of authors (*AU*), the number of references cited (*NR*); and the total page count (*PG*). In addition Ho and Ho [5] suggested that (AU^*/TP^*) be used to report the average of number of authors in a publication in the field of dance Ho and Ho [5] proposed similar procedures for art exhibit reviews in A&HCI [12].

Table 1 shows that the average length of a D. P. review length fluctuated slightly, with a maximum of 2.1 pages in 2005 and a minimum of 1.2 pages in 1996, 1997, and 2003, with an overall average length of 1.5 pages. A dance performance review entitled, 'The *Sleeping Beauty*' [25] had the highest number of 28 pages.

The numbers of references cited per D. P. reviews were low and they fluctuated slightly, from a minimum of 0.92 in 2016 to a maximum of 2.9 in 1999, and the average overall was 1.5.

There were 345 anonymous reviews (3.5% of 9,938). In general, these were included in editorials [5]. The typical D. P. reviews (99%) were written by single-authors, although one paper, a review of 'Sergei Filin', did have six [26]. It is possible that such a high percentage of single authors indicates their independent views of art [5].

Among the 836 named authors who contributed 9,593 D. P. reviews in A&HCI, 397 (47% of the 836) published only one D. P. review, 103 (12%) published two, and 43 (5.1%) published three. Only 12 (1.4%) authors published 100 or more the D. P. reviews. Table 2 lists the top 20 productive authors with five indicators: total number of D. P. reviews (*TP*), first-author (*FP*), corresponding-author (*RP*), single-author (*SP*), and collaborative (*CP*) D. P. reviews.

3.3 Editorial Contributions

Jack Anderson who is one of the two founding editors and is a member of the advisory board of *Dance Chronicle* - ranked top for four of five indicators shown in Table 2 - while Jonathan Gray published the most collaborative D. P. reviews. Mary Clarke (editor of *Dancing Times* from 1963 to 2008), ranked 4th with 446 D. P. reviews, all of which were published in *Dancing Times*. Clarke published not only most articles in *Dancing Times* but she ranked 1st in first-author, corresponding-author, and single-author articles in the dance field in A&HCI [5]. George Dorris (one of the founding editors of *Dance Chronicle*, ranked 23th with 73 D. P. reviews of which 66 were in *Dancing Times* and seven in *Ballet Review*, and Jonathan Gray who was the editor of *Dancing Times* from 1963 to 2008 [27], published all 591 of his D. P. reviews in *Dancing Times*, including 542 single-author D. P.

Table 2
Top 20 most productive authors of dance performance reviews during 1992-2016

Author	<i>R (TP)</i>	<i>R (FP)</i>	<i>R (RP)</i>	<i>R (SP)</i>	<i>R (CP)</i>
J. Anderson	1 (714)	1 (713)	1 (713)	1 (713)	21 (1)
J. Gray	2 (591)	2 (562)	2 (542)	2 (542)	1 (49)
Z. Anderson	3 (460)	3 (449)	3 (445)	3 (445)	2 (15)
M. Clarke	4 (446)	4 (442)	4 (433)	4 (433)	3 (13)
D. Jays	5 (219)	6 (219)	5 (210)	5 (210)	5 (9)
F. Pitt	6 (200)	7 (198)	6 (198)	6 (198)	11 (2)
D. Hering	7 (165)	8 (165)	7 (165)	7 (165)	N/A
C. Crisp	8 (131)	9 (131)	8 (131)	8 (131)	N/A
G. Solomons	9 (129)	10 (129)	9 (129)	9 (129)	N/A
L. Garafola	10 (122)	11 (122)	10 (121)	10 (121)	21 (1)
H. Regitz	11 (114)	12 (114)	11 (113)	11 (113)	21 (1)
A. Wesemann	12 (113)	13 (112)	12 (110)	12 (110)	8 (3)
G. Jackson	13 (99)	14 (99)	13 (99)	13 (99)	N/A
R. Greskovic	14 (97)	15 (97)	14 (97)	14 (97)	N/A
M. Willis	14 (97)	15 (97)	15 (96)	15 (96)	21 (1)
G. Dowler	16 (95)	17 (92)	19 (84)	19 (84)	4 (11)
C. Hardy	17 (90)	18 (90)	16 (90)	16 (90)	N/A
T. Hahn	18 (87)	19 (86)	18 (85)	18 (85)	11 (2)
I. Stupnikov	19 (86)	19 (86)	17 (86)	17 (86)	N/A
M.U. West	20 (80)	21 (80)	20 (80)	20 (80)	N/A

TP: total number of dance performance reviews; *FP*: first-author dance performance reviews, *RP*: corresponding-author dance performance reviews; *SP*: single-author dance performance reviews; *CP*: collaborative dance performance reviews; *R*: rank; N/A: not available.

reviews and the highest number (49) of collaborative D. P. reviews. Finally, Wendy Perron who was editor in chief of *Dance Magazine* from 2004 to 2013 (<http://www.dancemagazine.com/meet-the-editors-2398353884.html>) published 63 dance performance reviews in *Dance Magazine* and four in *Tanz*.

Editors thus appear to be avid writers for their respective journals in this context. Other examples include, Clement Crisp, and Joel Lobenthal. Finally, we note that most productive writers in this field preferred to publish their works in certain journals in Web of Science category of dance [5].




Figure 3

Publications of the four journals, 1992-2016.

3.4 Journals

9,938 dance performance reviews were published in four of eight journals in the Web of Science category of dance. *Dancing Times* (UK) published most D. P. reviews with 4,468 (45% of 9,938 D. P. reviews), while *Dance Magazine* (USA) ranked second with 3,031 (30%) followed by *Ballet Review* (USA) (1,347 articles; 14%) and *Tanz* (Germany) (1,092; 11%). No D. P. reviews were published in the other four journals in the category of dance including *Dance Chronicle*, *Dance Research*, *Dance Research Journal*, and *Research in Dance Education*. Figure 3 shows the annual number of D. P. reviews in each of the four journals from 1992 to 2016. The figure shows a decreasing trend of D. P. reviews from 2003 in *Dance Magazine*, while *Tanz* became one of the most productive journals. Similar publication trends have been reported in dance field [5].

3.5 Words in the Titles of Dance Performance Reviews

Table 3 shows the 26 most frequently used words in the titles of D P reviews from 1992 to 2016, as well as in five-year periods within this time span. The word 'Ballet', for example New York City Ballet, Royal Ballet, etc., was the most frequently used single word in D. P.




Figure 4

Comparison of the trends of 'Triple Bill', 'Double Bill', and 'Mixed Bill' during 1992-2016.

reviews titles during the period 1992–2016, followed by 'dance', 'company', 'royal', 'Bill', and 'theatre'. Some title-words related to names of people in the dance field and particular ballets, such as, for example, 'Romeo', 'Juliet', and 'Giselle'. It is clear from Table 3 that the use of 'Bill', 'Triple', and 'Mixed' showed sharply increasing trends. J. Gray ranked top in D. P. reviews of 'Triple Bill' (44 D. P. reviews; 31% of 84 reviews) followed by followed by Z. Anderson. Figure 4 shows the growth in the number of performance reviews for *Swan Lake*, *Sleeping Beauty*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Cinderella*. Table 4 shows the numbers and names of authors who published three or more related D. P. reviews about these ballets.

Table 3
Top 26 most frequently used single word dance performance reviews' title ($TP > 70$)

Words in title	<i>TP</i>	92-16 <i>R</i> (%)	92-96 <i>R</i> (%)	97-01 <i>R</i> (%)	02-06 <i>R</i> (%)	07-11 <i>R</i> (%)	12-16 <i>R</i> (%)
Ballet	1,371	1 (14)	1 (16)	1 (24)	1 (13)	1 (8.7)	1 (6.9)
Dance	911	2 (9.2)	2 (11)	2 (14)	2 (8.4)	2 (6.2)	3 (5.3)
Company	465	3 (4.7)	3 (6.5)	3 (9.1)	3 (4.4)	3 (2.5)	25 (0.71)
Royal	197	4 (2.0)	5 (2.0)	5 (2.7)	5 (2.4)	7 (1.7)	13 (1.3)
Bill	188	5 (1.9)	107 (0.24)	91 (0.31)	N/A	4 (2.0)	2 (6.3)
Theatre	188	5 (1.9)	47 (0.39)	4 (5.1)	4 (2.7)	12 (1.5)	35 (0.58)
New	165	7 (1.7)	8 (1.5)	8 (2.0)	11 (1.5)	12 (1.5)	8 (1.7)
American	155	8 (1.6)	6 (1.8)	7 (2.1)	9 (1.7)	10 (1.6)	30 (0.62)
Theater	155	8 (1.6)	4 (4.0)	16 (0.94)	22 (0.73)	23 (0.81)	41 (0.49)
Swan	152	10 (1.5)	13 (1.1)	14 (1.0)	6 (1.9)	5 (2.0)	7 (1.9)
National	148	11 (1.5)	10 (1.2)	6 (2.2)	13 (1.1)	14 (1.4)	11 (1.4)
Lake	147	12 (1.5)	12 (1.2)	16 (0.94)	6 (1.9)	6 (1.9)	9 (1.7)
City	127	13 (1.3)	9 (1.5)	8 (2.0)	20 (0.80)	18 (1.2)	23 (0.80)
Beauty	119	14 (1.2)	20 (0.67)	16 (0.94)	10 (1.7)	9 (1.7)	13 (1.3)
Sleeping	112	15 (1.1)	18 (0.71)	19 (0.89)	11 (1.5)	7 (1.7)	16 (1.1)
York	110	16 (1.1)	15 (1.0)	10 (1.8)	14 (1.1)	20 (0.93)	22 (0.85)
Festival	108	17 (1.1)	31 (0.51)	44 (0.52)	8 (1.8)	11 (1.6)	12 (1.4)
Opera	102	18 (1.0)	7 (1.7)	11 (1.4)	16 (1.0)	33 (0.58)	47 (0.40)
School	88	19 (0.89)	24 (0.63)	23 (0.78)	26 (0.66)	27 (0.70)	10 (1.6)
Triple	85	20 (0.86)	878 (0.039)	N/A	530 (0.066)	21 (0.87)	4 (3.0)
Romeo	83	21 (0.84)	20 (0.67)	40 (0.57)	77 (0.33)	16 (1.4)	15 (1.2)
Juliet	81	22 (0.82)	20 (0.67)	32 (0.63)	77 (0.33)	17 (1.3)	17 (1.1)
Giselle	79	23 (0.79)	27 (0.59)	14 (1.0)	14 (1.1)	21 (0.87)	30 (0.62)
Nutcracker	79	23 (0.79)	47 (0.39)	27 (0.73)	26 (0.66)	18 (1.2)	17 (1.1)
Ballets	72	25 (0.72)	13 (1.1)	19 (0.89)	58 (0.40)	29 (0.64)	47 (0.40)
Mixed	70	26 (0.7.0)	N/A	N/A	N/A	14 (1.4)	5 (2.0)

TP: total number of dance performance reviews in the study period; *R* (%): rank (percentage of dance performance reviews containing this title-word); N/A: not available.

Table 4
Comparison of dance performance reviews with topics of *Swan Lake*, *Sleeping Beauty*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Cinderella* (TP □ 3)

Author	<i>Swan Lake</i> Rank (TP)	Author	<i>Sleeping Beauty</i> Rank (TP)	Author	<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> Rank (TP)	Author	<i>Cinderella</i> Rank (TP)
J. Gray	1 (28)	J. Gray	1 (26)	J. Gray	1 (15)	J. Gray	1 (11)
M. Clarke	2 (11)	M. Clarke	2 (17)	F. Pitt	2 (4)	Z. Anderson	2 (4)
Z. Anderson	2 (11)	D. Vaughan	3 (6)	Z. Anderson	2 (4)	M. Clarke	3 (3)
R. Greskovic	4 (6)	F. Pitt	4 (5)	P. Daly	2 (4)		
C. Crisp	5 (5)	M. Haegeman	5 (4)	M. Clarke	5 (3)		
		Z. Anderson	5 (4)				

TP: total number of dance performance reviews

4. Summary

The dance performance reviews in the Web of Science category of dance indexed in A&HCI were published in seven languages. English was the dominant language followed by German. Most D. P. reviews were written by single-authors, and most authors preferred to publish their reviews in the same journal. J. Anderson published the most first-author, corresponding-author, and single-author D. P. reviews while J. Gray collaborated most. Only four journals in Web of Science category of dance published D. P. reviews. Altogether, 45% of the D. P. reviews were published in *Dancing Times*. J. Gray published most D. P. reviews for the four typical topics of *Swan Lake*, *Sleeping Beauty*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Cinderella*. In recent years, more authors, especially J. Gray and Z. Anderson, have paid more attention to Triple Bills, Double Bills, and Mixed Bills.

References

- [1] Hsu, Y. H. E. and Ho, Y. S., Highly cited articles in health care sciences and services field in Science Citation Index Expanded: A bibliometric analysis for 1958-2012. *Methods of Information in Medicine*, 53 (6), 446-458 (2014).
- [2] Kolle, S. R., Shankarappa, T. H. and Ho, Y. S., Highly cited articles in Science Citation Index Expanded - subject category of horticulture: A bibliometric analysis. *Erwerbs-Obstbau*, 59 (2), 133-145 (2017).

-
- [3] Campanario, J. M., González, L. and Rodríguez, C., Structure of the impact factor of academic journals in the field of Education and Educational Psychology: Citations from editorial board members. *Scientometrics*, 69 (1), 37-56 (2006).
- [4] Ivanović, D. and Ho, Y. S., Highly cited articles in the information science and library science category in Social Science Citation Index: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 48 (1), 36-46 (2016).
- [5] Ho, H. C. and Ho, Y. S., Publications in dance field in Arts & Humanities Citation Index: A bibliometric analysis. *Scientometrics*, 105 (2), 1031-1040 (2015).
- [6] Sigogneau, A., An analysis of document types published in journals related to physics: Proceeding papers recorded in the Science Citation Index database. *Scientometrics*, 47 (3), 589-604 (2000).
- [7] Ingwersen, P., Larsen, B., Garcia-Zorita, J. C., Serrano-López, A. E. and Sanz-Casado, E., Influence of proceedings papers on citation impact in seven sub-fields of sustainable energy research 2005-2011. *Scientometrics*, 101 (2), 1273-1292 (2014).
- [8] Agudelo, D., Bretón-López, J. and Buela-Casal, G., Bibliometric analysis of the reviews of Clinical Psychology published in Spanish. *Psicothema*, 15 (4), 507-516 (2003).
- [9] Ho, Y. S. and Kahn, M., A bibliometric study of highly cited reviews in the Science Citation Index Expanded™. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65 (2), 372-385 (2014).
- [10] Nicolaisen, J., The scholarliness of published peer reviews: A bibliometric study of book reviews in selected social science fields. *Research Evaluation*, 11 (3), 129-140 (2002).
- [11] Liu, W. S., Ding, Y. S. and Gu, M. D., Book reviews in academic journals: patterns and dynamics. *Scientometrics*, 110 (1), 355-364 (2017).
- [12] Wang, W. M. and Ho, Y. S., Bibliometric analysis of art exhibit reviews in the Arts & Humanities Citation Index. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 22 (1), 59-68 (2017).
- [13] Ardanuy, J., Quintana, L. and Urbano, C., International presence of studies on Catalan literature in the Arts & Humanities Citation Index. *Revista Española de Documentación Científica*, 33 (2), 298-309 (2010).
- [14] Yalçın, H., Bibliometric profile of *Journal of National Folklore* (2007-2009). *Milli Folklor*, 85, 205-211 (2010).
- [15] Al, U., Şahiner, M. and Tonta, Y., Arts and humanities literature: Bibliometric characteristics of contributions by Turkish authors. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 57 (8), 1011-1022 (2006).
- [16] Dorta-González, P. and Ramírez-Sánchez, M., Production and impact of the Spanish research institutions in *Arts & Humanities Citation Index* (2003-2012). *Arbor-Ciencia Pensamiento y Cultura*, 190 (770), Article Number: a191 (2014).
- [17] Lauk, K., Bibliometric analysis of Estonian folklore research and folklore: Electronic journal of folklore. *Trames-Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 20 (1), 3-16 (2016).
-

- [18] Lin, C. L. and Ho, Y. S., A bibliometric analysis of publications on pluripotent stem cell research. *Cell Journal*, 17 (1), 59-70 (2015).
- [19] Chuang, K. Y., Wang, M. H. and Ho, Y. S., High-impact papers presented in the subject category of water resources in the Essential Science Indicators database of the Institute for Scientific Information. *Scientometrics*, 87 (3), 551-562 (2011).
- [20] Wang, M. H., Fu, H. Z. and Ho, Y. S., Comparison of universities' scientific performance using bibliometric indicators. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 16 (2), 1-19 (2011).
- [21] Li, Z. and Ho, Y. S., Use of citation per publication as an indicator to evaluate contingent valuation research. *Scientometrics*, 75 (1), 97-110 (2008).
- [22] Andersen, J., Nacho Duato - Multiplicity. Forms of quietness and emptiness. *Dancing Times*, 100 (1194), 72 (2010).
- [23] Crisp, C., 'Other Dances'. *Ballet Review*, 30 (4), 88 (2002).
- [24] Anonymous, Dutch dance days. *Tanz*, 10, 37 (2015).
- [25] Macaulay, A., The Sleeping Beauty. *Ballet Review*, 43 (4), 82-109 (2015).
- [26] Tikhomirova, A., Zwolinska, L., Shadur, N., Rosano, N., Sarli, G. and Rodriguez, M., Sergei Filin. *Tanz*, 12, 29 (2013).
- [27] Anonymous, Mary Clarke - Editor, 'Dancing Times', 1963-2008 - Tribute. *Dancing Times*, 98 (1177), 11 (2008).