Errata

In: R. B. *Baldauf*, Jr., B. H. *Jernudd* (USA): Language Use Patterns in the Fisheries Periodical Literature, *Scientometrics*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (1983) 245–255, the correct text of pages 249–250 is the following:

Table 3
A comparison of characteristics of English and non-English language publications of four variables (values in percentages)

Number of authors	No.	1	2	3	4 +	Corp	x^2
English	589	57	20	08	05	10	
Non-English	208	59	21	08	03	09	0.93
Year of publication	**No.**	**Pre 76**	**1976**	**1977**	**1978**		
English	662	02	14	68	16		
Non-English	216	13	27	52	08		72.27**
FR, DE, JA	104	07	17	70	06		14.51*
ES, RU, OT	112	19	36	36	09		106.32**
Document type	**No.**	**Article**	**Report**	**Num**	**Conf**	**Other**	
English	666	44	29	06	18	03	
Non-English	218	55	18	09	13	05	17.77*
Article subcategory	**No.**	**Gen**	**Survey**	**Stats**	**Stock**	**Sport**	
English	666	08	15	29	44	04	
Non-English	218	11	25	21	42	01	18.57**

*$p < 0.01$
**$p < 0.001$

significantly more quickly than non-English ones ($\chi^2 = 72.27$, $p < 0.001$). Although documents in French (FR), German (DE), and Japanese (JA), and documents in Spanish (ES), Russian (RU), and low frequency languages (OT) (i.e., ten articles or less) were abstracted significantly more slowly than documents in English, the latter group was particularly disadvantaged.

A number of non-language hypotheses could be advanced to explain these differences. Our assumption was that most of these explanations would relate to data that was randomly distributed across linguistic groupings. For example, the hypothesis that postal delays might have caused these differences would seem improbable when one considers that *ASFA* is based in Europe. English language publications from North America, Australia, New Zealand and India would be at more a disadvantage than those in the comparison groups, from Germany, France, the Soviet Union and Spain. Language would therefore seem to be the singificant factor in how quickly research information is available for communication through *ASFA*.

Other significant differences between English and non-English language publications were found. When looking at document type, non-English language publications contained a significantly higher proportion (55 vs 44) of journal articles but fewer reports (18 vs 29) than English language ones. Reflection on this data suggested that these differences may have been due to to the large number of United State government documents abstracted in *ASFA*.When the category reports" is removed from the analysis, the trend toward more frequent journal publication remains but is no longer significant. This result suggests that differences for document type may be more related to different national patterns of research funding and reporting rather than to language related differences in the use of publication medium.

The article subcategory classification used by *ASFA* also showed significant differences by language. A higher proportion of statistical publications ($\chi^2 = 18.57$, $p < < 0.001$) were in English (29 vs 21) than in other languages while fewer survey and prospecting publications were in English (15 vs 25). These results suggest a tendency for statistical information to be made available in the dominant language, English, while information related to the availability of particular fish stocks is communicated in the language of the user.

Number of authors was not found to differ between English and other language publications. Just under sixty percent of all publications were produced by individuals.

The location of the study and type of fisheries data were examined more generally. Of the twenty-one study locations which had ten or more studies conducted in them, only two, the northwest Atlantic region, and the North American lakes region, were written solely in English. In four of the twenty-one locations, less than half of the studies were written in English. These study locations included the Polar southwest, 8 of 15 publications in Spanish; the Pacific southeast, 15 of 28 in Spanish; the Pacific northwest, 10 of 22 in Japanese; and the Atlantic southeast, 10 of 20 in French. Thus while a variety of languages was found in most study locations, there is a tendency for regional research to be published in the national languages.

Similar results were found when type of fishery was examined. Of the seventeen major types of fisheries which had ten or more studies conducted about them, only two, sport fishing and trout fishing were entirely in English. In the other fifteen fisheries, fluency in at least one language other than English would be necessary to read the literature in the field.

National or international communication responses

To answer the second question of whether English language dominance was a response to the need to communicate with a largely international audience, or whether other factors were largely responsible, the language of the article, language of the abstract, and country of first author data were examined. It was hypothesized that a mismatch among these variables could be an indication of an attempt to communicate the research to an audience which differed linguistically from that of the author. As a first step a number of languages were diagrammed schematically so that the relationship of the language to the abstract to the address of first author could be examined.