

## From the editor

Harvey S. James Jr.<sup>1</sup>

Published online: 17 July 2015  
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2015

For the 2014 reporting year (most recent available), *Agriculture and Human Values* had an Impact Factor rating of 1.617, the highest it has been since Thompson Reuters began including the index in its Journal Citation Reports in 2005. The Impact Factor is calculated as the ratio of the number of citations to articles published in the journal in the previous 2 years to the total number of articles published in those years. The 5 year Impact Factor is 2.196, also the highest it has been and the first time it has exceeded 2.000. Google Scholar calculates an h5-index at 29 for the journal in 2014, which is an increase over the previous year. This means that during the previous 5 years, there have been 29 articles published in *Agriculture and Human Values* that had at least 29 citations each. In 2014 we also saw the largest number of submissions to the journal, now well over 300. This means the acceptance rate is the lowest it has been, currently at about 10 %. I hope to be able to increase the number of articles published in each issue in order to avoid further declines in the acceptance rate. The good news is that the journal is doing well, which is a testament to the dedicated and capable scholars who publish in the journal and a renewed signal of the importance of the academic debates conducted herein.

This issue of *Agriculture and Human Values* contains the following articles. Hayes-Conroy shows how societal norms and values affect what it means to be food secure in a case study of food insecure women in Colombia. Thompson, Reimer and Prokopy present results of a survey of

Illinois farmers that shows how farmer attitudes about the environment and the farm as a business affect their agricultural management practices. Sanderson and Frey assess the effectiveness of groundwater management efforts over the high plains aquifer in Kansas. Vitiello et al. re-assess the relationship among food banks, local agriculture and food security in the US. Grey and Patel examine the relationship between food sovereignty and the struggles of Indigenous groups in North America. Kelly et al. examine trends in food retailing in Thailand. Som Castellano uses data from an Ohio study to examine the extent to which gender inequalities exist among participants of alternative food networks. Trivette examines how proximity and relationships interact to affect definitions of what local food means. Krzywoszynska uses the case of artisan wine production in Italy to show how variations in product quality can aid the marketability of ecologically embedded foods. Kurland and Aleci interview market managers to understand the cultural evolution of farmers and other public markets. Timmermann and Félix argue that the nature of farm work improves with agroecological farming compared with conventional farming practices. Mason et al. examine how differences male and female headed households and control of resources affect food security of smallscale farming households in Tanzania. Hill uses case studies of banana production to critique the method by which scholars write about and evaluate the food system. Book reviews and the list of books received round out this issue of the journal.

---

✉ Harvey S. James Jr.  
hjames@missouri.edu

<sup>1</sup> Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics,  
University of Missouri, 146 Mumford Hall, Columbia,  
MO 65211, USA