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Preface

Initiated by Professors Olle Persson and Peter Ingwersen, bibliometric researchers in the Nordic countries have arranged annual Nordic workshops on bibliometrics since 1996. The general scope of the Nordic Workshop on Bibliometrics and Research Policy is to present recent bibliometric research in the Nordic countries, to create better linkages between the bibliometric research groups and their PhD students, and to link bibliometric research with research policy.

The workshop language is English and the workshop is open to participants from any nation. The 21st Nordic Workshop on Bibliometrics and Research Policy (NWB’2016) was organized by Aalborg University (Copenhagen branch), in collaboration with University of Copenhagen and Copenhagen University Library. It was held at the University of Aalborg, in Copenhagen, on November 2-4th, 2016 with more than 100 participants.

In total, we received 37 submissions. After reviewing the submissions, the program committee decided which papers were to be presented orally and which as poster presentations. 19 papers were accepted as oral presentations. These, as well as 2 invited keynote talks and 12 posters, are presented as abstracts in these proceedings. The posters and oral presentation slides are also available for viewing and peer-feedback at figshare (with citable DOIs):

https://figshare.com/collections/NWB_2016_Posters/3581330

We would like to thank all authors for their submissions, the session chairs and the keynote speakers, Ronald Rousseau and David Budtz Pedersen, for their contributions to the workshop, photographer Balázs Schlemmer and the student volunteers, Annika, Halle and Lejla, for their diligent efforts during the workshop. Further, we would like to thank the sponsors for their generous financial support, without which the Nordic workshops could not be organised in their current form.

The NWB’2016 website is at http://nwb.aau.dk. Follow on twitter as @nwb2016 / #nwb2016, and on flickr as nwb2016.
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KEYNOTE 1: Diversity measurement, knowledge integration and heterogeneity of networks

Ronald Rousseau
University of Antwerp and KU Leuven
ronald.rousseau@kuleuven.be

Abstract
In this talk we discuss the notion of inequality (concentration, diversity). We begin by recalling the classical notions of a Lorenz curve, the Gini index and the Simpson index. Then we come to the problem that classical measures do not allow to refer to changes in diversity in terms of percentages. For this, one needs so-called “true” diversity measures. Using this notion we propose a definition of heterogeneity of networks. Yet, even these basic ‘true’ diversity measures do not capture the complete notion of diversity. Such measures must moreover take variety, balance and disparity into account. Following Leinster and Cobbold it is shown that a whole family of such measures exists. This is then applied to measure interdisciplinarity of articles based on their references. We conclude by stating that the use of proper diversity/interdisciplinarity indicators can be valuable in comparative studies of emergent fields such as nanotechnology and synthetic biology where claims of novelty and interdisciplinarity are often heard but rarely substantiated.

Profile
Ronald Rousseau was guest professor at University of Antwerp and at KU Leuven. He holds two PhDs: one in Mathematics and one in Library and Information Science. He has a broad set of research interests including almost all aspects of informetrics, scientometrics and bibliometrics, as well as mathematics and ecology. He publishes widely in these areas with a wide network of collaborators from all over the world. He has particularly strong relations to China, where he is honorary professor and guest professor at several universities. He was President of ISSI, the International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics, in the period 2007-2015; and is the recipient of several prestigious awards and honours, including the Derek de Solla Price award for research in scientometrics. He is also editorial or advisory board member of the most central journals in the field of informetrics and a co-editor of the new open access Journal of Data and Information Science.
KEYNOTE 2  
Responsible Metrics for Open Human Science  

David Budtz Pedersen  
Aalborg University Copenhagen  
davidp@hum.aau.dk

Abstract  
Open communication has been a central cornerstone of research in the humanities and social sciences since the inception of modern universities. In our increasingly data-driven era, research practices and dissemination are facing new challenges as well as opportunities. In this talk I reflect upon the significance of the open science movement and the necessity of adjusting impact assessment frameworks to accommodate open science policy.

The talk discusses how openness in contemporary research practices may be used to create a set of more humane metrics, also referred to as humetrics, in order to gain a broader perspective on the impact of science. I argue for a more procedural, dynamic and responsible approach to research metrics, which includes ‘productive interactions’ rather than focusing merely on outputs and products. Among other things, this shift in emphasis requires a new understanding of knowledge circulation, which acknowledges the interconnectedness of research institutions, companies, civil society and public authorities. My discussion will draw upon research funded by the European Commission Horizon 2020 ACCOMPLISSH Project and the European Open Science Policy Platform.

Profile  
David Budtz Pedersen is Associate Professor and Co-Director of the Humanomics Research Centre, Aalborg University Copenhagen. His current research focuses on research and innovation policy with a special interest in research evaluation, impact assessment, and Open Science and Innovation. He holds PhD, MA and BA degrees in philosophy and science policy studies. David Budtz has more than 75 entries on his list of publications ranging from research papers, research monographs, edited volumes, policy reports, op-ed columns, newspaper articles etc. In 2007, he became a member of the European Commission’s FP7 Programme Committee for the Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities, dealing with analysis and priority-setting in SSH research. In 2012, he supported the Danish Presidency of the European Union in the areas of science and innovation, co-organising the high-level conference “Science in Dialogue” at University of Southern Denmark. More recently, David was the successful Bid Coordinator of Denmark’s campaign to host Europe's largest interdisciplinary conference Euroscience Open Forum 2014 in Copenhagen. Dr. Budtz Pedersen is regularly acting as policy adviser to European governments, funding agencies and knowledge-based companies. He tweets as @HumanomicsMap.
FP7-funded publications - Comparative evaluation of European countries?

Guillaume Warnan
Research Intelligence Consultant, Elsevier, Radarweg 29, Amsterdam, 1043 NX
g.warnan@elsevier.com

Abstract
On January 19th 2016, DG Research of the European Commission released its “Ex Post Evaluation of the Seventh Framework Programme” report. This report aimed at giving answers on the interest and achievements of the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7). One part of this evaluation focused on publications funded by the FP7, but remained quite high-level, focusing solely on European funding schemes (Space, ICT, ERC, PEOPLE, etc.).

Nowhere in those evaluation reports can one find information on how each member states performed in comparison to its national research and to the other European member states. Who are the most performing European countries in terms of citations (Field-Weighted Citation Impact, top-cited publications), international collaboration (Field-Weighted Internationalisation Score), corporate collaboration or compared to their “national” research?

This presentation would focus on such a comparison and would be articulated into 3 main parts:

— Introduction to the FP7 ex-post evaluation and presentation of the methodology
— European member states’ comparison with a focus on Nordic countries
— Analysis of Nordic institutions’ performance

References

Pohl, H. et al. (2014) “Level the playing field in scientific international collaboration with the use of a new indicator: Field-Weighted Internationalization Score”, Research Trends, Issue 39, pp. 37

Annex to the Staff Working Document: Part 1, pp.32-36
Abstract

One of the challenges faced by the funders of research in conducting bibliometric analyses is knowing which publications to include.

This paper presents the interim findings in a two-year study looking at the effect of different methods of collecting information on publications.

In 2015 Researchfish began a 2 year study with 6 UK universities and 10 different funders to look at the feasibility of incorporating information collected by:

1. Passive collection of publications by using funding attribution metadata.
2. Active collection of publications from researchers by universities.
3. Active collection of publications from researchers by Researchfish.

This paper describes how the information was collected, examines the technical challenges and lessons learned from the integration of this data, the benefits for researchers, universities and funders arising from attribution and open access policies and discusses the potential impact of the findings on bibliometric analyses.

This paper also includes preliminary results from the second phase of the study, widened to include over 60 funders in Europe and North America, with particular focus on nordic funders using Researchfish.
Medical research and disease burden. A method for classifying publications according to the Health Research Classification System (HRCS)

Dag W. Aksnes
Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education NIFU
dag.w.aksnes@nifu.no

Abstract

The Health Research Classification System (HRCS) is a system for classifying biomedical and health research which was developed by the UK Clinical Research Collaboration. The main purpose of the system is to provide an overview of health research funding. The research is classified according to a two dimensional framework. One dimension is used to classify the type of health or disease being studied. There are 21 categories encompassing various diseases and areas of health.

The HRCS system is mainly developed for analyzing the funding of research. In this study, a method for classifying the publication output according to HRCS categories is presented. The method adopts a combination of journal based and content based delineation using topic specific key-words. Details of the classification method will be described along with a discussion of the challenges involved. Based on the method, it is possible to analyze how the research output compares with the research funding amount, which also has been classified according to the HRCS-system. Preliminary results on these characteristics of Norwegian medical research will be presented. As a next step, the results may be linked to disease burden measurements, for example in terms of prevalence, mortality, extent of disability and social economic costs of various diseases. This represent new and interesting background information in the setting of research funding priorities.
Investigating the growth and distribution of a priority research area: A bibliometric study of rare disease research

Alexander Rushforth, Alfredo Yegros & Thed van Leeuwen
CWTS, Leiden University
a.d.rushforth@cwts.leidenuniv.nl

Philippe Mongeon
ESBI, Université de Montréal, Canada

Abstract

In this paper, we use bibliometric mapping and analysis tools to explore the global ‘research landscape’ of rare diseases – a category of diseases which over the past two decades has been subject to significant prioritization efforts in the European Union and North America (Melnikova 2012). Despite concerted efforts, a number of epistemic conditions governing rare disease research are often said to stand in the way of building increased capacity for this area within contemporary research systems. As such rare diseases offer a compelling case through which to explore tensions and controversies emerging between the actual ‘supply’ of scientific knowledge on the one hand versus the expectant ‘demands’ by stakeholders for science to address unmet social needs and ‘grand challenges’ (Sarewitz and Pielke 2007; Wallace and Rafols 2015).

Retrieving literature based on classifications given by the European Commission’s Orphanet database, our efforts to map the scientific literature on rare diseases is posed through the following questions:

1. What share of scientific publications within the biomedical literature has been devoted to rare diseases? Has the share of publications on rare diseases increased over time?
2. Is the citation impact of publications dealing with rare diseases systematically lower than other publications in the biomedical literature? Are there differences in terms of citation impact among specific rare diseases?
3. What is the position of rare disease research within the global biomedical research landscape?

References

Sarewitz, Daniel and Pielke, Roger A (2007), 'The neglected heart of science policy: reconciling supply of and demand for science', Environmental Science & Policy, 10 (1), 5-16.
Indicators as judgment devices: The use of bibliometrics for evaluating candidates for professorships in biomedicine and economics

Björn Hammarfelt
University of Borås & CWTS, Leiden University
bjorn.hammarfelt@hb.se

Alexander D. Rushforth
CWTS, Leiden University
a.d.rushforth@cwts.leidenuniv.nl

Abstract
The number of publications has been a fundamental merit in the competition for academic positions since the late 18th century. Today, the simple counting of publications has been supplemented with a whole range of bibliometric measures, which supposedly not only measure the volume of research but also its impact. In this study, we investigate how bibliometrics are used for evaluating the impact and quality of publications in two specific settings: biomedicine and economics. Our study exposes the extent and type of metrics used in external evaluations of candidates for academic positions at Swedish universities. Moreover, we show how different bibliometric indicators, both explicitly and implicitly, are employed to value and rank candidates. Our findings contribute to a further understanding of bibliometric indicators as “judgment devices” employed to evaluate individuals and their published works within specific fields. We also show how “expertise” in using bibliometrics for evaluative purposes is negotiated at the interface between domain knowledge and skills in using indicators. In fact, examiners in these documents emerge as experts in three roles: 1) as domain experts 2) experts on metrics and 3) experts on how metrics are used and valued within their field. In short expertise here means evaluating not only publications but also judgment devices. In line with these results we propose that the use of metrics in this context is best described as a form of “citizen bibliometrics” – an underspecified term which we build upon in this paper.
Philosophical and theoretical considerations on bibliometric analysis

Thed van Leeuwen
CWTS, Leiden University
leeuwen@cwts.leidenuniv.nl

Alexander D. Rushforth
CWTS, Leiden University
a.d.rushforth@cwrs.leidenuniv.nl

Abstract

Previously we explored the distinction between evaluative and descriptive bibliometrics (van Leeuwen, 2004). While the main argument in making this distinction was the ‘reach’ of the conclusions drawn in descriptive bibliometric studies in comparison to evaluative applications of bibliometrics, it never felt really fully elaborated. In this next step we will use a French tradition of philosophy and history of science to further align our thoughts on the distinction between descriptive and evaluative bibliometrics.

Assuming Pierre Duhem was right in his Law of Cognitive Complementarity (Rescher, 2006), we realize that accuracy and detail stand in rather tense relationship. It is this tension, based upon the levels of analysis always at stake in bibliometric studies, that plays a role in understanding and interpreting outcomes of bibliometric studies. Findings of bibliometric analyses are often extrapolated in a downward fashion, thereby running the risk of drawing conclusions that are nearly always incorrect, and at least unfair.

By bringing in the work of Michel Foucault (Rabinow, 1984), and in particular the various phases that can be distinguished within his oeuvre, we can further elaborate on the distinction between descriptive and evaluative bibliometrics. The archaeological approach in which description and understanding of historical developments play a role would link to the macro level of bibliometric studies, and as such is descriptive by nature, while the genealogical approach centers around the working and functioning of power. Related to bibliometrics, we link this to meso level, within the genealogical approach a further focus on the ethical dimension clearly relates to the micro level.

References


A replication study: Seglen’s work on journal impact factors

Ronald Rousseau
University of Antwerp and KU Leuven, Belgium
ronald.rousseau@kuleuven.be

Lin Zhang
KU Leuven, Belgium

Gunnar Sivertsen
Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education – NIFU
gunnar.sivertsen@nifu.no

Abstract

• We confirm Seglen’s observation of the lack of causal relationship between article citedness and the impact factor of the journal in which the article is published. Our test in a much larger dataset than Seglen’s provided only a marginally larger correlation.

• We add the observation that the lack of relationship is more evident among the majority of researchers with average or lower citedness than among the minority of highly cited authors.

• We also confirm Seglen’s specific observation that less cited authors do not gain from publishing in high impact journals; highly cited authors, however, do benefit.

• We used two methods to operationalize citedness: one uses the absolute number of citations during a three-year citation window, close to Seglen’s approach, while the other one is a relative method with a variable citation window. It turned out that results do not depend on the exact method, supporting the robustness of Seglen’s observations.

• The article citedness distributions – for the two measures of citedness - are markedly different for journals with a low JIF (JIF < 5) or with a higher JIF (JIF > 10).

• The average value of ‘Pearson Correlation between JIF and article citedness’ showed a clear decline from the higher cited author group towards the lower cited ones.

• None of our findings are contrary to the understanding that journal impact factors cannot be used for the evaluation of individual researchers and their publications.
Evaluating publications across business disciplines: Inferring interdisciplinary 'exchange rates' from intradisciplinary author rankings

Timo Korkeamäki
Hanken School of Economics
timo.korkeamaki@hanken.fi

Jukka Sihvonen & Sami Vähämaa
University of Vaasa

Abstract
This paper proposes a novel approach for comparing publications across business disciplines. Specifically, we aim to provide an objective method for evaluating the interdisciplinary value of publications based on intradisciplinary author rankings. Using publication data from the leading journals in accounting, economics, finance, management, and marketing, we first construct intradisciplinary author rankings and then utilize these rankings to estimate the marginal effect of an additional publication on the individual’s ranking within her own discipline. Based on the implied effort required for improving individual’s intradisciplinary ranking, we infer interdisciplinary “exchange rates” for evaluating the value of top-ranked publications across disciplines. Our estimates indicate that the value of a single single-authored publication in a top-ranked journal is highest in accounting and lowest in marketing. We confirm the validity of our “exchange rate” approach by constructing an interdisciplinary author ranking in which authors from the different disciplines are uniformly distributed across the ranking list.
Using eye-tracking to develop key indicators for posters in national evaluations: Report of the pilot test at STI2016, Valencia

Lorna Wildgaard & Haakon Lund
Royal School of Library and Information Science, Faculty of the Humanities, Copenhagen University
lorna.wildgaard@hum.ku.dk
hl@hum.ku.dk

Abstract
Posters are the recognized medium for presenting new and innovative research at conferences. They are communicative support devices that encapsulate 6 essential qualities in effective research practice: doing research, writing a paper, getting it published, producing a visualization, verbally disseminating the results and engaging in the academic community. Accordingly, they are a form of output rewarded in research evaluations. But, even though posters are recognized in evaluation exercises, we believe they are still regarded as low rank, entry-level publications. Rather, it is the subsequent articles that are considered to carry the real “scientific” importance and thus highly ranked in evaluations. Yet posters have an important role to play, as they are one of the key ways early research is disseminated and how we interact with our academic community. Their effectiveness and utility therefore needs to be established for fair evaluation (Ilic & Rowe, 2013; Goodhand et al, 2011; Rowe & Ilic, 2009; Salzl et al, 2008; Halligan, 2008). We believe that by exploring the perceptions, attitudes and experiences of conference participants, we will be able to investigate the value of poster and perhaps unlock their potential for successful knowledge transfer. In this poster, we report the results of a pilot study at the recent Science and Technology conference in Valencia. Test persons were asked to interact in the poster sessions wearing eye-tracking glasses and respond to a survey about their attitudes and experiences to the poster session. With this knowledge we can begin to develop key indicators that will both inform poster design and evaluation practices.

References
Weighing the kilo-authors: how particle physics is affecting evaluations

Eva Isaksson
Helsinki University Library, Research Services / Metrics
Eva.Isaksson@helsinki.fi

Abstract
Particle physics collaborations are a challenge to how we are doing bibliometrics calculations. The World University Rankings’ decision to exclude physics “kilo-author” collaborations with over 1,000 authors from the overall 2015-2016 university rankings reflects this situation (Ross, 2015). On a national or institutional level, these kilo-author contributions are usually treated as annoying anomalies. Yet it is fairly easy to quantify and visualize these publications.

In this contribution, the focus is in particle physics collaborations by University of Helsinki. What is the share of kilo-authored papers? How do these affect the number of collaborating institutions? What do these collaborations look like in VOSviewer visualizations? How much do they distort the evaluation of overlapping research areas like astronomy? Data from the most recent evaluation of University of Helsinki publications (Forsman et al. 2014) and current publication data from the UH Pure research database TUHAT are used.

There is one Finnish university with 13.2% of all citations coming from particle physics collaborations. What about the other Finnish universities?

Looking beyond these problems, what do the particle physicists themselves expect from bibliometrics? A brief case study of the publications of the sub-kilo CDF collaboration (~400 authors) is presented.

References

Infrastructures as an analytical framework for understanding research evaluation systems

Fredrik Åström
Lund University Library
fredrik.astrom@ub.lu.se

Abstract

When trying to map the bibliometrics based ‘research evaluation landscape’ in terms of for instance methods, technical systems and stakeholders; the complexities soon become obvious. Different methods are used at different national and local levels; there is a great variation of systems used for gathering, organizing, and analyzing data; and a multitude of stakeholders, many of which taking on a variety of roles within the context of evaluation practices. To be able to study and understand the evaluation landscape, an infrastructure perspective is suggested as an analytical framework, as proposed by Star and Bowker (2006). According to Star and Bowker, an infrastructure should be understood, not as a concrete technology, but as a system of contextual factors, representing “one of a number of possible distributions of tasks and properties between hardware, software and people” (Star & Bowker, 2006, p. 232). In the context of research evaluation studies, “hardware” could be operationalized as technical systems, “software” as the evaluation practices per se, and “people” as the stakeholders involved. The operationalization of the concepts will be further illustrated by examples from previous research on e.g. stakeholders involved in the research evaluation process, systems used in bibliometric evaluations, and indicators utilized for measuring academic performance; as well as the use of one empirical example, outlining how one stakeholder can be studied through its different roles in research evaluation – as well as its interactions with other stakeholder, and its use, and production, of both ‘hardware’ and ‘software’.
Long-term stability in national research performance: Patterns and potential explanations

Kaare Aagaard & Jesper W. Schneider
The Danish Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy, Aarhus University
ka@ps.au.dk

Thed van Leeuwen
CWTS, Leiden University

Abstract

An examination of long term developments in academic performance measured by relative, bibliometric impact indicators based on CWTS’ enhanced WoS database reveals a remarkably, stable hierarchy among the top research nations of the world. During almost four decades the positions in this hierarchy have been surprisingly unaffected by changes in policy and funding, by the globalization and growth of science, by database-changes and by major changes within science in itself. Furthermore, the top performing nations represent very different system types which all have remained competitive throughout the period. However, although the positions in the hierarchy have remained stable for a prolonged period of time, equalizing effects are clearly starting to diminish the gaps between the different layers of countries. We examine these patterns in more detail from different methodological angles with a particular emphasis on the effects of the expansion of WoS based on the establishment of a fixed set of journals. In addition we suggest potential explanations of this remarkable stability. We argue that the importance of underlying factors such as scientific culture and time of inclusion in the Anglo-American science communication system as well as self-reinforcing mechanisms such as reputation and networks often may be underestimated vis-á-vis more short term policy changes when developments in performance at a national level is studied.
More than twenty years of research evaluation in the Netherlands: The role of bibliometrics and bibliometric expert organizations

Sabrina Petersohn
GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Cologne, Germany
Sabrina.Petersohn@gesis.org

Abstract
This paper studies the evolution of the national system of assessment of public research in the Netherlands in the context of Dutch science policy and university governance. It puts a specific focus on the use and relevance of the bibliometric indicators as a tool for measuring scientific quality in former and current evaluation practices.

The study draws on policy documents, archival material and 11 expert interviews with bibliometricians and science policy stakeholders. Also more than 200 evaluation reports of the past 20 years of national Dutch research evaluation have been studied.

First results show that the use of advanced bibliometric methods occurs at a stable, yet low level in the nineties in the evaluation reports and increases strongly as of the early 2000s. Most review committees value the data as a supporting or confirming additional piece of evidence in their assessments.

The firm establishment of bibliometrics in the Dutch evaluation landscape is the result of several overlapping historical developments which are related to science policy developments, the evolution of bibliometrics as a discipline and the institutionalization and professionalization of the Center for Science and Technology Studies, CWTS, Leiden University, as an expert organization.

The study invites a discussion on commonalities and differences with the evolving Scandinavian research evaluation practices and one of its major expert organizations in bibliometrics, the Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education, NIFU.
Educational research publication patterns in a context of Norwegian model: The case of the University of Gothenburg (2005-2014)

Linda Sile
ECOOM, University of Antwerp
Linda.Sile@uantwerpen.be

Abstract
In this study I explored educational research publication patterns in relation to the use of the so-called Norwegian model (NM) at the Faculty of Education in the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. The study included 4090 publications. The approach to analysis was designed to enable a comparison of publication patterns before (2005-2009) and after (2010-2014) the introduction of NM.

The findings suggest that the numbers for Level 1 are increasing with a greater rate than those publications that are excluded from the model (see Figure 1). However, such a trend can be identified already before the introduction of the model, thus raising further question on how to interpret this pattern. Further exploration suggests that the annual number of Level 2 publications fluctuate around 25 (SD 6.89) throughout the whole period with the exception for the last year explored (2014) when the annual number increases to 62. A comparison on basis of annual average growth rates show that increase in annual average growth rate can be identified only for Level 1 publications. For Level 2 and those publications that are excluded from the model the annual average growth rate after the introduction of the model matches the rate before.

Consequently, it is not clear to what extent the change in publication patterns is related to NM. With findings from this, I wish to express a few conceptual and methodological concerns and open up a discussion on alternative ways to capture the relationship between publication patterns and one or another research assessment approach.

Fig. 1. Annual number of publications. All publication types, full counts.
Wind power research in Wikipedia: Can Wikipedia be used as an adequate source in research evaluation?
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Abstract
This paper is a result of the WOW project (Wind power On Wikipedia) which forms part of the SAPIENS Project (Sanz-Casado et al., 2013). WOW is designed to measure the relationship between scholarly publications and social impact through the mentions of scholarly papers (journal articles, books and conference proceedings papers) in Wikipedia, English version. As Wikipedia is a highly used tool by common citizens, and provided that a substantial portion of wiki entries contains references to scientific papers, it might constitute a relevant and reliable approach to measure the societal influence of scholarly papers. The methods for collecting data are based on Web mining techniques in order to determine 1) the ratio of scientific papers from a specific set defined by Wind Power research in Web of Science (WoS) that are included in Wikipedia entries, 2) the distribution of scientific papers in Wikipedia entries on Wind Power, 3) the distributions of document types in wiki entries’ reference lists, and 4) the density of those types in wiki entries. Findings show that if the Wikipedia set of entries is defined by WoS records on Wind Power found in the Wikipedia (named Method A) 27.2% of the wiki references are scholarly, with a density of 12.65 academic records detected per wiki entry. However, the main conclusions stress an insignificant presence of scientific papers in another Wikipedia set defined by the three categories for the topic Wind Power: Wind Power, Wind turbines and Wind farms (6.9%; density: .65), named Method B. Hence, only with difficulty Wikipedia can be used as source to measure the direct societal influence of Wind Power research. However, the Wikipedia can be used as a tool that informs about the transfer from scholarly publications to popular and non-peer reviewed publications, such as Web pages (news, blogs), popular (science/technology) magazines and research reports. Such document types stand for 70% of the wiki references (Method A) and more than 90% (Method B). Interestingly, the few scholarly papers present on average 34.3 citations received during the same period (2006-2015) as WoS Wind Power publications not mentioned in wiki entries receives only 5.9 citations.
Google Scholar and Web of Science - A Case study on climate and society
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Abstract
This study aims at comparing search results of Google Scholar (GS) and Web of Science (WoS) for the interdisciplinary field of climate impact on societies in a historical perspective. On one side we expect contributions from the humanities insufficiently covered by WoS, on the other side we expect GS results overwhelming, displaying only the 1000 most cited documents. How to handle these different services is one of the challenges of our study.

We start out with a simple search expression including synonyms for climate, impact, society and history. Based on these first results, we extract the most frequent words from the title, abstract and keywords to refine our search. Similarity of the two services is estimated by author names and title words. Interdisciplinarity is visualized by networks based on co-authorship, paper citations and co-words. We applied analysis tools which are freely available, in particular Sci2Tool (http://sci2.cns.iu.edu) for the bibliometrics and Gephi.org for the network visualizations.

Our first result of author names retrieved by the two services is shown in figure 1. 88 of totally 6352 names, less than one percent, were equal, indicating that the services indeed cover different content and can’t be used as proxies for each other. Both services have to be consulted for a more complete overview of this interdisciplinary field. What kind of implication our findings may have in a possible evaluation context remains to be discussed.

Fig. 1. Overlap of author names retrieved by WoS and Google Scholar
Bibliometric analysis of large Nordic ORCID-based customized datasets using Web of Science data and InCites research performance evaluation platform
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Abstract
In recent years, significant research efforts have been focused on the evaluation of research performance, particularly national/international benchmarking by applying bibliometrics analysis to large customized publication datasets. The widespread adoption of unique author identifiers such as ORCID or ResearcherID have been increasingly mandated by funders, as well as required by publishers worldwide. Certain benefits include streamlined data entries and robust data infrastructures and research information systems.

In this study we analyze a large Nordic ORCID-based publications dataset retrieved from the Web of Science Core Collection and use the InCites platform for advanced bibliometrics analysis. The study will focus on the Nordics scientific landscape addressing the following research topics:

- Trends in output and citation impact using international benchmarking
- Collaboration network patterns
- Open Access and Funding analysis
- Publication strategy and collection development tools
- Leading and emerging research analysis
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Potentially Predatory Journals in Scopus: Descriptive statistics and Country-level Dynamics
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Abstract

Global rise of metrics-based research assessments is leading to a surge of so-called predatory publishers. These firms and individuals are actively selling WoS\Scopus “indexing” services to authors using gold-Open access model, and are not investing in credible peer review for their journals. In order to get indexed and to attract authors they mimic respected well-established venues. In turn, authors are motivated by simple metric-based evaluations, especially those that treat all WoS\Scopus-indexed papers equally.

We present findings from an exploratory study of a key subset of such potentially predatory journals (PP-journals), namely several hundred titles that we’ve found in both Scopus’ and in Beall’s Lists.

Beall’s list as a source is problematic because of severe criticism from the library community (Berger and Cirasella, 2015), but there is no other such a collection and the list’s author himself is open to all questions about specific journals or publishers. Beall’s list is used in almost all prominent studies of possibly predatory publishing (Shen and Bjork 2015, Kozak et al 2016, Xia et al 2015). Scopus was chosen as a bibliometric source because of its superior coverage of lower-tier journals.

Using automated and manual cross-matching of Beall’s lists of publishers and standalone journals and Scopus title list, we’ve identified 665 journals, 447 of which were active by the time of data collection (May 2016). We present descriptive statistics of main journal indicators available in Scopus (SNIP, SJR, IPP) for 2014 and 2015 and compare it to the average SNIP and SJR values across the entire Scopus Title List. PP-journals rank significantly lower on the average, but there are some prominent outliers. Interestingly, we’ve found two publishers with significantly higher average SNIP and SJR scores for their journals, one of them being Frontiers S.A (it’s authors\countries distribution is also significantly different from typical amongst PP). We also present an analysis of countries and subject categories assigned to PP-journals in Scopus.

Via our set of PP-journals we were able to calculate shares of publications in PP-journals to publications in all journals for a set of 77 countries using publication window 2011-2015. Our findings indicate that PP-publishing is not confined to Asia and Africa, it is widespread across the globe, with different trends across the regions. For some countries the share of PP-articles reaches 45-47% (Kazakhstan in 2013-14). Examining yearly data for major countries shows us that while China and Iran have gradually managed to substantially reduce the share of PP-articles, it is still on the rise in India, and Russia is the aggressive latecomer. We also present a list of top 10 universities in terms of PP-article counts; half of these are in India. We then investigate the
interplay between share of PP-publications and other macro-indications of R&D for a subset of countries.

We conclude with discussion on the possible causes of such rise of PP-journals and then speculate on directions of some further bibliometric studies of this phenomenon.
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Abstract

Recent changes in scholarly communication and new technology have led to a practical need to expand current bibliometric services at the Helsinki University Library. Traditional bibliometrics measures only a minor part of the attention received and impact of scientific publications. In altmetrics the emphasis is on societal impact, and a broader scope of research artifacts are of interest. Altmetrics aims to catch these new forms and routes of scholarly communication, beyond traditional citations.

Libraries are the organizations within universities that altmetrics falls upon the most, since we are already maintaining and providing various databases, are experts on metadata and also important actors in promoting Open Science.

The presentation illustrates the planned altmetric service, currently tested by the Helsinki University Library altmetrics team, and discusses the challenges faced especially within humanities and social sciences.

General experience indicates that altmetrics is most useful in fields that already benefit from (traditional) bibliometrics. Altmetrics, in SSH with PlumX, are currently very labour-intensive, and despite the rather manual work, the data quality and coverage are not satisfying.

In practice, altmetrics seems to favour medical and life sciences, English as a publication language, major reference databases, but also articles, which are open access and represent topics that are “popular science friendly”. The role of proper metadata is still considered to be the major player in altmetrics.
CONCLUSIONS

- DOAJ is not complete (as well as other sources for the Gold OA status of journals considered here)
- A combination of sources leads to a more complete detection of Gold OA journals. Suggestions a combination of DOAJ, ROAD, PMC and OAPEC.
- Effects on analyses of publications in Gold OA journals on different aggregation levels can be seen.
- ISM-Gold OA: Result list of Gold OA journals (with ISSN and Linking ISSN).
- Integrated with DOAJ, ROAD, PMC and OPAC including manual quality checks.
- Available at: www.unclejohn.org/isso/ISSN-GOLD-OA/
- Input & comments are welcome!
The Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) Framework for indexing monographs: Implications for the Book Citation Index™ and metric evaluations
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Abstract

In the past, bibliographic data and citation data pertaining to books were difficult to retrieve. Now, as digital resources have improved, so has the priority to advance book-related metrics. This is partly due to the introduction of Thomson Reuter’s Book Citation Index (BKCI) (Adams & Testa, 2011) and the addition of books to Elsevier’s Scopus. These commercial databases; however, are not the ‘be-all and end-all’ for the discerning bibliometrician. Recent assessments of the BKCI (in particular) point to numerous indexing problems, which can lead to flawed evaluations (Gorraiz et al., 2013; Leydesdorff & Felt, 2013; Torres-Salinas et al., 2014). Still, researchers continue to use the BKCI or Scopus, and work mainly with book citations from journal articles (Hammarfelt, 2011; Zuccala et al., 2014), or choose alternative resources, like Google Books (Kousha & Thelwall, 2009), Google Scholar (Kousha & Thelwall, 2011) and OCLC WorldCat (Torres-Salinas & Moed, 2009; White et al., 2009). Concerted efforts are even being made to assess data that has been retrieved from multiple resources (e.g., Zuccala & Cornacchia, 2016).

The bibliometrics community is making rapid progress, but there are still several issues that need to be addressed. One in particular is central to all previous studies combined: regardless of where and how bibliographic and citation data are collected, it is essential to recognize that books often belong to bibliographic ‘families’. Since ‘bibliographic families’ can be examined both theoretically and empirically, the aim of our study is to examine and explain several interrelated concepts linked to a family-oriented entity-relationship model, known as the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR). Here, we have chosen to use this model to illustrate the extent to which books, as complex entities, are not always indexed accurately with appropriate metadata. In the second part of our study, we will present some data collected
and assessed from the BKCI, OCLC-WorldCat, and Goodreads, and use this data to demonstrate why a robust model is necessary, first for the practice of indexing books, and more critically for the practice of book-oriented metrics. The empirical aspect of our research is based on the following question: Do books currently indexed in the Book Citation Index have adequate metadata and/or data designed to reflect inherent familial components and relationships?
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Opposing incentives for collaboration
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Abstract
Our study describes the Danish publication award system (BFI). It discusses its built-in incentives for researchers to collaborate across institutional and national boundaries. Previous studies have shown that co-authored journal articles in general attract more citations than single author articles. The reasons for this are not clear, but in the research community and among university managements, research collaboration is accepted as a way to increase the researchers’ and institutions reputation and impact. Therefore the Danish BFI system has been designed to favor collaborative scholarly publications in high impact international journals. However it turns out that the build-in incentives leaves the researcher and his or her institution with a dilemma: If the researchers optimize their performance by forming author groups with external collaborators the optimal way of doing this for the researchers is not the optimal way seen from the perspective of the university. In order to find out whose interests the current publication patterns serve, we have analyzed publication data from University of Southern Denmark’s CRIS system (Pure) and from SciVal. Our analysis show that the typical article has 6.5 authors of which 2 are internal and that this has remained stable since the introduction of the BFI. However, variation exists across the disciplines. While ‘Arts and Humanities’ and ‘Social Sciences’ seem to optimize author groups in such a way that researchers optimize their own performance, both ‘Health’ and ‘Natural Sciences’ seem to optimize by other criteria than BFI.
The disconnection between use of scientific journals and their price
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Abstract
In 2015, on behalf of Finnish universities, universities of applied sciences, and other research institutions, the FinElib consortium negotiated the contracts of almost 80,000 scientific journals, with subscription costs of 19.2 million euros. On average the member organizations of the consortium decreased their subscriptions by 8%, while at the same time the cost for subscriptions increased by about 1 million euros. The cost for scientific literature has risen to a level that threatens the availability of scientific literature in Finland. To this background this research set out to map the usage of scientific journals at the University of Turku and to investigate how usage and quality of the journals meet with the listed price of the journals. Using download statistics, citation counts (from WoS), and a survey, we mapped the usage of journals, while both SJR and SNIP were used to assess the perceived quality of the journals. Annual subscription prices of the journals were retrieved from the publishers’ websites. The results demonstrate how usage is completely disconnected from the price of the journal (figure 1). In addition, taking into account usage, quality, and price, we ranked the journals as per their value for money.

Fig. 1. Connection between ranking of journals by normalized usage and by price.
How to perform research analysis at a full-fledged university?
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Abstract
Research policy may be qualified by using research analysis. At the workshop we propose that differences in publishing behavior in different research areas are considered when writing research policies. We make the differences in publishing behavior visible at department level at Aalborg University. Aalborg University has faculties with 20 departments ranging from humanities over social sciences and natural sciences to engineering and health science.

Challenges
- Diversity in publication types
- Coverage in Web of Science and Scopus
- Other languages than English
- Time window for citations and number of references and authors
- Is impact measured through citations enough?

Method
We compare departments and faculties at the university using the same yardsticks in the period 2011-15.

The local Pure installation is the starting point, when we try to picture research. Every department will perform well in one frame of measurement when using Pure data. The job is to widen the frame with as many yardsticks as possible until that is the case.

Preliminary results
We have widened the frame of measurement. Pure data is supplemented with citation databases, the Danish Research Indicator and ERIH. Press Clippings and altmetrics are included.

Fractionalized publication numbers and BFI-points are used to overcome the diversity in numbers of authors on publications. We use field-weighted indicators where possible.

Perspectives
New modules in Pure can be used for measuring transfer of knowledge to society: Impacts and Award Management. The content type Activities can also be used in this respect.
Reconfiguring Accountability
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Abstract
Metrics have become objective measures for evaluating research performance, particularly from the point of view of university administration and funding agencies. The work-in-progress study aims to understand the implications of the use of metrics on publication and citation practices. Semi-structured interviews were conducted. Participants were recruited from seven Irish national universities. The participants are scholars, ranking from post-doctoral researchers to professors, in the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences. All participants showed concerns pertaining to the use of quantitative methods for measuring quality. Most participants admitted that the use of metrics influenced their choice of research topics, publication channels, as well as the number of publications they aim for. The participants also articulated the necessity of gaming the system in order to survive academia. In conclusion, preliminary findings show that the use of one-size-fit-all metrics, namely h-index, journal impact factor, and citation counts, do not take into account the traditions and epistemic cultures of different disciplines and, more importantly, that metrics have become a target rather than a measure. If the purpose of metrics is to support creativity and innovation and to hold scholars and researchers accountable, it is time to reconfigure the measures and mechanisms for evaluating research performance.
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Abstract
Internationalisation is one of the topical and leading science policy aims in Finland. Universities are expected to recruit more international researchers and thus strive for increasing the quality of their research. This study takes a bibliometric approach to the profile and publishing productivity of foreign researchers in Finnish universities by taking into account nationality, gender, career stage and discipline a researcher present.

The study is a pioneer study in the Finnish context in that we have been capable of combining publishing information to personnel registers of universities. The data consists of national research database of universities (Vipunen) and the personnel and publishing information collected from universities in 2012–2014 by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Finland). Publishing productivity is measured by using the following indicators: a) scientific publications per person-year, b) publication score per scientific publications and c) international co-publications per scientific publications. Profile data comprise all 14 Finnish Universities. The publishing productivity of researchers is studied in the light of five case universities.

The differences between publishing productivity of Finnish and foreign researchers are modest and approximately smaller than expected in the light of previous research. However, foreign male researchers outperform Finnish (male and female) researchers at the career level of professors and research directors.

The results of this study highlight the contrast between science policy rhetoric of internationalisation, which calls for import of best talent, and the heterogeneity and performance of the group of foreign researchers actually coming to Finland.
Effects of Accountability: How performance-based evaluation systems affect research practices, publication practices, disciplinary norms, and the subjectivation of scholars at the faculties of Humanities and Theology at Lund University
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Abstract

My presentation will focus on how scholars at the faculty of Humanities and Theology at Lund University respond to the implementation of a performance-based research funding system. Combining bibliometric studies and qualitative interviews, the aim is to provide an in-depth study of how research practices, disciplinary norms, and academic subjectivity is affected by the increased role of bibliometric measurement in research evaluation and policy work.

While publication patterns from 2002 to 2014 depicts a series of gradual changes that are in line with the incentives of the evaluation system under study, no radical shift in publication practices can be detected. Thus, it seems as the evaluation system primarily strengthens already existing tendencies in the academic field.

The interview study shows that the use of bibliometric indicators in research evaluation does not only evoke a conflict between disciplinary norms and external demands, but also affect the disciplinary norms as such by constituting a powerful discourse of what a good academic is. This is particularly applicable for international publications, which the informants perceive as a hierarchical mechanism in research assessment, essential to their future career. This career driven mind-set, which should be comprehended as a survival driven mind-set, impels humanities scholars to adapt to dominant trends in academia; trends that are enhanced by the implementation of an evaluation system unilaterally defining researcher’s achievements and professional subjectivity in terms of international publications. Regarding this, performance indicators (used in evaluation system and policy work) exists as an instrument of governmentality, producing a field of realities that scholars must act upon as they constitute themselves as a good and successful academic subject.
Abstract

Measuring societal impact of research activities has recently become the attention of government agencies and societal stakeholders, to secure that funding is purposeful and to ensure the empirical soundness of professional activities. Although case studies and reports of interventions could give grounds for qualitative evaluation, bibliometric methodology has been adapted to explore these issues quantitatively. In the health sector traces of clinical practice as measured in treatment recommendations and clinical guidelines have received attention as sources to identify and measure research impact. Among issues considered, the scraping of references, data quality and to what degree references overlap with traditional “academic” citation numbers are still relevant.

In this paper, two distinct research questions are pursued: Does clinical practice oriented literature cite differently from the academic literature, and could their relationship be quantified using citation data? The data used for analysis consists of references matched by Pubmed ID in Scopus (~6000 unique citations) from 15 clinical guidelines issued 2009-2015 by the Swedish National board of health and welfare together with a reference sample of research cited in research published in the same time frame.

The overall goal of this project is to gain insights in reference practice and distribution in publications close to professional practice to provide grounds for developing indicators of “clinical impact”. Future applications with regards to the broader area of “professional impact” based on references found in the literature of a wide range of professions, e.g. the health sector, social welfare, engineering and the environmental realm are considered.
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Janne Pölönen
Federation of Finnish Learned Societies, Finland
janne.polonen@tsv.fi

Leena Wahlfors
Universities Finland UNIFI, Finland
leena.wahlfors@unifi.fi

Abstract
National publication channel ratings in Norway, Denmark and Finland have been designed as quality indicator for the entire publication production of universities. The indicator’s task is to reward and encourage quality in publication. That has been executed by including the indicator into the funding model, through which the universities basic funding is allocated by the ministry of education and culture. The local use of quality indicator is also a research policy concern.

The aim of our paper is to point out, to which purposes universities use the publication channel based quality indicator, and how does it fit into these different kind of purposes. We report the main findings from a survey the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies and the Universities Finland UNIFI conducted among university managers in the fall 2015. The sample consists of 10 rectors, 19 deans and 68 heads of department. The questionnaire concerned the use of the Publication Forum rating in assessing funding allocation, recruitment, personal performance, rewards/bonuses, and publishing development at different institutional levels.

The results show that the Finnish universities make use of the national publication channel-based quality indicator, also at the individual level, to quite the same degree as the Norwegian universities (Aagaard 2015). Also in Finland, the rating is used more in SSH fields – especially the humanities –to replace, in lack of alternative indicators such as JIF, mere publication counts.
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Bibliometric indicators of OSH publications in 2010–2015 in WoS CC and Scopus: their role for Polish authors.
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Bibliometric indicators available in Web of Science Core Collection (WoS CC) and Scopus are the focus of this poster. The first step consisted in retrieving articles from WoS CC and Scopus with the following keywords in the field of occupational safety and health (OSH): "occupational safety and health", "ergonomics", "hazard AND workplace". Then, I studied bibliometric indicators of articles with citations and those with no citations at all. I also analysed other information, e.g., access to publications on the Internet through links between records in WoS CC and Scopus. I registered cooperation between authors from Poland and other countries and tried to find correlations between the number of affiliations and the number of citations. I limited the search to articles published in 2010–2015 by authors affiliated to Polish institutions.
Do physicians continue to publish internationally after PhD defense?
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Abstract
PhDs in Denmark are to be reduced by 10%. At about 1.5 million DKK (€ 202,000) per 3-year PhD, it is desirable that candidates continue academically and publish internationally (Cheung 2008; Christensen & Kaur-Pedersen, 2014).

In this paper, we investigate the extent Danish PhD graduates continue to publish internationally after PhD completion. Authors of 208 medical science PhD theses from 2005 and 2006 and their publications were identified in PubMed. Only publications produced 6-10 years post PhD defense were included in the analyses. A five-year gap was chosen, to allow delayed publication from the PhD period to be washed out. Results show that 42/208 graduates did not publish in PubMed indexed journals (20%) post PhD. The remaining 166 graduates produced a total 1776 publications in year 6-10 post PhD, with 1-24 publications per person per year. Sixty percent published 5 or fewer articles over the measured 5-year period. Male graduates published more frequently 6 articles or more (47% male vs 33 % female). However, we identified a core of 53 researchers, 25% of the original sample, who published consistently across the five years and were responsible for producing 70% of all publications. Female PhD graduates produced 60% of the papers in this core group (26 males and 27 females). Next steps are to investigate the characteristics of this group so we can learn more about the graduates who will continue to be productive in the long term.
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Abstract
Since Open Access (OA) has become a major issue in the development of the scientific communication system, a growing number of bibliometric studies are carried out with regard to this topic. Many of these studies refer to a set of Gold OA journals. According to Éric Archambault et al. (2014, following Peter Suber 2012) a Gold OA Journal is a journal offering immediate cover-to-cover open access, provided by a publisher, sometimes with paid for publication fee. A most popular source for determining the Gold OA status of journals is the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). In fact the majority of bibliometric studies dealing with Gold OA journals up to now rely solely on DOAJ as a source. Likewise, the OA-flag in Web of Science is exclusively linked to DOAJ. However, blind spots and problems with data quality in DOAJ show up, when compared to other sources. Within the project Transparent Infrastructure for Article Charges (INTACT)¹ we therefore studied a number of different sources for determining the Gold OA status of journals. The analysis provides an overview of existence and quality of publicly available sources and suggests a choice suitable for bibliometric studies concerning the Gold OA journal set. Our results of course will be made OA.

¹ http://www.intact-project.org/