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Science Citation Index

• Introduced in *Science* 1955 by Eugene Garfield
  – The citation as a construction
• Citation ≠ reference

Merton’s norm system of science

- Communalism
- Universalism
- Disinterestedness
- Originality
- Scepticism

CUDOS vs. PLACE

- Communalism → Proprietary
- Universalism → Local
- Disinterestedness → Authoritarian
- Originality → Commissioned
- Scepticism → Expert

Quality indicator or measure of performance?
From cited reference to citation

Cited reference in text:
Garfield (1955) argued that the citation index could be viewed as an "association ideas index…"

Entry in reference list:

Citation in the citation index:
GARFIELD E, 1955, SCIENCE, V122, P108
Conditions for transformation

1. The *citing* paper must be indexed in the citation index.
2. Normally, also the *cited* paper (that receives the citation) must be indexed.
3. The *cited reference* (in the citing paper) must be given correctly so that the reference could be matched to the cited paper.

= CITATION!
The citation as an indicator of quality

• Eugene Garfield (1963):
  – "One purpose of this communication is to record my forewarning concerning the possible promiscuous and careless use of quantitative citation data for sociological evaluations, including personnel and fellowship selection"

  – "Impact is not the same as importance or significance"

• At the same time, he also argued SCI to be used to evaluate Journal performance
  – Journal Impact Factor (JIF)

Kessler and Heart

• The warning reads: "CAUTION! Any attempt to equate high frequency of citation with worth or excellence will end in disaster; nor can we say that low frequency of citation indicates lack of worth."

Key arguments for using citations for evaluation

Classic debate:
• Citations as influence vs.
• Citations as indicator of rhetorics/persuasion

Citer motivations:
  – Negative citations
  – Perfunctory (slentrianmässig)
  – Redundant
• But of course also:
  – Conceptual/operational
  – Evolutionary or
  – Confirmational

(from a classification by Moravcsik and Murugusan, 1975)
Argument for the use of citation analysis as a quality indicator:

"The observation that citations indicate use, and therefore usefulness as well as impact, is the basic argument for using them as an indicator of quality."

Susan Cozzens middle ground:
• Citations as a measure of visibility

"being cited"

• However, most papers are not read at all. No matter what a paper did to the former literature, if no one else does anything else with it, then it is as if it never existed at all. You may have written a paper that settles a fierce controversy once and for all, but if readers ignore it, it cannot be turned into a fact, it simply cannot. (Latour, 1987, p. 40)
Citations as performativity - “being cited”

Traditionally:
- Citations as reward, (passive)
- Citation Index as representation of publication patterns

My proposal: **Performativity** of “being cited”
- What research work do citations do?
- Citations as construction and epistemological networking
- The citation viewed as an outcome of active achievement or “performance”
- Reflexive actors (researchers are active)

Citation index as a performative arena
- for publishers, authors, citers, publications and articles; indeed the whole “citation culture” (Wouters, 1999)
- Authors actively position themselves by choosing journal/field to publish in & research problems to publish on
- Making themselves “cite-able”
Tentative suggestions: *Different roles*

**Different disciplinary uses of citations:**

- In **Natural science**, citations mark *influence*
  - *(to a higher degree)*

- In **Social science**, citations mark *rhetorics*
  - Argumentative

- In **Humanities**, citations mark *textual aspects:*
  - ’conversation with the cited texts’
Part 2: Referencing practices

In natural science, social science and the humanities
Biochemistry
‘cumulative’

Theoretical philosophy
‘textual’

Political science
‘rhetorical’

Idealized contributions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Ideal contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural science</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CULTURE OF CELLS AND PRIMARY ISLETS
The rat insulinoma cell line INS-1E [Merglen et al., 2004] (a kind gift from Professor Claus Wallgren) was used between passages 71-80.

Thapsigargin Down-Regulates Protein Levels of GRP78/BiP in INS-1E Cells

Victoria Rosengren,¹ Henrik Johansson,² Janne Lehtio,² Liselotte Fransson,¹ Åke Sjöholm,¹ and Henrik Ortsäter¹

¹Unit for Diabetes Research, Department of Clinical Science and Education, Södersjukhuset, Sjukhusbacken 10, Research Center 3rd Floor, Karolinska Institutet, 118 83 Stockholm, Sweden
²Science for Life Laboratory, Department of Oncology and Pathology, Karolinska Institutet, Alfa Floor 1, Tomtebodavägen 23A, 171 21 Stockholm, Sweden

ABSTRACT
Pancreatic β-cells have a well-developed endoplasmic reticulum (ER) and express large amounts of chaperones and protein disulfide isomerases (PDI) to meet the high demand for synthesis of proteins. We have observed an unexpected decrease in chaperone protein levels in the β-cell model INS-1E after exposure to the ER stress inducing agent thapsigargin. As these cells are a commonly used model for primary β-cells and have been shown to be vulnerable to ER stress, we hypothesize these cells are incapable of mounting a chaperone defense upon exposure. To confirm this, we have used an ER stress-inducing agent (thapsigargin) in these cells and determined the levels of the ER chaperone GRP78/BiP. Our results show a significant decrease in GRP78/BiP protein levels in INS-1E cells upon exposure to thapsigargin, indicating an inability to mount an effective chaperone defense. This finding has implications for the use of INS-1E cells as an in vitro model for β-cell function and may provide insights into the pathogenesis of diabetes.

C57Bl/6J mice [Scandinavia, Sweden] and maintained in culture as previously described [Sargsyan et al., 2008]. Animal handling was performed according to national law and approved by local ethical committee.
Actuality and knowability

DAVID J. CHALMERS

It is widely believed that every proposition is knowable a priori for all such p, it is held, against these claims.

The argument ‘Actually’, ‘Some’, ‘Possibly’, while ‘-`

In addition, q is an actually entertained.

(1) Ar
(2) Ar → □Ar
(3) □(Kr ↔ Ar)
(4) □(r → ¬Kr)

r ↔ Ar is not knowable. In addition, one may also have to accept that provability (as usually understood) does not entail knowability. The sentence ‘p ↔ Ap’ is a theorem in many systems of ‘actually’-involving logic.2 If so, then the proposition r ↔ Ar is provable, in the standard sense that there exists a proof of it. Nevertheless, r ↔ Ar is not knowable, and also is not provable in the sense that someone could prove it: the proof cannot be used to gain knowledge of r ↔ Ar.

Given the surprising consequences, one may want to examine the options for responding to the argument in more detail. A number of the available options are tied to different available views of the semantics of ‘actually’ and of the way it behaves in epistemic and modal contexts.

What we might call the face-value view of ‘actually’ holds that there is a proposition expressed by ‘Ap’ such that ‘KAp’ and ‘□Ap’ are true iff this proposition is known or necessary (and likewise for other ‘A’-involving sentences). Given the face-value view, the conclusion (5) follows directly from the standard principles above (Ap → □Ap, there can be no knowledge of false propositions) and the existence of a true proposition that satisfies (4).

2 For example, ‘p ↔ Ap’ is a theorem of Hazen’s (1978) natural deduction system S5A. Of course such systems will not have an unrestricted principle of necessitation for provable sentences. The standard notion of provability applies to sentences, but we can extend it to propositions by saying that a proof of a proposition p in a system L is an abstract sequence of interpreted sentences such that the sequence is a proof in L (in virtue of the logical form of the sentences) of a sentence that expresses p.
In her work about the importance of ideas in major policy choices made by different European Social Democratic parties in the inter-war period, Berman argues that ‘actors with different ideas will make different decisions, even when placed in similar environment’ (Berman, 1998: 33). From a rationalistic perspective, the argument is similar: ‘ideas matter because they affect how individuals interpret their world via the likelihood they accord different possibilities’ (cf. Scharpf, 1997: 60; Bates et al., 1998).

If so, the solution to our problem must be found in who controls what information (or ideas) agents will use when deciding how to act (Berman, 1998: Ch. 2). The problems are: (1) where do those ideas come from and (2) what or who determines which ideas will dominate most. Mailath (1998) puts it in his discussion about known as evolutionary game theory: ‘the problem seems to require that players know which player has the right to move’, while Scandinavians, their political system and gladly pay their citizens have been distrustful of their government institutions, as do citizens of Latin Europe and Latin America. According to Robert Putnam (1993), the reason Northern Italians trust each other can be traced back to political traditions established in the medieval city states, while southern Italians have much less social capital, because no such ‘horizontal’ political culture ever got started.

The problems with all these explanations are well-known. First, they reduce the agents to, more or less, cultural or structural ‘duces’ (Giddens, 1984). Instead of being able to choose, they have no choice at all, and
There are **Quantitative** differences
But what about **Qualitative** differences?
Part 3: The citation as symbol

Means for identifying “visibility” of research
Citation indexes

Commercial

Freely available

THOMSON REUTERS
WEB OF KNOWLEDGE™
DISCOVERY STARTS HERE

Microsoft Academic Search

SciVerse
Scopus

Google scholar
Garfield: How to use the Citation Index (1967) - Informersial

$.\text{TS}=$ (terroris* OR antiterroris* OR bioterroris* OR counterterroris* OR cyberterroris* OR ecoterroris* OR narcoterroris*) AND $\text{TS}=$ (neuro*)

Refined by: Document Type=(ARTICLE OR LETTER OR REVIEW) AND [excluding] Publication Years=(2011)

\textbf{Databases} = SCI-EXPANDED  \textbf{Timespan} = 1989-2011

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart.png}
\caption{Number of scientific articles per year including the concepts of *terroris* and neuro*. N=208. Source: Web of Science. Last updated May 2010.}
\end{figure}

WoS: Citation report profiles
Publication analysis

*Searches* using variants of ‘*terroris*’ in title, abstract or author generated keywords.

*Research area*: Engineering

*Document types*: Research, conference and review articles; editorial material

*Indexes*=SCI-EXPANDED, CPCI-S

*Timespan*=1989-2013

*Selection*: 1989-2013: 1842 papers

1. 1989-2000
2. 2001-2006
3. 2007-2013
HistCite\textsuperscript{1}: citation maps (WoS data)

Nodes: cited documents

Arcs: references

\textsuperscript{1} http://www.histcite.com
Figur 22: Enkelcitering

Figur 23: Exempel på långcitering.

Figur 24: Stegvis kedja (2030, 2604, 3408, 4525).

Figur 25: Ankrarartikel (Nod nr. 1780)

Figur 26: Samlingsartikel (5391)

Figur 27: Spindeln i nätet (2225), samt Åsenvänsgränd (1620).
Citation kinds

Figur 28: Självcitering (3162).

Figur 29: Citeringspar (Ömsesidig referens) (2850, 2851).

Figur 30: Ensamvargar.
Bibliographic coupling of sources

Work conducted w/ Christopher Kullenberg, GU: Co-production of Happiness research and society
Bibliographic coupling of sources
Qualitative clustering

Work conducted w/ Christopher Kullenberg, GU:
Co-production of Happiness research and society
Co word "heat map"

1. 1989-2000
Co word “heat map”
2. 2001-2006
Co word “heat map”
3. 2007-2013
Geografisk representation

Altmetrics’ sources

Social media metrics
Performance based allocation models on three levels in Sweden

Torn between qualitatively different systems of research impact measures
Different measures on three levels

• National level (in Sweden):
  – Field normalized publication and citation measures

• Within (many) universities:
  – Norwegian “impact factor” model based on secondary peer review (BUT: See below for update)

• Individual level:
  – H-Index
Present performance based funding model (2008/2012)

**Basic funding (80 %)**

**Performance based share (20 %)**

1. External funding (50 %)
2. **Publication performance (50 %)** as normalized data for *publication & citation rates*

**Main features**

- Four year moving average
- Author fractionalization
- Normalization:
  - Publications: *Waring Distributions*
  - Citations: *Field Normalized Citation Level*
- Additional Weighting
  
  Medicine + Technology: 1.0;  
  Science: 1.5;  
  Social Sci + Humanities: 2.0;  
  Other: 1.1

Motives for weighting

- ”We have made some runs when it comes to what effects different variants of the allocation system would give. /.../
- I can only say that a big problem for me was naked – would turn out negative for the humanities and social sciences. We introduced this doubling factor ‘to make sure to have a cupped, a protective hand, especially for the humanities.’
- We’ll see how it goes.

Our assessment is that this multiplier 2 is sufficient to protect the humanities. I can not guarantee that it is so. Of course, we will follow up on it. But I think it will turn out positive.
- (Applause). ”

The ’problem of the humanities’

Citing practices differ and are not comparable

– between different disciplines, e.g. natural sciences, social sciences & humanities

There is order of magnitude

– handled by weighting (normalization, fractionalization...)

But could these be compensated for?

– By quantitative measures?
– or qualitative measures?
The order of magnitude - articles with "Sweden" in the address field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database within Web of Science</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Published articles</th>
<th>No. of citations</th>
<th>Average No. of Citations per Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;HCI</td>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>2002–2011</td>
<td>3,319</td>
<td>4,443</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSCI</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>2002–2011</td>
<td>27,388</td>
<td>203,811</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>2002–2011</td>
<td>203,056</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>-*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collected 2012-05-11
* data exceeding the limits of WoS.

One order of magnitude \((10^1)\)

Two orders of magnitude \((10^2)\) (?)
The myth of progress in HSS

• A **trend break in 2007** in Humanities’ publication numbers?
  – If so, how big is it?
  – what is the cause?

• It has been argued:
  • "**The trend is that the social sciences and humanities are increasingly publishing in English-language journals in order to influence the scientific development.**" (Flodström, 2011)
  
  and, in many of the inquiry responses
Was there a trend break in 2007?

Publications (AD=Sweden) in A&HCI

A&HCI (World)  A&HCI (Swe)
This is the answer!

Introduced in WoS in:

2007

2010
Journals introduced in A&HCI

2007

Table 1: Journals wherein at least one author with a Swedish address published in 2007 that was first indexed in A&HCI in 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>No. of articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCANDIA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWEGIAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORDIC JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA LINGUISTICA HUNGARICA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA THEOLOGICA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCIENT MESOAMERICA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHAEOLOGISCHES KORRESPONDENZBLATT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTACHMENT HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRITISH JOURNAL FOR THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROATIAN JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOPOLITICS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP ORGANIZATION MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BILINGUALISM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DESIGN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL OF AFRICAN ARCHAEOLOGY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND MANAGEM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVUE FRANCAISE DE LINGUISTIQUE APPLIQUEE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRESS AND HEALTH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINGTIEME SIECLE REVUE D HISTOIRE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Journals within which authors with Swedish addresses published between 2008 and 2011. (Only journals with n≥10 are displayed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>No of articles (2008-2011)</th>
<th>In Web of Science (SCI-e, SSCI, A&amp;HCI) since:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCANDIA</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORNVANNEN JOURNAL OF SWEDISH ANTICUARIAN RESEARCH</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KONSTHISTORISK TIDSKRIFT</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDIA NEOPHILOLOGICA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF HISTORY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL OF PRAGMATICS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN STUDIES IN SCANDINAVIA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAN LEGACY TOWARD NEW PARADIGMS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNTHÈSE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWEGIAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE HEALTH CARE AND PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY AND EDUCATION</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEORIA A SWEDISH JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORDIC JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHICAL THEORY AND MORAL PRACTICE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBERICA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLAM AND CHRISTIAN MUSLIM RELATIONS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMENOS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH STUDIES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILOSOPHICAL STUDIES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY AND CULTURE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERKENNTNIS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERNA SPRAK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2007: trend break for Swedish humanities in Wos AHCI?

Swedish articles (A&HCI)
- 2006: 221 articles
- 2007: 310 articles

Apparent difference: 89 articles
=> 40 % increase in one year!

• But If corrected for the 50 articles published in journals unavailable in 2007 in WoS:
  • Leaves 39 articles, a more moderate 18 % increase
Was there a trend break in the number of Swedish published papers in 2007?
Research and innovation bill 2013-2016

‘Research and innovation’ (Prop. 2012/13:30)

Key points:

• Performance based share doubled (20 %)

• ’Peer review’ instead of bibliometrics?
  – Cf, the British RAE/REF system or
    Univeritetskanslerämbetets ”kvalitetsutvärderingssystem för högre utbildning”

• But, implemented ”not before 2018”

• Meaning:
  – two general elections (2014, 2018)
  – one innovation bill (expected in 2016)
    • ...will pass before the new model is implemented.
Within universities
(my assumption)

• A large number of universities within higher education sector have adopted a system based on the ‘Norwegian model’

• Allocation and re-allocation:
  – at the faculty level
  – department level
  – (individual level)
’Norwegian model’
(also used in Denmark and Finland)

• Two dimensions:
  – publication channel
  – level of the channel
    • (0: not scientific)
    • 1: ordinary scientific
    • 2: highly prestigious publication channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication channel</th>
<th>Level 1 (80%)</th>
<th>Level 2 (20%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monograph</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in journal or serial publication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in edited work</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arguably:
• ’Secondary peer review’
• ’Impact factor’ based system
Within universities

Swedish Academia
47 HEIs
27 awarding third cycle degrees (doctorates)

Preliminary findings - overview

• All universities – with the exception of Chalmers and Stockholm School of Economics - use bibliometric measures to some extent for resource allocation at one or several levels.

• The types of measures and models used differs considerably, but models counting publication are more common than citation based models.

• The largest and most diversified universities often use a range of measurements depending on faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication based (10)</th>
<th>Citation based (2)</th>
<th>Combination of C &amp; P (11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blekinge Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Karolinska Institutet</td>
<td>Jönköping University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halmstad University</td>
<td>KTH</td>
<td>Karlstad University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linneaus University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lund University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luleå University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linköping University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sweden University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Malmö University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mälardalen University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholms University</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Swedish School of Sport and Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Södertörn University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Umeå University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Borås</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Gothenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Gävle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uppsala University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Örebro University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculties (9)</th>
<th>Departments (16)</th>
<th>Individuals (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blekinge Institute of Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karolinska Institutet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jönköping University</td>
<td>X (fackhögskolor)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlstad University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTH</td>
<td>X (schools)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linköping university</td>
<td>X (Health Science)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linneaus University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Gothenburg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmö University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sweden University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mälardalen University</td>
<td>X (research spec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luleå University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (not formalized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Södertörn University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (social sciences?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Swedish School of Sport and Health Sciences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Borås</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Gävle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Halmstad</td>
<td>X (research area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umeå University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppsala University</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Humaniora vid GU (Swepub)
"Tidskriftsartikel (refereeegranskat)"

2004
Translation Universals, Do They Exist?.
Chaos Dansk norsk tidsskrift for religionshistoriska studier.
Svensk Botanisk Tidskrift.
Barnboken, Svenska barnboks Institutets tidsskrift.
Journal of Gender Studies.
Historisk Tidskrift.
Journal for Contemporary History.
Svensk Tidskrift för Musikforskning.
Anders Cullhed (red.) Perspektiv på Dante. II. Nordic Dante Studies II.
Proceedings from the Second Conference of the Nordic Dante Network at the Italian Cultural Institute in Stockholm, October 5

2007
Mythisierungen, Entmythisierungen, Remythisierungen.
Grazer Philosophische Studien.
Women's Studies International Forum.
FINYAR Föreningen Forskning och information om nyreligiositet.
Australian Economic History Review.
Berichter zur Polar und Meerforschung.
The Oxford Encyclopedia of Maritime History.
On the Road. Studies in Honour of Lars LarssonActa Archaeologica Lundensia in 4o, No. 26..

2010
Tidskrift för litteraturvetenskap.
The reception of medieval Europe in the Baltic Sea region. Ed. Jörn Stæcker..
Från hedniskt till kristet. Förändringar i begravningsbruk och gracskick i Skandinavien c:a 800
Culture Unbound.
Lejana. Revista critica de narrativa breve..
Journal of Ethics.

2013
Journal of Archaeological Science.
Norwegian Archaeological Review.
International Biodeterioration & Biodegradation.
Agricultural and Food Science.
Journal of Danish Archaeology.
Historisk Tidskrift.
Ideas in History.
Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina Vereins.
Comparison Sw/No model

**Swedish model**

- **Transparency:**
  - Variables in the calculated model are relative
- **Selection:**
  - Only published material that is indexed in WoS ISI
- **Measure of quality**
  - Citation measures, field normalized
- **Source of data:**
  - Already available data (WoS ISI)

**Norwegian modell**

- **Transparency:**
  - Pre-determined ‘point system’
- **Selection:**
  - More research channels (Monographs, conf. Proc, journal articles)
- **Measure of quality:**
  - “Secondary peer review”
- **Sources of data:**
  - An authorization index must be created (Cristin, NSB) and publication lists must be updated.
Individual level

**H-index**

- Introduced as "an index to quantify an individual’s scientific research output" (Hirch, 2005)

- Measure of *individual performance*

- Calculated as the break point value for an individual’s publications where No. of published papers meets frequency of citations

\[ H = \text{citations} = \text{published papers} = 13 \]
Constant flux of measures at all three levels

• National level (in Sweden):
  – Field normalized publication and citation measures
  – From 2018: Peer review – Role of bibliometrics?

• Within (many) universities
  – Norwegian “impact factor” model based on secondary peer review
  – Swedish citation based model (few Univ’s)
  – Or Both Swedish/Norwegian models

• Individual level
  – Norwegian
  – H-Index
Downside of the performative idiom

’curriculum vitae AND h-index’


‘Gaming the system’

Techniques

• self (colleague) citation
• editor coercion
• citation cartels

Research policy advice:
Division of Analysis and Evaluation, GU
In response to university rankings:
• “another way of advancing on the list would be to appoint highly cited researchers, since they ’bring with them’ their earlier citations…”

(Gunnarsson 2013, my translation)
Dear Reviewer,

We are very grateful for all reviewers’ efforts and contribution to Scandinavian Journal of [_____] and for taking time reviewing manuscripts. Both authors and reviewers are very important for the quality of the journal and without you we will not reach the goal of being the leading international journal of [ämnesområde].

We hope you will continue with your excellent work on Scandinavian Journal of [_____] review and contribute to the journal. We would like to further develop the journal and therefore highlight the following issues:

As part of your review, please consider all of the following:

1. Manuscripts should not exceed 5000 words excl. abstract, references, figures and tables
2. Maximum 5 tables and 3 figures are allowed.
3. Maximum 12 words in the manuscript title
4. Maximum 10 keywords related to the title, and the words should appear in the abstract
5. Manuscript should refer to at least one article published in Scandinavian Journal of [_____].
6. If you agree to review a paper, it is expected that you will also review the revised version of the manuscript. This is important for the quality of the manuscript and for the authors.
7. Maintain confidentiality throughout the process until publication.
8. Follow the reviewers manual and give comments to author and/or the editor.
10. Be timely. If you are unable to review a paper, please let us know immediately as this will fasten the process.

You can do this by logging into your account, clicking on the ‘Edit Account’ tab at the top right hand side of the page, next to the orange ‘Get Help Now’ tab and following the instructions.

Kind regards,
Editor-in-Chief, Scandinavian Journal of [_____]
“Over three thousand researchers earned the distinction by writing the greatest numbers of reports officially designated by Essential Science Indicators℠ as Highly Cited Papers—ranking among the top 1% most cited for their subject field and year of publication, earning them the mark of exceptional impact.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3215 Entries
SWE 28 prim
5 sec
GU: 3
CTH: 1

http://highlycited.com
Conclusion

• Bibliometrics in research evaluation:
  – **Quantitative** or
  – **Qualitative** solutions?
  – **Prevalent both in** ’citation’ & ’impact factor’ based models.

• ”Field normalization” and other bibliometric techniques **solve** quantitative aspects, but what about qualitative differences in citation practices?

• **Individual performativity** – incentives to publish
  – E.g. ”being cited” – how well researchers make themselves cite-able in citation based metrics.

• ‘**Citedness’**


Garfield, E. 1972. Citation analysis as a tool in journal evaluation. Science 178:471-79


Kessler, M. M. & F. E. Heart (1962) "Concerning the probability that a given paper will be cited", Report (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge).


Wouters, P. 1999. The Citation Culture. Diss: Faculteit der Schelkunde, Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Thank you!

gustaf.nelhans@hb.se