

„But I haven't published
for two years“
or What is not visible for
evaluators?

Agnė Girkontaitė, VU
agne.girkontaite@fsf.vu.lt

Michael Ochsner,
ETH Zurich ir FORS Lausanne

-
COST ACTION CA15137 ENRESSH



Institute for Science Information

SSH in unfavourable position
(Nederhof 2006, Hicks 2004):

- National vs international
- Single author vs team
- Books vs articles
- Non-scholarly audience
- Different citation patterns

Donovan (2007): evaluation is data-driven, not indicator-based.

> Streetlight effect of observation bias

Campbell (2011 [1976], 34): Corrupting Effect of Quantitative Indicators: „The more any quantitative social indicator is used for social decision-making, the more subject it will be to corruption pressures and the more apt it will be to distort and corrupt the social processes it is intended to monitor.“

Methodology

2 cases:

FORS, University of Lausanne

VU ISSW – Institute of Sociology and Social Work at the Vilnius University

– perspectives of ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’

Mixed methods:

quantitative and qualitative analysis of data on scientific production, years 2012-2016 (institutional repositories, annual reports, Web of Science, personal webpages)*, overview of repositories themselves,

2 x 4 qualitative semi-structures interviews with employees of institutes** (selected according to insights from quantitative analysis of reporting, quota based on the variety of their publication patterns).

* Data collecting from VU ISSW is still in progress.

** Citations from interviews in the presentation are in *italic*; feminine gender is chosen to save anonymity; Lithuanian translated to English.

Results:

What is visible, what is
not?

	FORS	VU ISSW
Outputs N	733	442
Persons N	49	53
Outputs/Persons	15.0	8.3
WoS	64	57

2012-2016 reported in institutional repositories, annual reports, Web of Science.

	FORS	VU ISSW
Journal Publication	120	234
Book	25	60
Book Section	50	13
Presentation	428	60
Report	23	30
Extra-academic	53	21
Thesis	8	9
Review	1	4
Working Paper	12	0
Other	6	8
Not defined	7	3
Total	733	442

Differences in classification

The first step is to choose the type and subtype of your publication. This step is very important because the fields will vary according to your choice. You will not be able to change this choice once it is done.

For the example we will enter a book of various studies.

The screenshot shows a web interface for classifying a publication. At the top, there are tabs for 'Publications', 'Documents', 'Liens', and 'Visibilité'. The 'Publications' tab is active. Below the tabs, there are three main sections: 'Collection', 'Type', and 'Sous-type'. The 'Collection' section has a radio button for 'Publications'. The 'Type' section has a dropdown menu with 'Livre' selected, and a description: 'Livre: un livre et son éditeur.' The 'Sous-type' section has a dropdown menu with 'Etudes diverses' selected, and a description: 'Etudes (diverses) (collected works): recueil de publications d'un auteur donné ou traitant d'un thème donné.' On the right side, there are two buttons: 'Continuer' (labeled with a red '3.') and 'Annuler'.

1. Enter the type of your publication (book, article, thesis etc.).
2. If necessary, enter the subtype of your publication. The list of subtypes offered varies according to the chosen type!
3. Click Continue to enter the metadata.



Mokslo publikacijų rūšių klasifikatorius

KODAS			MOKSLO IR KITŲ PUBLIKACIJŲ RŪŠYS
K			KNYGOS
	K1		MONOGRAFIJOS
		K1a	<p>Monografija – neperiodinis ir netęstinis leidinys, kuriame sistemingai ir/ar išsamiai išnagrinėta viena tema (dalykas), aiškūs ir žymūs naujumo ir kiekvienai mokslo sričiai arba krypčiai savi moksliskumo elementai; monografija privalo turėti ISBN numerį, mažiausia įskaitoma apimtis – 8 autoriniai lankai.</p> <p>Stepukonienė, Inga. Roberto Keturakio kūryba : monografija. Kaunas : Naujasis lankas, 2011. 464 p. ISBN 9789955036722.</p>
		K1b	<p>Mokslo studija – ne mažesnės kaip 2 autorinių lankų apimties mokslo darbas, atitinkantis mokslo straipsniui keliamus reikalavimus.</p> <p>Ruškus, Jonas; Žvirdauskas, Dainius; Stanišauskienė, Vilija. Neformalusis švietimas Lietuvoje. Faktai, interesai, vertinimai : mokslo studija. Vilnius : Švietimo aprūpinimo centras, 2009. 90 p. ISBN 97899986036517.</p>
		K1c	<p>Teorinis, sintetinis mokslo darbas – kurią nors mokslo kryptį, šaką, discipliną apimantis ar tarpdalykinio pobūdžio darbas, sintetinantis ilgalaikius tyrimus, pateiktus monografijose, studijose bei mokslo straipsniuose, atitinkantis monografijoms keliamus mokslinio lygio ir adresato reikalavimus.</p>

What is not visible?

Of all reported production units in FORS	Institute repository	Annual report	In report, but not in repository	In repository, but not in report
	568	652	130	46
	77.5%	88.9%	17.7%	8.1%

FORS: Individuals report less than institute.

Mostly when:

- Specific FORS production: *working papers* and *lunch seminars* - 9+25
- 59 presentations (9 of these scientific)
- 24 for extra-academic audience

What is not visible?

Of all reported production units in VU ISSW	eLABa of persons	eLABa of institute	Institution didn't report but had to
	437	296	9
	98.9%	67.0%	2.0%

VU ISSW: Attribution to institute.

Hard to tell, what else.

„ - *Haven't you reported presentations?*

- *Do I need to report these too?*“

What to report?

- Importance
- Individual communication style

What to report?

Important (=defined in research evaluation > defined in repositories)

„I report what is necessary. <...> everything else, where would I record it?“ [repository defines]

„It is important that others would see what I have done. <...> I look myself, if someone comes to some conference, what he does. <...> [reporting] form does not matter <...> important, that it would be by [within] university, as before, my publications, and everyone would find it.“ [place within university]

„You should not overreport. // Why? // You should not spend more time in communicating what you do, because there is no time left to do it.“ [choices]

What to report?

Communication styles

E.g. 1: FORS 2015 most of unreported presentations (including scientific ones) were by one author.

E.g. 2: Many reports for EC, says: *„What use of a scientific article that is read by two doctoral students“*; but she does not record these reports herself, co-author does it.

E.g. 3: *„I do not write scientific articles [in traditional sense]“, „I think about making a blog. <...> because this is that communication I am interested in, in-between academic and popular, it is based academically, but said in human language“; but has no strategy of communication yet.*

E.g. 4: Many scientific articles, everything recorded; 6 books out of two, by translating into 3 languages; huge amount of production for extra-academic audience, but only part of it reported, mostly not by individual, but by institute.

Ch. Wright-Mills:
individual biography
within a context of
social history

Social context

Global context > general tendency of ISI and impact factors

Evaluation system > performance based vs not performance based

Institutional and technological adaptation to the evaluation system > what are regulations and instructions and who is responsible to ensure it

Missions of institutions > only research-oriented or more (data management, education...)

Personal audiences > (in)formal expectations of personally important audiences

Individual

More or less successfully
(mis)adapting to social contexts:

- know and understand (or don't)
 - agree (or don't)
 - is concerned (or not)
 - is able (or not)
- > Time and priorities!

Individual

Types:

researcher - it is all OK („I want to communicate with my peers and I succeed in doing it“)

troubled researcher - trying, but not always succeeding („Am I a researcher if I do not publish enough?“), often - in conflict with other obligations

double identity - researcher + lecturer, social policy researcher or working with data („It is important for me to be in this other role“) - main meaning is not in a scientific audience

Individual

Types:

researcher

troubled researcher

double identity

**BUT ALL OF THEM PUBLISH
SOMETHING SCIENTIFIC!**

„I do not publish“ = „I am not a researcher“

Misrecognised in their everyday activities, that do not lead directly to publishing.

Self-worth.

Some of them take it as a trouble: *„I want to be a researcher“*, but *„everything I do is misrecognised“*.

Some take it more easily: *„[data infrastructures] are invisible while they work. It is like electricity in home. <...> We are happy, silently doing what we do, without recognition we deserve. And it is ok, we like it.“*

On research evaluation:

„It is very narrow, on scientific production. <...> it should be more personalised, every researcher cares about different things, connection with practice is important for some, in-depth analysis – for others.“

- variety should be accounted for.

Conclusion

Current research evaluation limits understanding of the work of a researcher, ignores variety of personalities needed within universities and omits non-visible but important activities that leads to (reported, evaluation-compliant) publishing only in some cases but is inseparable part of researcher's life.

References

- Campbell, Donald T. 2011. Assessing the Impact of Planned Social Change. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, [S.I.] 7(15): 3-43.
- Donovan, Claire. 2007. The qualitative future of research evaluation. In *Science and Public Policy*, 34(8), 585–597. doi:10.3152/030234207X256538.
- Hicks, Diana. 2004. The four literatures of social science. In H. F. Moed, W. Glänzel, & U. Schmoch (Eds.), *Handbook of quantitative science and technology research: The use of publication and patent statistics in studies of S&T systems* (pp. 476–496). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Nederhof, Anton J. 2006. Bibliometric monitoring of research performance in the Social Sciences and the Humanities: A review. In *Scientometrics* 66(1): 81–100.