

ARTICLE 9 READINGS

Webometrics

Aguillo, I. 2009. Measuring the Institution's Footprint in the Web. *Library High Tech*. Vol. 27, No. 4, pp.540-556. Argues for open access and new models of dissemination of research; goes into detail on indicators in the two Cybermetrics Lab rankings.

Aguillo, I.F., Bar-Ilan, J., Levene, M. and Ortego, L. 2010. Comparing University Rankings. *Scientometrics* Vol. 86, pp.243-256. Statistical comparisons among the rankings, including Webometrics)

Almind, T.C. and Ingwersen, P. 1997. Informatric Analyses on the World Wide Web: Methodology approaches to 'webometrics'. *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 53, No. 4, pp. 404-426.

Bjorneborn, L. and Ingwersen, P. 2001. Perspectives of Webometrics. *Scientometrics* Vol. 50, No.1, pp. 65-82. Progress in webometrics since it was first introduced as a concept in 1997 and room for more progress.

Thelwall, M. 2008. Bibliometrics to webometrics, *Journal of Information Science* Vol. 34, No.4, pp. 605-621. A review article on the changes in bibliometrics and early uses of webometrics and link analysis in measuring scholarly impact.

Aguillo, I. 2009. Measuring the Institution's Footprint in the Web. *Library Hi Tech* Vol.27, No. 4, pp. 540-556. Background document for the Ranking Web of Universities.

Altmetrics

Overviews:

Bornmann, L. 2014. Do Altmetrics Point to the Broader Impact of Research? An overview of benefits and disadvantages of altmetrics. *Journal of Informetrics* Vol.8, No.4, pp.895-903. For the researcher.

Sutton, S.H. 2014. Altmetrics: What Good are they to Academic Libraries? *Libraries in Transition*, Vol.4, No.2. Retrieved 25 March 2014. Excellent overview for librarians, including advantages and disadvantages,

<http://newprairiepress.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1041&context=culsproceedings>

Early articles

Arbesman, S. 2012. New Ways to Measure Science. *Wired*, 01/09/12.

<http://www.wired.com/2012/01/new-ways-to-measure-science/>

Stuart, D. 2011. Current Research Assessment Could Miss the Big Picture. *Research Information*, June/July 2011. Discusses estimating "attention".

http://www.researchinformation.info/features/feature.php?feature_id=324

McFedries, P. 2102. Measuring the Impact of Altmetrics. *IEEE Spectrum*, Vol.49, No.6, p.28.

From Nature

Woolston, C. 2014. Funders Drawn to Alternative Metrics. *Nature* Vol. 516, No. 7530, p.147. An online discussion among scientists of funding agencies' use of new metrics for evaluation. <http://www.nature.com/news/funders-drawn-to-alternative-metrics-1.16524>

Priem, J. 2013. Scholarship: Beyond the Paper. *Nature*, Vol. 495, No. 7442, pp. 437-440. A look at the future of dissemination of scholarly output. <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v495/n7442/full/495437a.html>

Cheung, M.K. 2013. Altmetrics: Too soon for use in assessment. *Nature*, Vol. 494, No. 7436, p.176) Argues against the use of non-citation based metrics into assessment.

Viney, I. 2013. Altmetrics: Research Council Responds *Nature*, Vol. 494, No. 7436, p.176. One UK funding agency argues for use of alternative outputs.

Piwowar, H. 2013. Value all Research Products. *Nature*, Vol. 493, No. 7431, p.159. The article that started the debate, highlighting the NSF's change from asking for research products, not research publications. <http://eprints.icrisat.ac.in/12069/1/value-all-research-products.pdf>

Historical Rankings

Magoun, H.W. 1966. The Cartter Report on Quality in Graduate Education: Institutional and Divisional Standings Compiled from the Report. *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 37, No. 9, pp. 481-492. Retrieved from Jstor. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1979136>