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Metrics at intersection

- measuring open access (OA journals)
- bibliometrics of humanities & social sciences
- webometrics of usage
- societal quality indicator

- All difficult and not always very successful so far
- All cope with data coverage problems
- All cope with fundamental validity problems

- And of course, metrics should not be leading ..... right?
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Does an OA citation advantage exist?

Figure 2. Variability plot of citations to APS articles 36 months after publication. Boxes represent the interquartile range (25th to 75th percentile) and contain the median value (horizontal line) and average value (horizontal dash). “Whiskers” extend 1.5x the length of the interquartile range.

Source: P. Davis (2010) Does Open Access Lead to Increased Readership and Citations? A Randomized Controlled Trial of Articles Published in APS Journals, The Physiologist, 53, 6
Building blocks for an agenda

• Model building: how do open access monographs actually function?

• Data curation

• Designing meaningful indicators in a variety of dimensions
  – creation or production
  – usage
  – impact or influence
Source: A. Zuccala, “The layperson and open access”, ARIST, 2009: 359 - 396
openness framework

- interface
- transparency
- access
- inclusivity
- interoperability
- standardization
- adaptability
- infrastructure

Clifford Tatum - January 2011
About COUNTER

Launched in March 2002, COUNTER (Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources) is an international initiative serving librarians, publishers and intermediaries by setting standards that facilitate the recording and reporting of online usage statistics in a consistent, credible and compatible way. The first COUNTER Code of Practice, covering online journals and databases, was published in 2003. COUNTER’s coverage was extended further with the launch of the Code of Practice for online books and reference works in 2006. The body of COUNTER compliant usage statistics has steadily grown as more and more vendors have adopted the COUNTER Codes of Practice. This has contributed to the new discipline of usage bibliometrics and a great deal of work is underway to try to establish value metrics, associated with usage, in which the COUNTER compliant statistics play an increasingly important role.

COUNTER does more than just set the standards for usage reports; we are co-operating with a number of organizations to develop a range of usage-related research and services. In 2008 COUNTER carried out research, sponsored by JISC (the UK Joint Information Systems Committee) on the effects of publisher platforms on usage and we are currently collaborating with the UK Serials Group on the possible development of a new Journal Usage Factor metric. Summary reports on both these projects can be found on the COUNTER website at http://www.projectcounter.org/news.html. COUNTER has also worked with NISO or SUSHI (Standardised Usage Harvesting Initiative) to develop a protocol to facilitate the automated harvesting and consolidation of usage statistics from different vendors. This protocol may be found on the NISO website at http://www.niso.org/schemas/sushi/index.html.

COUNTER brings the following benefits to librarians, publishers and intermediaries:

Librarians are able to compare usage statistics from different vendors; derive useful metrics such as cost-per-use; make better-informed purchasing decisions; plan infrastructure more effectively.

Publishers and intermediaries are able to: provide data to customers in a format they want; compare the relative usage of different delivery channels; aggregate data for customers using multiple delivery channels; learn more about genuine usage patterns.
The Ranking of Repositories is published since 2008 and two editions are available usually at the end of January and July. The repositories should have their own web domain or subdomain and include at least peer-reviewed papers to be considered (services that contain only archives, databanks or learning objects are not ranked). Starting with this January 2011 edition we are including a separate ranking (Top Portals) that accounts for national services, international platforms and portals of Journals.

The January edition consists of more than 1,200 repositories, ranked according to a composite index that combines activity indicators (size, rich files and Scholar) and impact (link visibility). The rank for each variable is shown in the lists, but the global one is computed combining normalized values instead of the individual rank of each indicator. In this edition we have excluded the Exalead data due to their strong geographical biases, also data regarding xls files has not been taken into account because of its lack of representativeness. We have considered all the external inlinks, including also those coming from gTLD domains.

The paper describing the Ranking has been already published, so you can request to the corresponding author for a copy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>CONTINENT</th>
<th>REPOSITORY</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>WORLD RANK</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>VISIBILITY</th>
<th>RICH FILES</th>
<th>SCHOLAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>HAL</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>HAL</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Igtur</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Ecole</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Universitat</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Universidade</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Dissertations</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Universitat</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Ludwig</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proceed in parallel?

• Data curation:
  – clear OA standards and business model
  – national documentation systems (Hicks)
  – web usage standards
  – mix data sources in new database systems (CWTS)
• Models of “productive interactions”
• Pilot indicator projects
  – ACUMEN
  – ERiC