

# La buona ricerca è rigorosa e rilevante

**Prof. Gaetano Aiello**



# Una autocitazione (mancata...)



## *Transizione e processi di valutazione*

---

Prof. Gaetano Aiello

Roma, 28 febbraio 2012

# Un caveat.....il REF 2014 (nel 2012)



REF 01.2012  
January 2012

This document is for information

This document sets out the assessment criteria and working methods of the main and sub-panels for the 2014 Research Excellence Framework. The deadline for submissions is 29 November 2013.

Panel criteria  
and working  
methods

## Part 2C Main Panel C criteria

---

**Main Panel C covers the following sub-panels:**

- 16 Architecture, Built Environment and Planning
  - 17 Geography, Environmental Studies and Archaeology
  - 18 Economics and Econometrics
  - 19 Business and Management Studies
  - 20 Law
  - 21 Politics and International Studies
  - 22 Social Work and Social Policy
  - 23 Sociology
  - 24 Anthropology and Development Studies
  - 25 Education
  - 26 Sport and Exercise Sciences, Leisure and Tourism
-

# Un caveat.....il REF 2014 (nel 2012)



## Citation data

64. Sub-panels 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 will neither receive nor make use of citation data, or any other form of bibliometric analysis including journal impact factors.

65. Sub-panel 18 (Economics and Econometrics) will receive citation data where available, and will make use of the data where considered appropriate.

# Un caveat.....il REF 2014 (nel 2012)



Tutti i sub-panel dell'area C, compreso il 19 in Business and Management Studies, ed escluso il 18 in Economics and Econometrics, scelgono di NON utilizzare indicatori bibliometrici nel processo di valutazione

# L'eccellenza (4\*) per il REF 2014 (nel 2012)



- a. In assessing work as being four star (quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics:
- outstandingly novel in developing concepts, techniques or outcomes
  - a primary or essential point of reference in its field or sub-field
  - major influence on the intellectual agenda of a research theme or field
  - application of exceptionally rigorous research design and techniques of investigation and analysis, and the highest standards of intellectual precision
  - instantiating an exceptionally significant, multi-user data set or research resource.

# Un caveat.....il REF 2014 (nel 2012)



- Tre tipologie di valutazione
  - Sui prodotti scientifici (outputs)
  - Impatto extra-accademico (impact)
  - Ambiente interno di ricerca (environment)

# Un caveat.....il REF 2014 (nel 2012)



## Output types

38. Main Panel C welcomes all forms of research output that fulfil the eligibility criteria for the REF (set out in paragraphs 105-117 of 'guidance on submissions' and in Part 1, paragraphs 43-44 of this document) and recognises that work of the highest quality can be found in a range of media. The sub-panels will assess all forms of output on an equal basis, with no preconception of quality attached to the form or medium of an output. No sub-panel will use journal impact factors or any hierarchy of journals in their assessment of outputs.



# I risultati del REF 2014 (nel 2015)



## Outputs

17. Journal articles comprised over 95 per cent of the outputs (11,660) submitted for assessment. Other types of research output included 168 authored books, 179 book chapters and 103 working papers. As in the previous research assessment exercises, journal articles were published in a very wide range of outlets, this time numbering in excess of 1,000. All outputs were read in sufficient detail to enable a grade to be defined. If the same article was submitted more than once by authors included in different submissions, the sub-panel ensured that all instances received the same grade. The sub-panel received just eight requests for outputs to be double-weighted and was able to agree to all but one, for which the reserve output was assessed. Items accepted as double-weighted were awarded grades that ranged from 2\* to 4\*.

# I risultati del REF 2014 (nel 2015)



## Outputs

20. As stated in paragraph 38, page 64 of the 'Panel Criteria and Working Methods', the sub-panel did not use journal lists to assess the quality of outputs. A post-assessment review of a sample of about 1,000 outputs showed that a range of grades was given to outputs in the same journal whatever the overall ranking of that journal.

# I risultati del REF 2014 (nel 2015)



## Impact

22. The sub-panel welcomed the inclusion of research impact in the REF, since it would help encourage research that continues to be relevant to policy and practice. The impact assessors were a great boon to the sub-panel, offering well-informed views that were sensitive to the aims of the REF and the opportunities available to researchers in business and management studies, whilst also being aware of the time and other constraints faced by UK academics. It is pleasing that a large majority of submissions showed elements of outstanding impact and clear relevance to policy or practice or both.

# I risultati del REF 2014 (nel 2015)



## Impact

25. The impact cases covered a very wide range of impact types, including impacts within organisations, on national policy, on international agreements and on the public. The high scoring impact cases typically provided clear evidence of the reach and significance of the impact, the underpinning research which was cited clearly met the threshold requirement of international excellence and there was a strong narrative that described how the research led to the impact.

# Un secondo caveat..... Journal of Marketing July 2011



Donald R. Lehmann, Leigh McAlister, & Richard Staelin

## Sophistication in Research in Marketing

Over the years, the level of analytical rigor has risen in articles published in marketing academic journals. While, *ceteris paribus*, rigor is desirable, there is a growing sense that rigor has become a, if not the, goal for research in marketing. Consequently, other desirable characteristics, such as relevance, communicability, and simplicity, have been downplayed, to the detriment of the field of marketing. The authors explore this imbalance, setting forth the consequences of overemphasis on rigor for (1) the manuscript review process, (2) PhD programs, (3) hiring, and (4) the tenure and promotion review process. Two surveys of “successful” authors provide empirical support for the conjectures put forth. The authors then identify the causes for this trend and propose some directions to reestablish a better balance between rigor and relevance.

Un terzo caveat....

Rigore e rilevanza per un *barone* della  
bibliometria (21.443 citazioni; h-index 62)



V. Kumar

## **My Reflections on Publishing in *Journal of Marketing***

### ***Rigor Versus Relevance***

This issue has surfaced in several scholarly discussions over the past few years and attains prominence especially during efforts to bridge the academic–practitioner divide. When scholars try to understand this dichotomy, the debate quickly

reaches a point of determining the trade-off between rigor and relevance. In other words, the thought process of “Does having more of one mean less of another?” emerges. There is also belief among scholars that marketing journals’ tendency to lean toward rigor is a cause for this situation (Ellison 2002; Lehmann, McAlister, and Staelin 2011). I believe that the marketing community will be better served if we adopt a rigor *and* relevance approach as opposed to a rigor *versus* relevance approach.

## Rigore e rilevanza per un *barone* della bibliometria (21443 citazioni; h-index 62)



**Rigor** thus should not be limited to study methodologies but should also be applied to articles' conceptual and analytical frameworks. Authors can incorporate rigor into articles by (1) reviewing published articles in scholarly journals such as *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Journal of Consumer Research*, and *Marketing Science*; (2) introducing concepts from other disciplines such as economics, statistics, and psychology; and (3) interacting with peers in academia.

## Rigore e rilevanza per un *barone* della bibliometria (21443 citazioni; h-index 62)



Ensuring **relevance** assists in making the research more accessible to the practitioner community.

Establishing relevance in articles begins with solving a problem of potential managerial interest. Authors can identify such problems by interacting with practitioners and decision makers. Essentially, when research articles comprehensively answer the question “What’s in it for me?” (as viewed from the practitioners’ perspective), they address the relevance issue and should secure the attention of the practitioner audience.



# Un quarto caveat....cosa sono le citazioni

## Articolo apparso su una rivista con 5YIF 2,71



Different types of citation may signal different degrees of scientific merit and impact. Yet, content analyses of the citations papers receive are rare. We gathered empirical data on citation types on an unprecedented scale – 659 papers published between 1990 and 2007 in the top 5 marketing journals – and are the first to empirically examine the determinants of different citation types. In our sample, 31.8% of all citations are perfunctory mentions and 52.9% are review citations. In other words, only 15% of all citations show irrefutable scientific merit from citing to cited article.

# Un quarto caveat....cosa sono le citazioni

## Articolo apparso su una rivista con 5YIF 2,71



Moreover, of 49 determinants of citation behavior, only 5 are statistically significant and have the same sign across citation types. Among the more noteworthy findings are the following. Editorial review board members receive more perfunctory citations than non-editorial board members, while for other types of citation they are cited equally frequently. Also articles with more references receive more perfunctory mentions, but not more citations of other types, confirming the “you cite me, I'll cite you” citation gaming, mentioned in prior literature.

# Steal or Buy? IF: 0,714



*Journal of Consumer Behaviour, J. Consumer Behav.*, 15: 3–14 (2016)

Published online 11 August 2015 in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com) DOI: 10.1002/cb.1526

## Download or stream? Steal or buy? Developing a typology of today's music consumer

GARY SINCLAIR<sup>1\*</sup> and TODD GREEN<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Stirling Management School, University of Stirling, Stirling FK9 4LA, UK*

<sup>2</sup>*Goodman School of Business, Brock University, 500 Glenridge Avenue, St. Catharines, Ontario, L2S3A1, Canada*

# Steal or Buy? IF: 0,714



## ABSTRACT

This paper explores the impact that recent transformations in digital music technology (e.g. the increasing popularity of legal streaming platforms) have had on the consumer experience. Following 35 in-depth qualitative interviews, we have identified four key segments of contemporary music consumers (steadfast pirates, ex-downloaders, mixed tapes and the old schoolers [the disengaged]) based on a continuum of their preference for illegal music piracy. Examining key themes (e.g. morality, format, value and identity investment) to distinguish each segment, we contribute to a fragmented music piracy literature in particular through the identification of the “ex-downloaders” and “mixed tape” segments. Previous literature has tended to frame music piracy in very simplistic terms, failing to acknowledge a large number of consumers who are conflicted about their actions and rationalise their piracy in complicated and inconsistent ways related to the broader industry and their own sense of identity as a music consumer. Additionally, the discussion of the ex-downloader segment provides significant evidence that for a large number of consumers, a policy of participation, in the shape of providing superior alternatives for legal digital music consumption, can be much more beneficial in tackling the problem of piracy than previous strategies of policing and coercion. Managerial and future research implications are discussed. Copyright © 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

# E quindi....



- La buona ricerca è rigorosa e rilevante
- Con il REF hanno provato a misurare la rilevanza (con l'impact)
- Se si supera la bibliometria come automatismo si può valutare la rilevanza anche negli output (basta leggere e valutare gli articoli)
- Ottimi articoli possono conquistare collocazioni prestigiose perché scritti su temi rilevanti e basati su ricerche condotte con metodi rigorosi

# E quindi....



- La bibliometria è una bestia brutta ma utile (come il somaro) a portare carichi pesanti, ma qualcuno deve guidarla, darle una direzione e non darle carichi che non può portare

