

Classifying SSH content within the Hungarian Scientific Bibliography (MTMT)

- theory and practice -

Sándor Soós





1.

Research classification for National publication databases: Why?



- Information retrieval
- Representations of scholarly activity and performance
 - > Reporting etc
 - Assessment on productivity
- Normalization of performance indicators:
 - Field-normalized citation impact measures

Are these purposes interchangeable? Results in a uniform classification?





2.

Research classification for national publication databases: How?



Dimensions of classification attempts



- Organizational
- > Cognitive
- Qualificaton-based

• Methodological aspect:

- Mapping via ontologies, thesauri, classifications (external sources)
- Empirical (data-driven): citations, (co-)authors, referencees, text descriptors
- Indexer-based (author selfassignment)

- Technical:
 - > Algorithmic
 - Manual
- Agency:
 - Indexer-based
 - Author-based
- Aggregation level:
 - > Organization
 - > Author
 - ➢ Paper





3.

Hungarian Scienctific Bibliography (MTMT)





4.4.6. MTMT in Hungary

The main purpose for MTMT is bibliometrics-based research evaluation; in addition MTMT is intended as a general source of information on research in Hungary.

For MTMT, inclusion criteria are specified in the law on the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. In general, all research output is included in MTMT using a detailed classification of output types. However, further criteria apply for subsets that are used in research evaluation and/or funding allocation. For those subsets, all output from research funded by public funds should be included in MTMT. Nevertheless, it is possible to include unaffiliated publications (e.g. researchers in retirement or without an affiliation) and publications resulting from research funded by other sources.

The main focus is on journal articles, books, book chapters, and conference proceedings. However, MTMT stores data also on research data, engineering and artistic products, and other types of research output (see Holl et al. 2014).





4.

Attempt 1: classification by external sources



Cognitive vs. qualification-based

- Comparing a cognitive and a qualification-based classifiocation imposed on the MTMT-WoS intersection (paper vs. Author level)
- ESI (WoS) vs. MAB (Hungarian Acreditation Committee): entropy of MAB categories





Cognitive vs. qualification-based

• Association of MAB and ESI categories



Cognitive vs. qualification-based

• Distribution of citation benchmark values in quali-based categories







4.

Attempt2: classifying SSH content



- Objective: classifying SSH content using the OECD FOR (Fields of Science) system (algorithmically)
- Option1: mapping-based
 - > Only applicable to MTMT intersections with WoS or Scopus
- Option2: empirical (for non-WoS/Scopus content)
 - References (bibliographic coupling): not available in MTMT
 - Citatios (co-citation analysis): citation numbers are very low and many zeros
 - ➢ Co-authorship: rare phenomenon in many SS and H fields...
 - ➢ Still need a mapping to FOS







FOR mapping problems









A hybrid approach:

• Mapping-based part

- Journal content
- > External classifications: ERIH, national library
- > Manual mapping of external classifications to FOS categories
- > Mapping journal content to FOS categories

• Text mining part

- Non-Journal content
- Using a detailed "ontology" with Hungarain subjet terms (committee of HAS)
- Mapping the upper level of this ontology to FOS
- Classifying items at **author level** via occurence of subject terms in authorprovided field descriptions (MTMT field, no controlled vocabulary)
- Mapping items to FOS categories









FOS_field	Total number of publications (#)	Number of publications in the main national language(-s) (#)	Number of English language publications (#)	Number of articles in books (#)	Number of monographs (#)	Number of articles in conference proceedings
5. Social Sciences	39,414	26,814	10,159	14,773	4,915	1,799
5.01 Psychology	4,354	2,487	1,760	1,388	349	523
5.02 Economics and business	9,761	6,141	3,032	3,025	1,126	371
5.03 Educational sciences	8,725	6,581	1,642	3,662	1,155	498
5.04 Sociology	3,897	2,752	954	1,096	443	138
5.05 Law	9,211	6,944	1,545	3,989	1,290	144
5.06 Political science	3,567	2,695	714	1,013	446	43
5.07 Social and economic geography	2,199	1,300	766	1,026	273	74
5.08 Media and communication	1,965	1,381	419	621	253	90
5.09 Other social sciences	1,126	949	149	186	111	4
6. Humanities	33,250	23,287	4,946	11,346	4,590	522
6.01 History and archaeology	15,952	11,601	2,095	5,528	2,312	183
6.02 Languages and literature	17,037	11,642	2,577	5,798	2,260	311
6.03 Philosophy, ethics and religion	2,808	1,962	546	960	404	39
6.04 Art	1,205	776	186	342	174	8
6.05 Other Humanities	911	626	121	232	110	1



Conclusions (problems)

- Regarding SSH content
- Empirical approaches: missing or scarce metadata, citation behavior does not allow for field delineation
- Mapping—based approaches: available mappings reflect the characteristics of national communities instead of field delineations)
- Pragmatic attempts (combining manual methods and data-mining heuristics): missing coherence

