

National research assessment exercises: a comparison of peer review and bibliometrics rankings

Giovanni Abramo · Ciriaco Andrea D'Angelo · Flavia Di Costa

Received: 4 May 2011 / Published online: 23 July 2011
© Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, Hungary 2011

Abstract Development of bibliometric techniques has reached such a level as to suggest their integration or total substitution for classic peer review in the national research assessment exercises, as far as the hard sciences are concerned. In this work we compare rankings lists of universities captured by the first Italian evaluation exercise, through peer review, with the results of bibliometric simulations. The comparison shows the great differences between peer review and bibliometric rankings for excellence and productivity.

Keywords Research assessment · Bibliometrics · Peer review · Research productivity · University · Italy

Introduction

In recent years there has been unanimous agreement that governments should assign resources for scientific development according to rigorous evaluation criteria. This responds to the needs of the knowledge economy, which demands development of efficient scientific infrastructure capable of supporting the competitiveness of the national production system. The rising costs of research and tight restrictions on budgets add to the tendency for evaluation. Governments thus resort to such exercises, for the following purposes: (i) to stimulate greater efficiency in research activity; (ii) to allocate resources in function of merit; (iii) to reduce information asymmetry between supply and demand for

G. Abramo
National Research Council of Italy, IASI-CNR, Rome, Italy

G. Abramo (✉) · C. A. D'Angelo · F. Di Costa
Laboratory for Studies of Research and Technology Transfer, School of Engineering,
Department of Management, University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Rome, Italy
e-mail: giovanni.abramo@uniroma2.it

C. A. D'Angelo
e-mail: dangelo@dii.uniroma2.it

F. Di Costa
e-mail: di.costa@dii.uniroma2.it

new knowledge; (iv) to inform research policies and institutional strategies; and (v) to demonstrate that investment in research is effective and delivers public benefits.

The need for evaluation is fully agreed at the theoretical level, but issues are more problematic when it comes to what methods to apply. The recent development of bibliometric techniques has led various governments to introduce bibliometrics, where applicable, in support or substitution for more traditional peer review. In the United Kingdom the Research Excellence Framework (REF 2009), taking place in 2014, is an informed peer-review exercise, where the assessment outcomes will be a product of expert review informed by citation information and other quantitative indicators. It will substitute the previous Research Assessment Exercise series which were pure peer-review. In Italy, the Quality of Research Assessment (VQR), expected in 2012, substitutes the previous pure peer-review Triennial Evaluation Exercise (VTR 2006). It can be considered a hybrid, as the panels of experts can choose one or both of two methodologies for evaluating any particular output: (i) citation analysis; and/or (ii) *peer-review* by external experts. The Excellence in Research for Australia initiative (ERA 2010), launched in 2010, is conducted through a pure bibliometric approach for the hard sciences. Single research outputs are evaluated by a citation index referring to world and Australian benchmarks.

The pros and cons of peer-review and bibliometrics methods have been thoroughly dissected in the literature (Horrobin 1990; Moxam and Anderson 1992; MacRoberts and MacRoberts 1996; Moed 2002; van Raan 2005; Pendlebury 2009; Abramo and D'Angelo 2011). For evaluation of individual scientific products, the literature fails to decisively indicate whether one method is better than the other but demonstrates that there is certainly a correlation between the results from peer-review evaluation and those from purely bibliometric exercises. This has been demonstrated for the Italian system based on a broad scale study conducted by Abramo et al. (2009), with metrics based on the impact factor of journals, and by Franceschet and Costantini (2011) using citation analysis of publications. Preceding studies concerning other nations have also demonstrated a positive correlation between peer quality esteem and citation indicators (Aksnes and Taxt 2004; Oppenheim and Norris 2003; Rinia et al. 1998; Oppenheim 1997).

The severe limits of peer review emerge when it is applied to comparative evaluation, whether of individuals, research groups or entire institutions. Abramo and D'Angelo (2011) have contrasted the peer-review and bibliometrics approaches in national research assessments and conclude that the bibliometric methodology is by far preferable to peer review in terms of robustness, validity, functionality, time and costs. This is due to the intrinsic limits of all peer-review exercises, in which restrictions on budget and time force the review to focus the evaluation on a limited share of total output from each research organization. One of the consequences is that comparative peer review is limited to the dimension of excellence and is unable to deal with average quality or productivity of the subjects evaluated. A second limitation is that the final rankings are strongly dependent on the share of product evaluated (lack of robustness). A third is that the selection of products to submit to evaluation can be inefficient, due to both technical and social factors (parochialism, the real difficulty of comparing articles from various disciplines, etc.). This can impact negatively on the final rankings and their capacity to represent the true value (or lack of same) for the single organizations evaluated. A fourth consequence is that peer-review evaluations do not offer any assistance to universities in allocating resources to their best individual researchers, since they do not consistently penetrate to precise and comparable levels of information (lack of functionality). Finally, the time and costs of execution involved prevent peer-review evaluations from being sufficiently frequent for effective stimulation of improvement in research systems.

The limitations indicated, particularly those related to the selection and the share of products, lead to legitimate doubts about the accuracy of rankings of organizations as obtained from peer-review national assessment exercises. The aim of this work is to measure the amplitude of shift in rankings of organizations compared to the rankings from bibliometric-type evaluations. Bibliometric simulation is legitimated by the above-noted correlation between peer review and bibliometrics concerning individual research products. The comparison refers to the first Italian research assessment exercise (VTR 2006), for the scientific production from the period 2001–2003.

The next section of the work describes the dataset used and the methodology for the analysis. “Evaluation of scientific excellence in universities: VTR versus bibliometric assessment” and “VTR versus bibliometric productivity assessment” sections present and comment on the results obtained from the study, conducted at the aggregate level of disciplines. The last section provides a summary of the main results and some further considerations of the authors.

Methodology

Before showing the comparison between the Italian VTR rankings list¹ and those derived from the bibliometric simulation, we describe the dataset and the specific methodologies applied.

The VTR peer evaluation

In December 2003, the Italian Ministry for Universities and Research (MIUR) launched its first-ever Triennial Research Evaluation (VTR), which for the opening occasion referred to the period 2001–2003. The national Directory Committee for the Evaluation of Research (CIVR) was made responsible for conducting the VTR (2006). The assessment system was designed to evaluate research and development carried out by public research organizations (102 in total), including both universities and research organizations with MIUR funding. However, the remainder of the current work pertains only to universities.

In Italy each university scientist belongs to one specific disciplinary sector (SDS), 370 in all,² grouped in 14 University Disciplinary Areas (UDAs). As a first step, the CIVR selected experts for 14 panels, one for each UDA.³ Universities were then asked to autonomously submit research outputs to the panels⁴: outputs were to be in the proportion of one every four researchers working in the university in the period under observation. Outputs acceptable were limited to articles, books, and book chapters; proceedings of national and international congresses; patents and designs; performances, exhibitions and

¹ http://vtr2006.cineca.it/index_EN.html, last accessed on July 5, 2011.

² Complete list accessible at <http://cercauniversita.cineca.it/php5/settori/index.php>, last accessed on July 5, 2011.

³ The CIVR also organized six additional panels for “interdisciplinary sectors”: Science and technology (ST) for communications and an information society; ST for food quality security, ST for nano-systems and micro-systems; aerospace ST, and ST for the sustainable development and governance.

⁴ Each university was also asked to provide the CIVR with sets of input and output data for the institution and its individual UDAs.

art works. Thus the VTR was designed as an ex-post evaluation exercise focused on the best outputs produced by Italian research institutions.

In the next step, the panels assessed the research outputs and attributed a final judgment to each product, giving ratings of either “excellent”, “good”, “acceptable” or “limited”. The panels were composed of 183 high level peers appointed by the CIVR, and called on additional support from outside experts. The judgments were made on the basis of various criteria, such as quality, relevance and originality, international scope, and potential to support competition at an international level. To this purpose, the following quality index ($R_{i,u}$) was used for ranking research institution “ i ” in UDA “ u ”:

$$R_{i,u} = \frac{1}{T_{i,u}} \cdot (E_{i,u} + 0.8G_{i,u} + 0.6A_{i,u} + 0.2L_{i,u}) \tag{1}$$

where $E_{i,u}$; $G_{i,u}$; $A_{i,u}$; $L_{i,u}$ is the numbers of “excellent, good, acceptable” and “limited” outputs submitted by the i th university in UDA u . $T_{i,u}$ is the total number of outputs submitted by the i th university in UDA u .

A final report ranks universities based on their results under the quality assessment index. The rankings were realized at the level of single UDAs. Within each UDA the universities were subdivided by size into four classes: very large, large, medium, and small. As an example, Table 1 shows the ranking list of Italian “large” universities based on $R_{i,u}$, in the UDA “Mathematics and computer science”. Table 1, in addition to the dimensional ranking, gives the excellence ranking within the universe of institutions active in the UDA under examination. Table 2 presents the example of the specific ratings obtained by the University of Rome “Tor Vergata”, in the 11 disciplinary UDAs for which it submitted outputs.

The magnitude of the VTR effort can be suggested by a few pertinent facts: the evaluation included 102 research institutions (77 universities and 25 public research organizations) and examined about 18,000 outputs, drawing on 20 peer panels, 183 panelists and 6,661 reviewers, with the work taking almost 2 years and with direct costs amounting to 3.5 million euros.

Table 1 VTR rank list of Italian “large” universities for mathematics and computer science: E, G, A and L indicate numbers of outputs rated by VTR as excellent, good, acceptable, limited

University	Selected outputs	E	G	A	L	Rating	Category rank	Absolute rank	Absolute rank (‰)
Milan	28	17	10	1	0	0.914	1	4	92
Milan Polytechnic	25	16	7	2	0	0.912	2	6	90
Pisa	42	22	18	2	0	0.895	3	9	85
Rome “La Sapienza”	61	31	26	4	0	0.889	4	13	77
Bologna	35	17	15	3	0	0.880	5	16	67
Padua	31	11	17	3	0	0.852	6	23	58
Florence	31	12	15	3	1	0.839	7	25	54
Palermo	31	9	14	7	1	0.794	8	39	27
Turin	30	7	15	7	1	0.780	9	41	19
Genoa	30	7	17	4	2	0.780	9	41	19
Naples “Federico II”	43	7	26	8	2	0.767	11	44	17

Table 2 VTR ratings for University of Rome “Tor Vergata”

UDA	Selected outputs	E	G	A	L	Rating	Category rank (class)
Mathematics and computer science	23	17	5	1	0	0.939	1 out of 15 (medium)
Physics	19	10	9	0	0	0.905	8 out of 23 (medium)
Chemistry	8	3	5	0	0	0.875	7 out of 26 (small)
Biology	38	21	13	4	0	0.889	5 out of 23 (large)
Medicine	93	23	51	12	7	0.778	10 out of 16 (very large)
Civil engineering and architecture	10	2	5	3	0	0.780	5 out of 15 (medium)
Industrial and information engineering	21	5	10	2	4	0.714	18 out of 18 (medium)
Arts and humanities	23	13	6	3	1	0.861	12 out of 17 (medium)
History, philosophy, pedagogy and psychology	15	6	7	2	0	0.853	2 out of 15 (medium)
Law	28	4	17	5	2	0.750	9 out of 15 (large)
Economics and statistics	18	0	7	4	7	0.522	28 out of 31 (medium)

E, *G*, *A* and *L* numbers of outputs rated by VTR as excellent, good, acceptable, limited

The bibliometric dataset

The dataset of scientific products examined in the study is based on the Observatory of Public Research (ORP), derived under license from the Thomson Reuters Web of Science (WoS). ORP provides a census of scientific production dating back to 2001, from all Italian public research organizations (95 universities, 76 research institutions and 192 hospitals and health care research organizations). For this particular study the analysis is limited to universities. Beginning from the raw data of the WoS, and applying a complex algorithm for reconciliation of affiliations and disambiguation of the true identity of the authors, each publication (article, review and conference proceeding) is attributed to the university scientist or scientists that produced it (D’Angelo et al. 2011). Every publication is assigned to a UDA on the basis of the SDS to which the author belongs. A research product co-authored by scientists working in different UDAs is assigned to all these UDAs, and a research product co-authored by scientists working in different universities is assigned to all these universities. The field of observation covers the 2001–2003 triennium and is limited to the hard sciences, meaning eight out of the total 14 UDAs: Mathematics and computer science, Physics, Chemistry, Earth science, Biology, Medicine, Agricultural and veterinary sciences and Industrial and information engineering.⁵ In the UDAs thus examined, over the 2001–2003 period, there were an average of 31,924 scientists distributed in 69 universities (Table 3).

Overall, in the triennium examined, the research staff of these UDAs achieved 84,289 publications.⁶ The products submitted for evaluation in the VTR represented less than 9% of the total portfolio. Table 4 shows the representativity of publications submitted, by UDA.

⁵ The analysis does not consider Civil engineering and architecture because WoS does not cover the full range of research output for this UDA.

⁶ This value includes double counts for publications co-authored by researchers from more than one UDA.

Table 3 Universities and research staff in the Italian academic system, by UDA; data 2001–2003

UDA	No. of SDSs	Universities	Research staff
Mathematics and computer sciences	10	59	3,006
Physics	8	57	2,484
Chemistry	12	58	3,057
Earth sciences	12	48	1,253
Biology	19	63	4,752
Medicine	50	57	10,301
Agricultural and veterinary sciences	30	49	2,867
Industrial and information engineering	42	60	4,204
Total	183	69	31,924

Table 4 Number of publications selected for the VTR by universities in each UDA, and their representativity (period 2001–2003)

UDA	VTR products	VTR ORP-listed publications (a)	Total ORP-listed publications (b)	a/b (%)
Mathematics and computer science	751	711 (94.7%)	6,722	10.6
Physics	626	596 (95.2%)	12,919	4.6
Chemistry	758	712 (93.9%)	8,991	7.9
Earth science	323	303 (93.8%)	3,827	7.9
Biology	1,279	1,239 (96.9%)	8,103	15.3
Medicine	2,644	2,574 (97.4%)	27,577	9.3
Agriculture and veterinary science	617	571 (92.5%)	2,650	21.5
Industrial and information engineering	909	807 (88.8%)	13,500	6.0
Total	7,907	7,513 (95.0%)	84,289	8.9

Evaluation of scientific excellence in universities: VTR versus bibliometric assessment

The VTR provided for evaluation of a number of products from each university proportionate to the number of researchers belonging to each UDA.⁷ The underlying objective was clearly to identify and reward the universities on the basis of excellence. However the resulting rankings listings present distortions due to two factors. The first is the inefficiency in selection of the best products on the part of the university, which we have already noted. For this, the rankings lists do not reflect true excellence, but rather that suggested by the products submitted, with the distance from reality depending on the inefficiency of the selection. Abramo et al. (2009) have already quantified the inefficiency related to this problem.⁸ The second factor concerns the method of identifying excellence. If an exercise is conceived to measure (and reward) excellence, then the ranking lists that it produces

⁷ In theory, a university could have submitted products for only one researcher from each UDA.

⁸ They found that the average percentages of publications selected by universities for the VTR with a bibliometric quality value lower than the median of the national distribution for all of the university's outputs in a UDA varies from a minimum of 3.7% in biology to a maximum of 29.6% for agricultural and veterinary sciences. Other than this last discipline, notable figures also emerge for industrial and information engineering (26.5%) and mathematics and computer science (24.8%) as disciplines in which the selection

should indicate first place for those universities that produce, under equal availability of resources, a greater quantity of excellent research results (top-down approach). However the VTR, in a pattern that is unavoidable under peer review, evaluated a fixed number of products per university, independently of their real excellence (bottom-up approach). Given the assumption, backed by the literature, that peer review and bibliometrics are of equivalent in their evaluations of individual research products, the bibliometric approach can overcome these limits. Through indicators of impact, it is possible to adopt a top-down approach and at the same time eliminate the inefficiency in selection by the universities.

Using the bibliometric method for the evaluation of excellence, the position of university i in the national ranking list of UDA u derives from the indicator of excellence $I_{i,u}$, defined:

$$I_{i,u} = \frac{Ne_{i,u}}{Ne_u} \left/ \frac{RS_{i,u}}{RS_u} \right. \quad (2)$$

where $Ne_{i,u}$ is the number of excellent research products in UDA u authored by scientists of university i . Ne_u is the total number of national excellent research products in UDA u . $RS_{i,u}$ is the research staff of university i in UDA u . RS_u is the Total national research staff in UDA u .

But how can we qualify the excellence of a research product? From a bibliometric point of view, the excellence of a publication is indicated by the citations that it receives from the scientific community of reference. For the aims of the present work we consider an indicator, named the Article impact index (AII), equal to the standardized citations of a publication, i.e. the ratio of citations received by a publication to the median of citations⁹ for all Italian publications of the same year and WoS subject category.¹⁰ The distribution of the AII of national publications of a given UDA permits identification of the excellent products on the basis of a given threshold level. We have simulated two scenarios, one in line with international practice and the other in line with the Italian VTR exercise. Consequently the two reference datasets differ in function of the different selection methods for excellent publications: (i) consisting of the top 10% of the national publications per AII in each UDA (analogous to international practice); and (ii) consisting of the best publications from a UDA in numbers equal to 25% of the total national members of the UDA (analogous to the VTR guidelines).

For each of these two scenarios, national ranking lists were prepared in each UDA on the basis of indicator $I_{i,u}$. For comparison with the rankings from the VTR, Spearman coefficients of correlation were calculated (Table 5): these result as significant for five UDAs out of eight for scenario A and six out of eight for scenario B. Between the two scenarios, five UDAs are the same: Mathematics and computer sciences, Chemistry, Biology, Medicine, Agricultural and veterinary sciences. For scenario B, the coefficient also results as significant for Industrial and information engineering. Amongst these areas, the coefficients show a non-weak correlation only in Biology. Thus we certainly cannot

Footnote 8 continued

process results as particularly ineffective. In six out of eight UDAs there were actually universities that submitted all publications with a bibliometric quality indicator lower than the median for the UDA.

⁹ Observed as of 30/06/2009, meaning a citation time window between 6 and 8 years, certainly sufficient for the purposes of this work.

¹⁰ A possible alternative would be to standardize to the world average, as frequently observed in the literature. Standardizing citations to the median value rather than to the average, is justified by the fact that distributions of citations are highly skewed (Lundberg 2007).

Table 5 Spearman correlation between VTR ranking list and bibliometric ranking list

UDA	Scenario A		Scenario B	
	Correlat coeff.	Two-tailed <i>p</i> -value	Correlat coeff.	Two-tailed <i>p</i> -value
Mathematics and computer sciences	0.388	0.004	0.432	0.001
Physics	0.175	0.214	0.177	0.208
Chemistry	0.494	0.000	0.468	0.001
Earth sciences	0.132	0.412	0.118	0.463
Biology	0.577	0.000	0.670	0.000
Medicine	0.500	0.000	0.506	0.000
Agricultural and veterinary sciences	0.407	0.029	0.384	0.040
Industrial and information engineering	0.325	0.031	0.331	0.028

affirm that the bibliometric evaluation of excellence provides a framework that thoroughly coincides with the results of the evaluation exercise.

Given the correlation analysis, it is useful to analyze the shifts between the ranking lists in terms of variation of percentile and quartile. The results for Scenario A are seen in Table 6. The variations are very substantial: in terms of percentiles, the shifts always involve at least 89% of the universities, with average values falling in the range of 20–31 percentile points and medians in the range of 11–25. Maximum shifts are notable, always greater than 67; in four UDAs the maximum shift is actually over 90 percentiles; in Earth sciences and in Medicine there is the extreme circumstance of the university that places first in the VTR rankings coming last in the rankings on the basis of bibliometric indicator for excellence.

The variations by quartile are also very substantial. At least 45% of the universities active in Agricultural and veterinary sciences shift by at least one quartile, and 80% of those active in Biology register such shifts. In the other UDAs, the percentages of universities that make a shift fall between these two extremes. The values for average and median shift are uniform (equal to one quartile), except for Agricultural and veterinary sciences (median nil), as is the value for maximum shift (3 quartiles) for all the eight UDA examined.

The comparison between VTR and bibliometric rankings for scenario B is presented in Table 7: the results are almost a complete match to those from the comparison for scenario A.

Table 8 provides an examination in more detail concerning the distribution of universities for extent of shift, in quartiles. We provide this examination for the example of scenario B. The most striking cases (shifts of 3 quartiles) are seen in three UDAs: Physics (5 universities out of 52), Earth sciences (5 out of 41) and Industrial and information engineering (5 out of 44). In Physics, of the five universities, three drop from first to last quartile and two rise in the opposite direction, with respect to the CIVR evaluation. In Earth sciences and in Industrial and information engineering these numbers are equal to, respectively, two and three.

We now imagine a division of the rankings into four classes, as in the four research profile classes of universities applied by the last UK Research Assessment Exercise. The Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) has adopted a performance-based

Table 6 Statistics for shifts between VTR and bibliometric ranking lists

UDA	Univ.	Percentile variations				Quartile variations			
		Var (%)	Max	Aver.	Median	Var (%)	Max	Aver.	Median
Mathematics and computer sciences	53	98	81	26	23	68	3	1	1
Physics	52	96	96	30	23	69	3	1	1
Chemistry	51	94	90	22	18	57	3	1	1
Earth sciences	41	98	100	31	25	80	3	1	1
Biology	55	96	91	20	15	56	3	1	1
Medicine	46	89	100	22	18	52	3	1	1
Agricultural and veterinary sciences	29	93	89	22	11	45	3	1	0
Industrial and information engineering	44	95	67	28	22	61	3	1	1

Scenario A: excellent publications = top national 10% per UDA

Table 7 Statistics for shifts between VTR and bibliometric ranking lists

UDA	Univ.	Percentile variations				Quartile variations			
		Var (%)	Max	Aver.	Median	Var (%)	Max	Aver.	Median
Mathematics and computer sciences	53	100	63	25	25	70	2	1	1
Physics	52	96	96	29	23	67	3	1	1
Chemistry	51	96	92	22	12	51	3	1	1
Earth sciences	41	98	100	31	23	68	3	1	1
Biology	55	89	65	19	17	62	3	1	1
Medicine	46	91	100	22	17	52	3	1	1
Agricultural and veterinary sciences	29	100	93	23	11	59	3	1	1
Industrial and information engineering	44	91	74	28	26	66	3	1	1

Scenario B: excellent publications equal to 25% of national FTE research staff per UDA

research funding scheme¹¹ which does not assign any funds to universities that placed in the lowest of these four classes. Universities with an evaluation of their research profile as first class receive (under equal numbers of research staff) three times more funds of universities in the second class, which in turn receive three times as much as those in the third class. If the resource attribution mechanisms for Italian universities were the same as that for the UK HEFCE, in Industrial and information engineering (as an example) three universities would not have received any funds, even though they place first in national rankings according to reliable bibliometric criteria. On the other hand, two universities that

¹¹ For detail: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/research/funding/qrfunding/>, last accessed on July 5, 2011.

Table 8 Numerosity of universities for extent of shift (in quartiles) for each UDA (scenario B)

UDA	Quartile leap				Total
	None	1	2	3	
Mathematics and computer sciences	16	25	12	0	53
Physics	17	14	16	5	52
Chemistry	25	17	6	3	51
Earth sciences	13	16	7	5	41
Biology	21	27	6	1	55
Medicine	22	13	10	1	46
Agricultural and veterinary sciences	12	9	5	3	29
Industrial and information engineering	15	19	5	5	44

place very low in the national bibliometric classification would receive very large quantities of funds on the basis of the VTR, with very evident distortion of the reward system.

VTR versus bibliometric productivity assessment

The main limit of the peer-review evaluation method remains that of not being able to compare the research productivity of organizations without excessive costs and times. The consequence of containing costs is the extreme volatility of rankings with variation of the share of product evaluated, as stated above and as measured in a preceding study by Abramo et al. (2010). The authors' opinion is that a system of evaluation and consequent selective funding should embed productivity measurements, which makes evaluation of the total output necessary. In the hard sciences the publications indexed in such bibliometric data bases as WoS or Scopus, represent a meaningful proxy of total output (Moed 2005), meaning that the bibliometric method permits comparative measurement of productivity. However, if rankings by quality evaluation based on peer review agree with rankings of universities based on productivity, it is evident that no conflict occurs. In this section we test for this occurrence, meaning we verify whether the research institutions evaluated as excellent in terms of quality are also necessarily those that are most efficient in research activities.

As previously, we first do a correlation analysis and then an analysis of the shifts in rankings. We apply a bibliometric indicator of productivity, defining research productivity ($RP_{i,s}$) of University i in SDS s as:

$$RP_{i,s} = \frac{1}{RS_{i,s}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{i,s}} AI_j \cdot n_{j,i,s} \quad (3)$$

with AI_j is the article impact index of publication j . $n_{j,i,s}$ is the fraction of authors of university i and SDS s to total co-authors of publication j (considering, if publication j falls in life science subject categories, the position of each author and the character of the co-authorship, either intra-mural or extra-mural¹²). $N_{i,s}$ is the total number of publications

¹² If first and last authors belong to the same university, 40% of citations are attributed to each of them; the remaining 20% are divided among all other authors. If the first two and last two authors belong to different

Table 9 Spearman correlation between VTR ranking lists and bibliometric rankings for productivity

UDA	Coefficient of correlation	Two-tail <i>p</i> -value
Mathematics and computer sciences	0.457	0.001
Physics	0.042	0.770
Chemistry	0.484	0.000
Earth sciences	-0.028	0.861
Biology	0.484	0.000
Medicine	0.375	0.010
Agricultural and veterinary sciences	0.156	0.419
Industrial and information engineering	0.469	0.001

authored by research staff in SDS *s* of university *i*. $RS_{i,j}$ is the research staff of university *i* in SDSs *s*

Once the productivity indicator has been measured at the level of SDS we proceed to aggregation at the UDA level, through standardization and weighting of the data for its SDSs. This method limits the distortion typical of aggregate analyses that do not take account of the varying fertility of the SDSs and their varying representation in terms of members in each UDA (Abramo et al. 2008). The research productivity ($RP_{i,u}$) in a general UDA *u* of a general university *i* is thus calculated as:

$$RP_{i,u} = \sum_{s=1}^{n_u} \left(\frac{RP_{i,s}}{RP_s} \cdot \frac{RS_{i,s}}{RS_{i,u}} \right) \quad (4)$$

with RP_s is the average research productivity of national universities in SDS *s*. $RS_{i,u}$ is the research staff of university *i* in UDA *u*. n_u is the number of SDS in UDA *u*.

Table 9 presents the Spearman coefficients of correlation for the ranking lists obtained from the VTR and from application of this bibliometric indicator of productivity. The coefficients are statistically significant in only five UDAs out of eight (Mathematics and computer sciences, Chemistry, Biology, Medicine and Industrial and information engineering), but the values indicate a weak correlation between the two rankings. Once again, the results clearly show that the research institutions evaluated through peer review as excellent in terms of quality are not necessarily those that are most efficient in research activities.

The analysis of the rankings shifts between the two lists (Table 10) shows obvious differences. For quartile rankings, the percentages of universities with shifts vary from a minimum of 53% in Chemistry to a maximum of 77% in Physics.¹³ Just as in the analysis for the preceding section, the results are uniform for values of average and median shift (equal to one quartile) and for maximum shift (equal to three quartiles). It should be noted that a shift equal to 3 quartiles means that a university in the top group of rankings by VTR would thus result in the last, or vice versa.

Footnote 12 continued

universities, 30% of citations are attributed to first and last authors; 15% of citations are attributed to second and last author but one; the remaining 10% are divided among all others.

¹³ In Table 1 it is also these two areas that are at extreme opposites in terms of differences between bibliometric rating and CIVR rating.

Table 10 Statistics for shifts in rankings between VTR ranking lists and bibliometric rankings for productivity

UDA	Univ.	Percentile variations				Quartile variations			
		Var (%)	Max	Aver.	Median	Var (%)	Max	Aver.	Median
Mathematics and computer sciences	53	96	81	24	21	68	3	1	1
Physics	52	100	88	33	28	75	3	1	1
Chemistry	51	98	86	23	20	53	3	1	1
Earth sciences	41	98	100	33	25	71	3	1	1
Biology	55	95	67	24	20	67	3	1	1
Medicine	46	100	96	24	16	57	3	1	1
Agricultural and veterinary sciences	29	100	93	30	25	69	3	1	1
Industrial and information engineering	44	98	79	23	16	57	3	1	1

Conclusions

Both within the scientific community and beyond, there is unanimous agreement that resources for science should be assigned according to rigorous evaluation criteria. However there is a lively debate on which methods should be adopted to carry out such evaluations. The peer-review methodology has long been the most common. This was the approach for the first large-scale evaluation in Italy (VTR), dealing with the 2001–2003 triennium and concluded in 2006. Recently, the agency responsible prepared the guidelines for an updated national evaluation (the VQR), this time on the basis of a 7-year period and a more ample set of products, but still a peer-review type exercise.

For whatever evaluation intended to inform a research funding scheme, the conception must be of a manner to achieve the strategic objectives the policy-maker is proposing. For the Italian VTR, the objective was to identify and reward excellence: in this work we have attempted to verify the achievement of the objective. To do this we compared the rankings lists from the VTR with those obtained from evaluation simulations conducted with analogous bibliometric indicators. The analyses have highlighted notable shifts, the causes of which the authors have amply examined in previous works. The results justify very strong doubts about the reliability of the VTR rankings in representing the real excellence of Italian universities, and raise a consequent worry about the choice to distribute part of the ordinary funding for university function on the basis of these rankings. One detailed analysis by the authors shows that the VTR rankings cannot even be correlated with the average productivity of the universities. Everything seems to suggest a reexamination of the choices made for the first VTR and the proposals for the new VQR. The time seems ripe for adoption of a different approach than peer review, at least for the hard sciences, areas where publication in international journals represents a robust proxy of the research output, and where bibliometric techniques offer advantages that are difficult to dispute when compared to peer review.

References

- Abramo, G., & D'Angelo, C. A. (2011). Evaluating research: From informed peer review to bibliometrics. *Scientometrics*, *87*(3), 499–514.
- Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Caprasecca, A. (2009). Allocative efficiency in public research funding: Can bibliometrics help? *Research Policy*, *38*(1), 206–215.
- Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Di Costa, F. (2008). Assessment of sectoral aggregation distortion in research productivity measurements. *Research Evaluation*, *17*(2), 111–121.
- Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Viel, F. (2010). Peer review research assessment: A sensitivity analysis of performance rankings to the share of research product evacuate. *Scientometrics*, *85*(3), 705–720.
- Aksnes, D. W., & Taxt, R. E. (2004). Peers reviews and bibliometric indicators: A comparative study at Norwegian University. *Research Evaluation*, *13*(1), 33–41.
- D'Angelo, C. A., Giuffrida, C., & Abramo, G. (2011). A heuristic approach to author name disambiguation in large-scale bibliometric databases. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *62*(2), 257–269.
- ERA. (2010). The Excellence in Research for Australia Initiative <http://www.arc.gov.au/era/>.
- Franceschet, M., & Costantini, A. (2011). The first Italian research assessment exercise: A bibliometric perspective. *Journal of Informetrics*, *5*(2), 275–291.
- Horrobin, D. F. (1990). The philosophical basis of peer review and the suppression of innovation. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *263*(10), 1438–1441.
- Lundberg, J. (2007). Lifting the crown-citation z-score. *Journal of Informetrics*, *1*(2), 145–154.
- MacRoberts, M. H., & MacRoberts, B. R. (1996). Problems of citation analysis. *Scientometrics*, *36*(3), 435–444.
- Moed, H. F. (2002). The impact-factors debate: The ISI's uses and limits. *Nature*, *415*, 731–732.
- Moed, H. F. (2005). *Citation analysis in research evaluation*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Moxam, H., & Anderson, J. (1992). Peer review. A view from the inside. *Science and Technology Policy*, *5*(1), 7–15.
- Oppenheim, C. (1997). The correlation between citation counts and the 1992 research assessment exercise ratings for British research in genetics, anatomy and archaeology. *Journal of Documentation*, *53*, 477–487.
- Oppenheim, C., & Norris, M. (2003). Citation counts and the research assessment exercise V: Archaeology and the 2001 RAE. *Journal of Documentation*, *56*(6), 709–730.
- Pendlebury, D. A. (2009). The use and misuse of journal metrics and other citation indicators. *Scientometrics*, *57*(1), 1–11.
- REF. (2009). Report on the pilot exercise to develop bibliometric indicators for the Research Excellence Framework. http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2009/09_39/.
- Rinia, E. J., van Leeuwen, Th. N., van Vuren, H. G., & van Raan, A. F. J. (1998). Comparative analysis of a set of bibliometric indicators and central peer review criteria: Evaluation of condensed matter physics in the Netherlands. *Research Policy*, *27*(1), 95–107.
- van Raan, A. F. J. (2005). Fatal attraction: Conceptual and methodological problems in the ranking of universities by bibliometric methods. *Scientometrics*, *62*(1), 133–143.
- VTR. (2006). Valutazione Triennale (2001–2003) della Ricerca italiana (italian Triennial Assessment Exercise). Risultati delle valutazioni dei Panel di Area. http://vtr2006.cineca.it/php5/vtr_rel_civr_rapp_panel_menu.php?info=-&&sel_lingua=EN&decritta=1&versione=2&aggiorna=0&info=. Accessed July 5, 2010).