

---

## **HUMANITIES TOWARDS A BIBLIOMETRICS FRAMEWORK**

**Dr. Anubhav Soni\*; Mr. Pooran Singh\*\***

\*SOMC

Sanskriti University, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, INDIA

Email id: anubhavs.somc@sanskriti.edu.in

\*\*SOMC

Sanskriti University, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, INDIA

Email id: registrar@sanskriti.edu.in

**DOI: 10.5958/2249-7315.2021.00285.9**

---

### **ABSTRACT**

*In this article the possibility of using bibliometric measures to assess the study in the sciences is addressed. A review of past attempts to develop bibliometric research methods shows that differences in organizational, epistemological and research practices in the fields of research are all to be taken into consideration. In several areas of humanism, the dependence on collaborators, interdisciplinary and the rural nature of research is emphasized as factors that influence the application of bibliometric methods. Some particularly intriguing approaches as well as the possibility of establishing a Bibliometric for the humanities are addressed. In addition, the intellectual characteristics of some areas should be considered when developing performance metrics and the need of engaging science specialists in the process is underlined. Bibliometrics may be helpful to evaluate the wider impact of scientific research in the future and an assessment of citations can help us understand better how these disciplines are structured and evolved.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Bibliometric, Citation, Humanities, Publication, Research.*

---

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

In this essay, the academics claim that the bibliographical study of humanities is eventually developing. Apparently the study is progressively moving away from comprehensive analyses as well as towards a new field of research which tries to define humanities in its own terms and concentrates on specific topics rather than a wide variety of disciplines grouped under the "humanities" name. This new model of research removes the usual but often difficult divide between scientific disciplines and humanities as well as the traditional practice of depicting social science as "the other" that does not fit in with the bibliographic paradigm(1). Initiatives to create bibliometric methods that are sensitive to the structure of the fields of research have emerged from a growing focus on the actual characteristics of subjects. Examples of such initiatives include the use of alternative databases like Google Scholar, and the current examination of the possibilities provided by the new Books Citation Index (BSI). All of these initiatives are instances of exploring regional databases, referrals to research funding, book reviews and inclusion in library collections. The possibilities altmetrics have lately been investigated for the humanities.

It seems to be promising to include many different types of techniques and materials, as well as to extend quality requirements. On the other hand, this chapter focuses on the study objective and organization rather than technology, resources or coverage. As a consequence, scholars argue, in addressing the use of bibliometrics in research fields included by the term "humanities" that saturation is not the only problem and maybe not the most important(2). The researchers start by outlining the bibliometric history of the humanities. Researchers do not claim that their summary, which is part of a dissertation, is a complete evaluation of previous research; instead, they provide

some of the most significant findings. Following the short introduction, they discuss current attempts to develop bibliometric methods that are consistent with research procedures in humanities. The next section presents theoretical concepts for linking the research field structure to publishing as well as citation patterns. These concepts are then used to describe the organization of study in the humanities and its effect on bibliometric measures. Finally, researchers evaluate how feasible it is to create a humanities bibliometric system and provide some suggestions for further studies(3).

The study of all human techniques aimed at recording and understanding human experience is called humanity. Students learn how to think, reason and make inquiries via philosophy, literature, linguistics, art and history, creatively and critically. These skills allow students to get new insights into the human experience and to broaden their knowledge of the world. Students are educated about the beliefs of different civilizations, what creates a piece of art and how history is made via the work of humanities. Humanities training helps pupils understand the world in which we live and enables them to see the future.

### *1.1 The Sciences:*

The categorization of the subject areas as social sciences and humanities, further affected by the local or country-wide research organization, is determined by institutional and epistemological criteria. The list of topics categorized in humanities depends on the circumstances and nation. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development lists Genealogy, history, literature, archaeology, languages, arts, philosophy, history of arts, theology and religion (OECD). On the other hand, the Humanities Resources Center (HRC) in the US includes eleven sections. Due to the fluid frontiers of humanities as well as the evolving academic environment, no comprehensive list of disciplines in the humanities could be given. Art, literature, language, literature, music and spiritual studies constitute the basis of all 'lists' of subjects. These are the same disciplines addressed in this article. The sciences are varied topics and have considerable differences between periodical studies and religious studies. The results in this chapter are applicable to the latter rather than to more journal-oriented topics such as linguistics and literature. Researchers are indulgent in referring to the topic of the investigation as "the humanities," which corresponds to the majority of the earlier research. At the same time, they are aware and handle the difficulties involved with such a technique(4).

### *1.2 Bibliometric Humanities:*

Historically, bibliometric research in the humanities has mostly concentrated on the failure to include the publications of humanities scholars in existing citation databases. In the literature concerned, different publication channels, the importance of "local" languages and the wide audience of research were all mentioned as explications for the lack of coverage. The various study audiences are often mentioned in the humanities research. There is frequently a fundamental difference between publications for other academics and texts for broad reading. The audiences are divided into three categories: worldwide academics, regional or national or academic, and non-student audiences.

Researchers suggested a further categorization that is widely used in which it separates into four categories journal articles, newspapers, national and non-scholarly literature. She already applies her classification method, which she designed to characterize academic writing mostly in social sciences. The major distinction between the two methods for the identification of publishing channels and the diverse research audience would be that Nederhof focuses on the 'target public' while Hicks concentrates on 'literature kinds.' Through focusing on readers rather than publications, academics allow a debate which highlights humanities' purpose and goals. The benefit of Nederhof's three types is currently not clearly defined, such that a publication may possibly target each three. On the other hand, Hicks categories argue for the separation of

academic and non-scholarly texts. It is also unclear how the categories connect to these categories; a book aimed at both a national and a general population may possibly be classified as a book, a national publication and an uneducated publishing at the same time(5).

### *1.3 Publication Patterns:*

The role of the monograph in the discussion on publishing techniques in the humanities is especially important. The monograph is more successful than a newspaper piece for all three categories, and is more effective in reaching non-scholarly readers. Broad readership publications are important and monographs may be seen as an effort to reach both academics and a general public. Humanities researchers prefer to publish their results in journals and books, on the other hand. According to researchers in Norwegian humanities, publishing habits is the most common production of books or journals. In social sciences and humanities, articles or chapters are also frequent in books and both international and co-authored publications have shown moderate increase. Publication patterns in Flanders (Belgium) have been studied lately, and journal publications have been found to increase mainly in social sciences and to decline in the sciences. There has also been an overall increase in publications, especially in English-language publications, but no major change has been seen in journal publishing. A recent study of publishing patterns from the Faculty of Arts of Uppsala University revealed comparable results and an increasing number of international publications.

### *1.4 Sources Citation:*

According to a common analysis, scholars in the sciences produce journal articles as well as book chapters, but reference monographs. In many fields, the overlap between referenced and quoted texts is minor and it is often said that scientists use older literature as well as primary sources. Nevertheless, the citation of sources in all the sciences is subject to considerable differences only with the percentage of books and edited books ranging from 88% in religion to just 49% in linguistics. Books are frequently referred according to the overview in social science fields, such as sociology or library and information science (LIS). Therefore, depending exclusively on quotations from journals is not restricted to the study of humanities. The degree to which the fields of humanities embrace natural scientific reference techniques has been an argument. In terms of journal publication researchers have compared social sciences, engineering, humanities and natural sciences. Between 1981 and 2000, the authors found a widespread increase in journal quotations, including in the natural sciences and engineering and social sciences. However, when certain fields have been examined(6).

### *1.5 Era of The Sources Cited:*

Since English is a scientific lingua franca, source language is seldom an issue. In the humanities, however, the situation varies, since many disciplines are mainly regional or national in science and science. This is particularly true in literature, sociology and political science. Archives that index English-language publications primarily cannot sufficiently cover this area, which is a key challenge when looking at research topics in humanities using well-known databases like the Web of science and Scopus. Literary studies frequently use non-English sources. English-language sources have a little impact since only 15 percent of all German literary references are in English, while only 9 percent of Old French sources are in English. Although English-language materials are mentioned more often in Swedish literary theory, sources are regularly quoted in Swedish, German and French. As a result, empirical study must be based on non-English sources, such as different studies in other countries(7).

Humanities scientists rely on a wide range of historical materials. The fact that the desire for literature is linked to the age of the materials utilized in the study makes it less apparent. As a result, it will be difficult to create a research scope and bibliometric investigations will take time.

‘With the lowest index, a humanistic metabolism is obtained, in which the scientist must digest all that has gone before, allow it to age into the knowledge vault, and then pour forth fresh words of wisdom along the same sort of problems as researchers using the analogy of digestion. Even if the comparison of digestion is enlightening, the diversity of the research in the humanities is ignored. Moreover, Price failed to note that many humanities are primary sources, raising the average age of sources considerably.

The monograph is the most commonly referenced kind of publication in humanities; the age group of the section of the reference is wide and in many areas bibliometric research suggests that languages other than English play a significant role. Many people agree on these characteristics, but there are still a few problems to be tackled. One question is whether scientists publishing habits comply with the laws governing research. Some research show this, whereas others emphasize the consistency of information referred to and published. How the increasing importance of "research outputs" across academic disciplines affects publication in the humanities is not apparent. Implementing performance measures based on publishing, however, would definitely bring attention to this issue(8).

#### *1.6 Bibliometric Consequences Research Organization:*

Researchers describe in the following section how disciplinary views may be utilized to understand publication practices and citation models, in which reference use is controlled by the structure of the field of study. Researchers offered characterizations of the fields of study in the humanities that are explored briefly with reference and publication trends. However, the vast variations in different areas of study and subfields covered by the humanities must be emphasized that the generalizations presented are mostly relevant to literary studies and related disciplines of books.

#### *1.7 Fields of Countryside Research:*

Whitley describes the bulk of the fields of humanities as fragmented adhocracies. As research under scattered adhocracies are individualized and poorly organized and there is little competence, these fields are both cognitively varied and heterogeneous. The lack of a permanent configuration is the main characteristic of these areas since tasks do not need specialist coordination and are reliant on human connections when they do exist. Subgroups are created with specific topics and different scientific approaches. As the methods employed, audiences change. There is a great deal of discussion about which topics to study and how to address these problems and the lack of standards made dispute resolution difficult. Another essential feature for understanding the organization of research areas is the difference between rural and urban fields. The distinction between rural and urban relates to the density of a discipline or research area, like if several scientists are dealing with the same issue; this study area is considered urban, while a less populated sector is known as rural. There is intense competition for employment and resources in the metropolitan sector of research, whereas there are less fighting's for resources and recognition in rural regions.

#### *1.8 Citation Patterns:*

Researchers believe that the study's intellectual characteristics assist to comprehend reference practices and citation trends. A less well-defined topic without a central core is significantly affected by other fields of research and interdisciplinary reference practices. The number of scholars working on a particular topic also affects quotation patterns: In an urban region, it is important to keep up with 'research front' and to mention current literature, while the ancient sources are less necessary in rural areas(9). Another element affecting reference techniques is the audience. Students may choose a reference style that addresses both an academic and a broad public in fields in which a non-academic readership is important. This reference, in fact, is an

example for scientists and ordinary readers alike. The use of references is also affected by the extent to which academics interdepend with the concept of originality. In domains where researchers trust each other to recognize and provide incentives, quote colleagues are important, whereas reference plays various roles in disciplines in which originality is highly valued(10).

As a consequence, there are two main characteristics affecting humanities' reference and citation traditions: low dependence on peers and the rural structure in the field. All are linked to the varied audience, the rural organization and the little dependence on colleagues. Individual scholars may find people beyond their fields via a large audience, resulting in less dependent academics on peer validation. Due to the high task insecurity and low level of dependence on peers in many fields, each student has significant freedom to pursue a unique research profile, which results in scientists scattered across many diverse topics with little interaction between them. Consequently, scientists have a large number of choices for selecting topics, publishing channels and who to refer, but it restricts their ability in the form of quotes to get "rewards." Consequently, a limited coverage of publications in citation books is not the main reason why citation is less useful to evaluate its effect in the humanities. Rather, academics believe that the social and intellectual structures of humanities are in fact the primary reason why citation methods in these areas are less effective.

## **2. DISCUSSION**

Research in the humanities may be helpful in future attempts to evaluate the wider impact of humanities research, and citation evaluation may aid us in better understanding how these disciplines are structured and evolve. Even while the usage of citations to non-source objects, the development of new databases and services, and the application of altmetrics metrics all seem to be promising, they are not yet generally applicable. Among the claims made in this chapter is that bibliometric research in the humanities has become more attentive to the academic legacy of humanistic study, as well as other innovative ways of investigating the humanities. But more work has to be done in order to assess the humanities, and experts have highlighted a few areas where future study may be particularly productive in the coming years.

First and foremost, researchers feel it is past time to narrow the scope of their research to more specialized and restricted areas of study. One reason for using a broad and comprehensive word when studying the humanities may be because it is easier to define fields and delineate 'subfields' in the scientific sciences, which may be one reason for using a broad and comprehensive term when researching the scientific sciences. Another reason for selecting "the humanities" as the topic of research may be the vast interdisciplinary citation that has been accumulated. However, I think that focusing more on specific areas and specialties would result in a more in-depth understanding of humanities publication and citation patterns in general. According to the researchers, the development of new and more accessible bibliometric tools and approaches will inspire humanist academics to use bibliometric methods on a more frequent basis. Alternative measurement methods that are in touch with the structure of the humanities are another field of investigation. We are encouraged by the many attempts to measure social effect outside of the academic community in a methodical way. Such criteria would be beneficial not just for evaluating humanities research, but also for determining the overall impact of research on society. Another interesting area of study is the evaluation of sources, such as books and non-English language journals, that were previously underrepresented by conventional bibliometric methods such as citation analysis. Despite the fact that altmetrics are a relatively recent phenomenon, their capacity to evaluate quality or effect is still up for debate. Though not specifically stated, the overall goal of integrating a broad range of sources that assess impact in a variety of ways is encouraging for attempts to create a "metrics for the humanities."

Finally, the intersection of a "metric culture" and humanities studies is an extremely significant field of study. Researchers in the natural sciences have historically utilized impact factors to



evaluate their work, and as a result, many researchers in these disciplines compute their own personal H-index. Humanities researchers, on the other hand, are less familiar with bibliometric techniques, and many are concerned not just about skewed rankings and evaluations, but also about the methodologies' being beyond the scope of humanistic inquiry. It is thus essential to consider how future measurement and assessment initiatives may affect the organization and personality of the humanities. The answer to this problem is critical not just for the bibliometric society, but also for the long-term viability of humanities study.

### **3. CONCLUSION**

When it comes to the employment of standard bibliometric techniques for assessing the humanities, the bibliometric community has been vocal in its criticism. These areas are less well served by citation analysis, which is especially useful when utilizing publications that are indexed in reference databases. The evidence for this conclusion comes from many studies showing that humanities representation in databases such as Web of Science as well as Scopus is inadequate for assessment and does not accurately reflect humanities research findings. All academic publications are included in research assessment systems, such as the one used in Norway, which considers all academic publications. After that, scores are assigned to the papers depending on the publication channel used as well as the journal or publisher's "quality level." On the other hand, the definition of what constitutes a scholarly publication is still up for debate. It's difficult to agree on what constitutes a significant research outcome in the humanities; a peer-reviewed journal paper published in an established non-academic journal, a chapter section in an edited collection edited by a renowned scholar, or a manuscript published by a well-known non-academic book publisher can all be considered significant outputs, and papers written for a general audience are frequently highly regarded. As a result, our perspective on the humanities, as well as their general function in society, dictates which publications should be given high regard when evaluating scientific research. When it comes to evaluating the humanities, the need for a long period of time to evaluate the impact of study is a recurrent problem. It is necessary to take into account the lifespan of a publication as well as the distribution of references to it over time. Even though humanities research has the potential to be useful over the next twenty, fifty, or even a hundred years, research endurance is seldom assessed in research evaluation activities. As a result, a significant portion of this essay's study is devoted to this particular topic. Despite the fact that humanities such as cultural heritage preservation and translation are invisible from the narrow viewpoint of scientific assessment, they may be critical for future generations.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Sula CA. Visualizing social connections in the humanities: Beyond bibliometrics. Bull Am Soc Inf Sci Technol. 2012;
2. Hammarfelt B. Beyond coverage: Toward a bibliometrics for the humanities. In: Research Assessment in the Humanities: Towards Criteria and Procedures. 2016.
3. Hammarfelt B. Four Claims on Research Assessment and Metric Use in the Humanities. Bull Assoc Inf Sci Technol. 2017;
4. Zuccala A. Inciting the metric oriented humanist: Teaching bibliometrics in a faculty of humanities. Educ Inf. 2016;
5. Tripathi M, Kumar S, Babbar P. Bibliometrics of social science and humanities research in India. Curr Sci. 2018;
6. Linmans AJM. Why with bibliometrics the Humanities does not need to be the weakest link. Scientometrics. 2010;
7. Hammarfelt B. Using altmetrics for assessing research impact in the humanities.

Scientometrics. 2014;

8. Archambault É, Vignola Gagné ÉV. The Use of bibliometrics in the social sciences and humanities. Final Rep. 2004;
9. Halevi G. Welcome to the 30th issue of Research Trends. Res Trends Spec Issue Big Data. 2012;
10. Bornmann L, Thor A, Marx W, Schier H. The application of bibliometrics to research evaluation in the humanities and social sciences: An exploratory study using normalized Google Scholar data for the publications of a research institute. J Assoc Inf Sci Technol. 2016;