

**“Face validity” differences
between locally published and the
highest level international
journals based on the in-text
citations approach**

Siniša Subotić
(sinisasub@gmail.com)

Introduction

- **Locally published journals (LPJ)**
 - Published outside of the most developed countries
 - Often not in English
- **(The highest level) international journals (IJ)**

Introduction

- **LPJ are a necessary complement to IJ**
 - Region, culture & language specific topics
 - Educational & training function
- **The issue of LPJ quality assessment**
 - The impact factor?
 - The regional impact factor?
 - “Technical” characteristics...

Introduction

- **How about counting in-text citations?**
 - In-text citations counting improves the accuracy of assessing scientific contribution (Hou, Li, & Niu, 2011).
 - “**Face validity**” (Šipka, 1996) – internal citation characteristics as a measure of (formal) quality

Research problem

- **The assumption:** LPJ should be “modeled” by the “gold science standard”, i.e. they should be compared with the highest level IJ.
- **The problem:** Expand the “face validity” in-text citations approach (Šipka, 1996), and use it to compare LPJ to IJ across several scientific fields.

Method

- **157 Serbian LPJ IMRAD social sciences (& cross-discipline) articles:**
 - From 2004 to early 2010
 - 65 psychology, 32 kinesiology, 26 psychiatry, 23 pedagogy and 11 other articles
- **Compared to 157 counterpart IJ articles**
- **In-text citations counting & calculation of various variables**

Results

<i>Variable list</i>	<i>Integration</i>	<i>Superficiality</i>
Number of citations	.99 (1.00)	
Number of references	.88 (.93)	(-.41)
Introduction \cap Results & discussion	.75 (.74)	
Introduction \cap Method	.71 (.65)	
Number of single citations	.68 (.74)	(-.42)
Method \cap Results & discussion	.61 (.57)	
Missing references (proportion)	-.33 (-.35)	
Number of missing citations		.56 (.54)
Imprecise citations		.56 (.54)
Number of secondary source citations		.55 (.54)

Results

- **Integration:** IJ > Serbian LPJ ($d = 1.49$)
- **Superficiality:** Serbian LPJ > IJ ($d = 1.10$)
- **Classification (cluster analysis) based on the two factor's scores:**
 - **Cluster 1:** 117 international, and 9 Serbian articles (psychology = 4, psychiatry = 2, kinesiology = 2, & pedagogy = 1)
 - **Cluster 2:** 148 Serbian, and 40 international articles (kinesiology = 16, psychiatry = 12, psychology = 5, pedagogy = 4, & others = 3)
 - Cluster 1: Higher tier (> Integration, $d = 2.14$)
 - Cluster 2: Lower tier (> Superficiality, $d = 0.93$)

Implications

- “Face validity” **CAN** be used to differentiate **LPJ** and **IJ** across multiple fields
- **LPJ** fall behind **IJ**
- Implications for peer & editorial review process
- This is just one aspect of quality...
- Necessity for replications