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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable list</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Superficiality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of citations</td>
<td>.99 (.1.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of references</td>
<td>.88 (.93)</td>
<td>(-.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction ∩ Results &amp; discussion</td>
<td>.75 (.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction ∩ Method</td>
<td>.71 (.65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of single citations</td>
<td>.68 (.74)</td>
<td>(-.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method ∩ Results &amp; discussion</td>
<td>.61 (.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing references (proportion)</td>
<td>-.33 (-.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of missing citations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56 (.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprecise citations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56 (.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of secondary source citations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55 (.54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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