

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 78, (2-3), 2008 DOI [10.1016/j.matcom.2008.01.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matcom.2008.01.020)

Please reference as:

Marinova, D., Newman, P. (2008) "The Changing Research Funding Regime in Australia and Academic Productivity", *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, Vol. 78, Issues 2-3, pp. 283-291

The changing research funding regime in Australia and academic productivity

Dora Marinova* and Peter Newman
Curtin University Sustainability Policy (CUSP) Institute, Curtin University of Technology, Australia

* Corresponding author:

Dora Marinova
CUSP, Curtin University of Technology
Murdoch, WA 6150
Australia
Phone: +61 8 9360 6103
Fax: +61 8 9360 6421
Email: D.Marinova@curtin.edu.au

Abstract

Australian university research output has been questioned by the Federal Government. A new research funding system is soon to be introduced which is likely to place a heavier weight on publications. Although the importance of publications is not disputed, the article argues that there is no reason for the performance of the Australian academics to be doubted. Data on research publications is used to show that Australia outperforms the UK and New Zealand whose systems are being used as the model for the proposed changes in Australia. The gap between Australia and these two countries has in fact widened since their research funding reforms were introduced. Further data is provided on different citation systems, research funding and PhD completions in one academic unit, namely the Institute for Sustainability and Technology Policy (ISTP) as a case study to demonstrate productivity and quality gains during the period under question.

It is usual practice for the Australian Federal Government to shape the country's research priorities to better reflect and care for the needs of the economy, society and the physical environment where they exist. The funding for research should provide the basis for achieving such long-term sustainability. A country with a long-term vision for the future should use universities as a social pillar, which can guarantee brighter prospects for its coming generations. For Australia to have a strong and world-class university research sector, adequate resources should be provided to match its current achievements. Also, a (new) funding model should allow for diversity and flexibility in research to properly reflect the complexity of the academic world.

Keywords: Citations; Google Scholar; Institute for Scientific Information (ISI); Institute for Sustainability and Technology Policy (ISTP); Research Quality Framework (RQF)

Comment [SE1]: The comments feature is used throughout this document. To print comments, select Tools>Options>Print and ensure 'Include with document', Hidden Text is checked.

1. INTRODUCTION

The academic environment in Australia is being constantly shaped by changing research priorities and most importantly changing funding models. However, the current debate surrounding the new Research Quality Framework (or the RQF buzzword) is the first time in Australia's history when universities are being publicly attacked for not delivering expected research outcomes. One of the RQF papers produced by the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) claims that "it is difficult to assure stakeholders that public funds for research are being invested in the highest quality endeavours. Without this assurance, the argument for further public investment in research is not as persuasive as it should be" [9, p. 7]. The paper (which is one of a series of RQF publications) asserts that if we have "a consistent approach to measure research quality and impact across the breadth of the Australian research landscape" [9, p. 7], it would be easier to convince the taxpayers that investing in Australian research capabilities is worth their dollar. While the Australian Government is aiming at developing a world's best practice RQF for evaluating research that "seeks to assure taxpayers that their money is being invested in research of the highest quality which delivers real benefits to the wider community" [2], it is very important to have a sound understanding as to where Australia's research performance currently sits.

The aim of this paper is to revisit the assumptions behind the current Australian Government position on publicly-funded research. To do this, it uses macro analysis of academic productivity in Australia (particularly in comparison with New Zealand and the UK) and a case study of the Institute for Sustainability and Technology Policy for changes in research quality. The main argument is that the constantly improving performance of Australian universities is not being acknowledged and instead, a concern about the use of taxpayer money is being created.

2. THE PRODUCTIVITY EVIDENCE

The main argument for change in the research funding in Australia is influenced by the schemes introduced recently in the UK, the National Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) [10] and New Zealand, the Performance Based Research Fund [13,16]. It is interesting to see how Australia has performed, particularly in comparison with these two countries in research output.

Since the advent of computerisation in the 1970s, bibliometric methods for analysing and describing research output have been accepted internationally and the journal lists, bibliometric indicators and rankings produced by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) have received a wide support [8,25]. The ISI covers around 10-12% of all refereed journals (e.g. 8700 in 2004) with additions and deletions from its list(s) made as often as fortnightly [18]. The ISI works on the belief that a core "small number of journals accounts for the bulk of significant scientific results" [12, p.13].

Previous studies, such as the analysis by Butler [5], have highlighted the increased Australian presence in the ISI Science Citation Index (as distinct from the Social Sciences Citation Index and the Arts and Humanities Citation Index) based on aggregate publication counts. It is interesting to examine what the recent situation is for all, science as well as

social sciences, arts and humanities publications. Table 1 shows that in the last three years, namely since 2003 Australia has outperformed both the UK and New Zealand by the number of ISI papers per capita. The estimated figure for 2005 is 182 papers per 100 000 population compared with 176 for New Zealand and 172 for the UK. For Australia, the increase since 1992 has been dramatic, namely by 72% (or around 5.5% per annum). The respective figures are 64% (or around 5% per annum) for New Zealand and 44% (or around 4% per annum) for the UK. Moreover, during the 1992-2005 period out of the three countries only Australia has consistently improved its absolute share of total ISI refereed papers (see Figure 2) to reach around 2.5%.

Table 1. ISI refereed paper publications by Australia, New Zealand and UK, 1992-2005


Year	United Kingdom		New Zealand		Australia	
	ISI papers	ISI papers per 100,000 people	ISI papers	ISI papers per 100,000 people	ISI papers	ISI papers per 100,000 people
1992	68 921	119	3692	107	18 612	106
1993	69 961	121	3708	107	19 427	110
1994	74 140	127	4109	117	20 770	116
1995	81 526	140	4414	124	23 112	128
1996	85 378	146	4612	127	23 838	130
1997	84 062	143	4828	131	24 819	134
1998	89 253	151	5397	145	26 477	141
1999	90 097	152	5358	142	27 053	143
2000	91 436	154	5505	144	26 882	140
2001	91 067	152	5524	143	28 087	145
2002	85 928	143	5418	139	27 631	141
2003	95 344	159	5962	151	32 589	165
2004	90 677	150	5732	144	30 425	153
2005*	103 848	172	7108	176	36 587	182

Notes: * The 2005 figure is extrapolated based on data until September 2005 (inclusive).

Source: Data extracted from ISI Web of Science, 30 September 2005.

The use of par capita data can be questioned on the basis that the academic or R&D sector can differ in size across countries, e.g. as share of employment or as the share of R&D expenditure in a country's GDP. Indeed, the number of researchers per 1000 employed is significantly higher in Australia, i.e. 7.8 in 2004, than for example UK, 5.5 in 2004, and lower than in New Zealand, 10.2 in 2004 [22]. On the other hand, gross domestic expenditure on R&D in the UK (1.88% of GDP in 2004) is higher than in Australia (1.69%) or New Zealand (1.16%). Irrespectively of this, as none of the three countries has experienced dramatic changes in the size of its R&D sector in the last few years, what is more interesting is what have been the trends in any particular indicator and the basic per capita indicator is used for this purpose. Also, have universities contributed to these changes and where do Australian universities, in particular, stand?

Figure 1. Percentages of total ISI papers for Australia, New Zealand and UK, 1992-2005



Source: Data extracted from ISI Web of Science, 30 September 2005.

Table 2 presents data on the ISI papers generated by the university sector in all three countries. The productivity of Australian universities (measured as number of ISI refereed papers per 100 000 population) has been consistently higher than that of New Zealand for the entire 1992-2005 period. It also has been higher than that of the UK since 2001. The gap between the Australian and British/New Zealander academic productivity increased significantly in the last three years (which broadly coincides with the introduction of their respective new university funding models). Figure 2 also clearly shows that the university sector has been pushed in all three countries to become the main contributor to the pool of ISI refereed papers. In the case of Australia, the share of universities has reached as high as 85% in 2005.

Against this outstanding performance of Australian university researchers, it is misleading for the Federal Government to imply that there are problems with how the taxpayers' money is used in supporting research. There is clear indication that research productivity of the Australian universities has been increasing consistently. This however has not been matched by any means with appropriate increases in their research funding.


The ISI evidence of productivity shows that Australian academics have been producing research that is widely accepted by the top refereed journals in an environment which generally undervalued the importance of publications and did not directly encourage publishing in ISI journals. It is therefore completely wrong to create an image of underperforming for the Australian university sector.

Table 2. ISI refereed paper publications by university sector in Australia, New Zealand and UK, 1992-2005

Year	United Kingdom		New Zealand		Australia	
	ISI univ papers	ISI univ papers per 100,000 people	ISI univ papers	ISI univ papers per 100,000 people	ISI univ papers	ISI univ papers per 100,000 people
1992	42 890	74	2485	72	13 074	75
1993	44 689	77	2470	71	13 642	77
1994	49 515	85	2740	78	14 860	83
1995	56 563	97	2968	83	17 050	94
1996	60 553	103	3227	89	17 979	98
1997	60 417	103	3354	91	19 009	102
1998	64 479	109	3863	104	20 767	111
1999	65 841	111	3895	103	21 378	113
2000	68 182	115	3964	104	21 696	113
2001	69 058	116	4060	105	22 730	117
2002	66 371	111	4125	106	22 606	116
2003	73 461	122	4605	117	27 196	138
2004	71 593	119	4516	113	25 650	129
2005*	81 005	134	5752	143	30 963	154

Note: * The 2005 figure is extrapolated based on data until September 2005 (inclusive).
 Source: Data extracted from ISI Web of Science, 30 September 2005.

Figure 2. Percentage shares of university papers in total national ISI refereed papers for Australia, New Zealand and UK, 1992-2005



Source: Data extracted from ISI Web of Science, 30 September 2005.

3. THE CITATION GAME

Citation rates are a major component in the British Research Assessment Exercise as well as in the Performance Based Research Fund in New Zealand. Although they have not been part of the current and past university funding models in Australia, they are likely to be given a heavy weighting in the proposed RQF. In the anticipation of this development, there has been a resurgence of interest in studies that rank and compare university departments. In addition to the econometricians' passion for rankings [1], some other recent examples are the following:

- the ranking of all Australasian political science units based on ISI publication and citations rates [8];
- the study by Hix [17] ranking international political science departments based on their publication rates in a selected group of "political science" journals which themselves are ranked according to the citations per article each journal has attracted; and
- the ranking of economics departments and individual academics in Australia and New Zealand [20] where the authors also incorporate journal weights (based again on citation rates) to measure quality.

Butler [5] argues that there has been significant decline in the citation impact Australia is achieving in comparison with other countries, using again the example of the ISI Science Citation Index. The basis for her argument is that although Australian researchers are publishing more, they are publishing in what ISI considers "lower impact journals", i.e. journals with less citation counts per published paper within the ISI selection of journals. She interprets this as decline in quality of Australian research. On the other hand, a case study of the Australian geosciences in particular for the same period reveals that there has been a shift in preferences of Australian researchers towards journals with more Australian content which for understandable reasons attract less citations [25,26]. In other words, the shift in what Butler terms "quality" is due because of the real value, potential impact, applicability and relevance of the Australian geoscience research and this is in fact what is needed to deliver "real benefits to the wider community" [2]. Hence, broad generalisations about quality are difficult and specifics need to be examined. Another aspect of this debate is whether journal impact factors should be seen as representative of all papers published and whether analysis of individual papers is a better approach.

Having the above considerations in mind, we looked at the academic unit with which we are affiliated, namely the Institute for Sustainability and Technology Policy (ISTP) at Murdoch University in Western Australia as a case study for citation rates. Case study research often attracts criticism related to issues such as its apparent lack of rigour, preconceived bias and the validity of generalisation [11,27]. Although case studies cannot be used to quantify frequencies, they can be very valuable to generalise theoretical propositions and particularly to inform policy making. According to Yin [27], the use of case studies is an iterative process where the first case study becomes a template against which new empirical evidence (including other case studies) can be assessed in order to test a particular preposition. This is what we are trying to offer here by examining the case study of ISTP.

Apart from the theoretical value of case study research, there is also a very important policy aspect in publicising positive examples – they set up good benchmarks. Example of

this is the Research Evaluation and Policy Project (REPP) at the Australian National University (ANU) which established a database covering all the publications from the Institute of Advanced Studies (IAS), a fulltime research institution at the ANU [4].

Since 1995, the ISTP has maintained the same size of 8 full-time equivalent academics. Table 3 shows its citation rates/academic staff for 1995-2005 using the ISI citation index.

Table 3. ISI citations for ISTP academics, 1995-2002

	ISI citations/ academic	ISI citations/ paper
1995	0.000	0.000
1996	0.250	0.667
1997	0.375	0.375
1998	1.375	11.000
1999	1.625	3.250
2000	1.750	2.800
2001	2.125	2.833
2002	1.875	3.750
2003	3.000	6.000
2004	2.250	3.600
2005*	6.000	6.000
1995-2000 average	0.725	3.058
1995-2002 average	1.172	3.084
1995-2005 average	1.919	3.747
2001-2005 average	3.050	4.437

Note: * The 2005 figure is extrapolated based on data for 2005 until September (inclusive).
Source: Data obtained from ISI Web of Science, 30 September 2005.

Despite some ups and downs in the ISI citations per ISTP academic and paper (triggered mainly because of the small size of the unit), the period averages show a distinctive trend towards increased citation rates. The latest 5-year annual average of citations/academic staff, namely 3.05 is more than 4 times higher than the first 5-year average (see Table 3). Similarly, the number of citations/paper for 2001-2005, namely 4.44, has increased one and a half times compared with the 1995-1999 period.²

An alternative citation tool, which is fast gaining popularity, is scholar.google.com. Google “works with publishers of scholarly information to index peer-reviewed papers, theses, preprints, abstracts, and technical reports from all disciplines of research” [15]. Apart from being freely available, it also has speedier and more flexible assessment procedures for inclusion of on-line publications (visited by Google’s crawler). Despite its wider coverage, it lacks the academic prestige of ISI. Jasco’s [19] analysis of the merits and demerits of Google Scholar for the very early stage of its operation (between its inception in November 2004 and March 2005) concludes that there was significant content omission but that it has the potential to become an excellent free tool for scholarly information. One year after Google Scholar’s inception, the study by Neuhaus [21] outlines as a strength the coverage

of science and medical databases and as a weakness, the coverage of social sciences and humanities.

In the case of ISTP, we noticed that there was very little overlap between the ISI and Google publications. Table 4 presents similar data for ISTP as Table 3 but based on information from Google.

Table 4. Google citations for ISTP academics, 1995-2002

	Google citations/ academic	Google citations/ paper
1995	1.750	2.800
1996	1.125	0.692
1997	1.375	1.100
1998	1.250	1.667
1999	2.125	1.700
2000	2.250	3.000
2001	4.875	3.250
2002	7.500	3.158
2003	12.875	4.292
2004	8.875	5.917
2005*	5.000	4.286
1995-2000 average	1.525	1.592
1995-2002 average	2.781	2.171
1995-2005 average	4.558	2.964
2001-2005 average	8.237	4.400

Note: * The 2005 figure is extrapolated based on data until September 2005 (inclusive).
Source: Data obtained from Google Scholar, 30 September 2005.

The same trends seem to be apparent in the Google citation rates, namely the citation rates have increased significantly during more recent years. Consequently, irrespectively of which citation tool is used to assess the quality of the academic output of ISTP, the changes that had been witnessed in the last decade are a clear signal of the increased quality of output by academics. Hence, again there appears to be no justification for concerns about the quality of Australia's research.

The above analysis assumes that higher citation rates imply higher research quality. This is obviously a simplification as citations can have positive or negative connotation. Citations are also affected by co-authorship; for example the study of Goldfinch et al. [14] discusses what the authors call "the periphery effect" and argues that more international collaboration increases citation rates. However, as Phelan [23] argues citation rates and other bibliometric measures should be viewed as a supplement to other research evaluation measures and should be treated with caution. It is also important to see them against the background of the full spectrum of academic research activities.

4. THE FULL PICTURE OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY

The full picture of academic productivity goes way beyond the ISI or Google refereed journals. A study by Smith [25], for example, found significant shifts in the publication patterns of Australian geoscientists who have become part of centres with partial industry funding (e.g. Cooperative Research Centres). Confidentiality and embargo clauses restrict making research outcomes available in the scientific literature or the public domain. The Australian focus of industry-funded research also makes it less appropriate to US, British or even international journal titles. Against this background it is also interesting to be aware of how Australian academic units have responded to the other criteria for research funding from the government purse.

4.1. *Research income and higher degree research student completions*

The other two components of the current research funding model include outside research income and completions of doctoral (e.g. PhD) and masters (e.g. MPhil) students. The ISTP is used again to show the changes that have occurred for these two measures of academic performance. Table 5 shows outside research income per ISTP academic and Table 6 presents the trend in completion time for ISTP PhD students. There is almost a two-fold increase in the outside research income during the 1999-2004 period (see Table 5) while the completion time for PhD students has been drastically reduced by 12 months (or a quarter) between 2001 and 2004 (see Table 6).

Table 5. Outside research income per academic at ISTP, 2001-2004

	A\$
1999	32 629
2000	41 939
2001	39 321
2002	39 573
2003	98 020
2004	81 416

Source: Data obtained from Murdoch University's Grants Office.

Table 6. Completion time (months) for PhD students at ISTP, 2001-2004

	months
2001	52
2002	46
2003	45
2004	40

Source: Data available at www.murdoch.edu.au.

The Institute for Sustainability and Technology Policy may not be the average academic unit (as it is consistently amongst the highest performing units at Murdoch) but it still feels

the pressure that the Federal Government has put on Australian universities. It has no special funding but has performed at a high level of research output at the time when the Federal Government is questioning university output. Research productivity and outstanding performance in academia have not been adequately rewarded and the public, including the average taxpayer, should be given the true picture. Creating knowledge and capabilities for the future generations is the most important role universities play. They should be encouraged to provide the best nurturing environment instead of being forced to adopt fierce competition strategies for a highly restricted and limited research budget. Australian academics are proud of their achievements and their pride is well justified.

4.2. *Research activities not included in the funding model*

The list and the range of professional activities researchers undertake are big. In addition to teaching, they include public seminars, academic refereeing, membership of professional and editorial bodies, administrative duties, community service, marketing and commercial activities, to mention a few [7,26]. There are significant questions as to whether these functions would be improved by a new more competitive model.

5. CONCLUSION

According to Phillimore [24], academic performance is a complex concept for which no objective indicators exist and “the context and process through which indicators of performance are arrived at, and the subsequent use to which they are put, are judged to be as important as the information which each indicator conveys” [24, p. 255]. It is therefore imperative to put the attempts of the Australian Federal Government in trying to find “a more consistent and comprehensive approach to assessing the quality and impact of publicly funded research” [9, p. 7] in the right context of excellent academic performance.

A country with a long-term vision for the future should have a strategy that allows its development to be sustainable. Most states and nations now use the language of sustainability to develop policy to ensure they have a long-term future. Universities are a social and institutional pillar, which can guarantee that future generations inherit the Earth with its natural and social resources in an equitable manner. Underfunding of research and research training is no different to the environmental damage and social destruction caused by solely economic and market driven measures. It is much easier to not let things slip than to try to fix them. In addition to rewarding the already outstanding performance of Australian universities, any change in research funding should reflect these needs and allow for adequate resourcing of academic activities.

There cannot be a definitive answer as to what is the best way to evaluate research. Any funding model is by definition a simplification of the real world. By making a set of assumptions, certain aspects of reality are better represented in a model than others. Consequently, with a shift from one model to another, some are winners and some lose. Trying to find the “best fit” or “a more consistent and comprehensive approach to assessing the quality and impact of publicly funded research” [9, p. 7] is a statistical illusion when it comes to investing in a more sustainable future for Australia. It is

extremely important within the Australian context to avoid the unintended “deleterious” consequences of the UK’s Research Assessment Exercise, including “the competitive, adversarial and punitive spirit evoked by the RAE which is clearly inherent in it”, to avert “them before they become apparent, let alone researchable” [10, p. 274]. A further warning that comes from New Zealand are “the questionable implications for teaching quality (especially at the undergraduate level) and community service by academic staff” [3, p. 83].

The new research funding model proposed by DEST, namely the RQF, is based on a 20th century concept of professional achievements which encourages actors in universities and government research organisations to move physically to larger centres to specialise rather than to diversify, and to move upwards through hierarchies of power and privilege whose apexes decide what counts and what should be rewarded [6]. Instead of giving a fair go to all Australian universities, it will encourage concentration and specialisation of research funding, including research students’ supervision. The evidence is that Australian academics have achieved an excellent performance record in a climate that allowed more for diversity, complexity, interdisciplinarity and did not target the building of hierarchical rankings. The Australian university sector has not been rewarded for its accomplishments. Moreover, there is also the risk of creating a negative image for the valuable work academics are doing.

There are at least two necessary pre-conditions for Australia to have a healthy, strong and world-class university research sector. Firstly, adequate resources should be provided to match and recognise its current achievements. Secondly, the funding model used³ should allow for diversity and flexibility to properly reflect the complexity of academic world.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The first author acknowledges the financial support of the Australian Research Council.

¹ Research funding in Australia is currently based on performance-driven formulas which include outside research income, high degree research student completions and load, and number of refereed publications (books, book chapters, refereed journal publications and full-paper refereed published conference proceedings). The latter component is valued only at 10% in the Research Training Scheme.

² The ISTP 1995-2002 citation averages also compare favourably with the averages of the top political science units in Australia and New Zealand [8].

³ Some very good recommendations are made by CHASS [7].

REFERENCES

- [1] B.H. Baltagi, B.H., Worldwide institutional and individual rankings in econometrics over the period 1989-1999: An update, *Econometric Theory* 19 (2003) 165-224.
- [2] J. Bishop, Research Quality Framework advice on preferred model, Media release, Minister for Education, Science and Technology, <http://www.dest.gov.au/Ministers/Media/Bishop/2006/03/B001280306.asp> (accessed 07/08/2006).

- [3] J. Boston, B. Mischewski, R. Smyth, Performance-Based Research Fund – Implications for Research in the Social Sciences and Social Policy, *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 24 (2005): 55-84.
- [4] P. Bourke, L. Butler, Publication types, citation rates and evaluation, *Scientometrics* 37 (1996): 473-494.
- [5] L. Butler, Explaining Australia's increased share of ISI publications—the effects of a funding formula based on publication counts, *Research Policy* 32 (2003): 143–155.
- [6] R. Chambers, *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*, Intermediate Technology Publications, London, 1997.
- [7] Council for the Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS) Measures of Quality and Impact of Publicly-funded Research in the Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, CHASS, Canberra, 2005, <http://www.chass.org.au/op2.pdf> (accessed 9/11/2005).
- [8] T. Dale, S. Goldfinch, S., Article citation rates and productivity of Australian political science units 1995-2002, *Australian Journal of Political Science* 40 (2005) 425-434.
- [9] Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) Research Quality Framework: Assessing the Quality and Impact of Research in Australia, Advanced Approaches Paper, Government of Australia, Canberra, 2005.
- [10] L. Elton, The UK research assessment exercise: unintended consequences, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 54 (2000): 274-283.
- [11] B. Flyvbjerg, Five misunderstandings about case-study research, in: C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium, D. Silverman (Eds), *Qualitative Research Practices*, Sage Publications, London, 2004, pp. 420-434.
- [12] E. Garfield, The significant scientific literature appears in a small core of journals, *The Scientist*, 10 (17/1996): 13.
- [13] S. Goldfinch, Investing in excellence? The performance-based research fund and its implications for political science departments in New Zealand, *Political Science*, 55 (2003): 39-53.
- [14] S. Goldfinch, T. Dale, K. DeRouen Jr., Science from the periphery: Collaboration, networks and 'Periphery Effects' in the citation of New Zealand Crown Research Institutes articles, 1995-2000, *Scientometrics* 57 (2003): 321-327.
- [15] Google, Support for Scholarly Publishers, 2005, www.scholar.google.com/scholar/publishers.html (accessed 30/09/2005).
- [16] C. Hall, K. Morris Matthews, T. Sawicka, Performance-based research fund (PBRF): Policy and practice, *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 13 (2003), 79-104.
- [17] S. Hix, A global ranking of political science departments, *Political Studies Review* 2 (2004) 293–313.
- [18] Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) ISI Essay, 2004, www.isinet.com/essays/selectionofmaterialforcoverage/199701.html/ (accessed 30/09/2005).
- [19] P. Jasco, Google Scholar: the pros and the cons, *Online Information Review* 29 (2005): 208-214.
- [20] J. Macri, D. Sinha, Rankings methodology for international comparisons of institutions and individuals: an application to economics in Australia and New Zealand, *Journal of Economic Surveys* 20 (2006) 11-156.
- [21] C. Neuhaus, The Depth and Breadth of Google Scholar: An Empirical Study, *Libraries and the Academy*, 6 (2006), pp. 127-141
- [22] Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), *OECD Factbook 2006 – Economic, Environmental and Social Statistics*, OECD, Paris, 2006.

- [23] T. J. Phelan, A compendium of issues for citation analysis, *Scientometrics* 45 (1999): 117 - 136.
- [24] J. Phillimore, University research performance indicators in practice: The University Grants Committee's evaluation of British universities, 1985-86, *Research Policy* 18 (1989): 255-271.
- [25] K. Smith, Performance Measurement of Australian Geoscientific Minerals Researchers in the Changing Funding Regimes, PhD thesis, Murdoch University, Perth, Australia, 2003.
- [26] K. Smith, D. Marinova, Use of bibliometric modelling for policy making, *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 69 (2005), 177-187.
- [27] R.K. Yin, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, third ed., Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, 2003.