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Preface

The present bibliography was created as part of the project «Developing and Testing Research Quality Criteria in the Humanities, with an emphasis on Literature Studies and Art History» of the Universities Basel and Zurich. It contains the relevant literature in the subject areas (Research) Quality in the Humanities and Evaluation and Bibliometrics in the Humanities respectively. On the one hand, the emphasis is on the disciplines literature studies and art history, on the other hand, it focuses on criteria or indicators for determining research quality.

This anthology tries to provide a comprehensive overview of the newish and newest literature on the aforementioned subjects. Moreover, basic and/or texts from other disciplines were incorporated if they had a definite connection to the topic, i.e. if they were highly relevant to the topic of quality measurement in the humanities even if the connection was not immediately obvious. For instance, publications that try new approaches in bibliometric research, fundamental texts or hypotheses, that can be read interdisciplinary, methods or theories whose application has not been applied to the humanities yet but is conceivable nonetheless etc. Texts whose results could not be applied to the humanities were excluded from the bibliography for the sake of brevity and clarity.

Admittedly, drawing the line between literature to be incorporated and to be ignored is often difficult and always subjective. Another complicating factor is that literature on non-bibliometric indicators determining quality in the humanities are very manageable at present, however, the number of publications that cover research evaluation in general, or only focus on bibliographic methods and studies respectively, is comparatively high.

Despite the mentioned limitations, the bibliography on hand attempts to offer an up to date as well as complete overview. The listing of publication titles is redundant, i.e. some publications are mentioned in different chapters depending on pertinence and topic. A postpositioned alphabetic list (on first author basis) facilitates the overview if one is not searching specific topics.

An online equivalent of the bibliography can be found at:

http://www.psh.ethz.ch/crus/bibliography/index_EN.

Zurich, December 2012

Bojan Peric, Michael Ochsner, Sven E. Hug and Hans-Dieter Daniel
Approach

The task of compiling this bibliography was undertaken right at the start of the project and continuously. In the beginning, based on the references collected from Scheidegger (2007), an initial search in relevant online portals, in pertinent publications as well as in bibliographies of important authors was conducted, after which, a diagram was created by means of the software RefViz in order to obtain a systematic overview of the existing literature.

Based on the results of the bibliogram, keywords were generated that were used to systemically search online portals and library databases (see Table 1). In September 2009, this led to an initial version of the database with 600 entries. The database, documented in the literature management tool EndNote, was expanded several times in the course of the project. These expansions were primarily based on a pragmatic and only in parts systematic basis; thus, prior to the creation of the present bibliography, another more advanced and systematized literature search was conducted, whose results were harmonized with the existing database.

Table 1: Keywords used in the literature search (possible truncations as well as combinations of the terms are not listed separately).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Online Portals</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>Eric Archambault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>JStor</td>
<td>Lutz Bornmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>arXiv.org</td>
<td>Linda Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH</td>
<td>NEBIS</td>
<td>Hans-Dieter Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
<td>Claire Donovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Google</td>
<td>Wolfgang Glänzel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliometrics</td>
<td>Bibliographie der deutschen Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft [Bibliography of German Linguistics and Literature Studies]</td>
<td>Jochen Gläser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>Modern Language Association International Bibliography</td>
<td>Björn Hammarfelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Artbibliographies Modern</td>
<td>Sven Hemlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Bibliography of the History of Art</td>
<td>Diana Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Scopus</td>
<td>Stefan Hornbostel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subsequently, the bibliography, now swelled to more than 1500 entries, was filtered according to the defined content criteria, whereby in particular the aspects listed in Table 2 were used to decide whether an individual entry was to be included or deleted respectively.

Table 2: Aspect for the inclusion or deletion of individual database entries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the humanities explicitly addressed?</td>
<td>Are literature studies and art history explicitly addressed??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are new approaches in bibliometrics, beyond established methods, thematized?</td>
<td>Are methods or theories being discussed that are not tailored explicitly towards the humanities or are previously untested, but whose use is conceivable in the respective field?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the texts be considered fundamental or are they treating fundamental questions that could be read multi-/interdisciplinary?</td>
<td>Can the texts be considered fundamental or are they treating fundamental questions that could be read multi-/interdisciplinary?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, publications in English or in German were preferred, not least due to the keyterms that were used. However, texts in different languages or from different countries
of origin, if they were collected during one of the investigative phases and if they correspond to the aspects previously mentioned, were not eliminated; examples are for instance publications such as by CNEAI (Spanish) or by Björn Hammarfelt (Swedish).

In order to gain a qualitative overview of the present literature as well as to conduct a segmentation of the content, the collected publications underwent a textual analysis. For this purpose, the titles of the texts and, if present, their abstracts were read into the software QDA Miner and analyzed with regard to the frequency of certain lemmata or lemmatized phrases of at least three words respectively. The results were sorted according to absolute frequency and eventual “noise words”, or expressions, were deleted manually. The remaining lemmata, such as “institu[ion]”, “field”, “disciplin[e]” or “educ[ation]” were used as a basis for the creation of the present classification (see Table of Contents, p. 2f.).

After the classification the individual entries were again examined in order to verify their thematic relevance. The result were just over 1000 entries which make up the present bibliography.

Due to the manual classification of the entries, and not least because academic study has become a dynamic entity indeed since the transfer to the information age, some relevant texts are still missing. Nonetheless, we hope that this bibliography will help interested readers facilitate access to the literature.
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