

Kent Academic Repository

Phillips, Paul, Moutinho, Luiz and Godinho, Pedro (2017) *Developing and testing a method to measure academic societal impact*. Higher Education Quarterly, 72 (2). pp. 121-140. ISSN 0951-5224.

Downloaded from

https://kar.kent.ac.uk/65117/ The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12154

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title* of *Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies).

Tables

Table 1. Academic Rigour and Relevance Index (AR2I) – components and supporting literature

Parameters	Variables	Supporting literature		
SC: Significance of the Contribution (Reviewers – rigour)	CR: Classification by the Reviewer PR: Perception by the	George (2014); Corley & Gioia (2011); Mingers (2009); Mizzaro (2003)		
ASI: Academic Scholarly Intelligence (Academics – rigour)	Reviewer P _A R: PAttern Recognition of the topic GDST: Growth, Decline, Stability of the Topic	Miller & Hartwick (2002) Collins (2000)		
RBS: Relevance to Business Systems (Business practitioners – relevance)	Interestingness RE: Read by Executives (or would you read it) EI: Executive Interest Justification CM: Change Mindsets TA: Take Action ISE: Impact to Society by Executives	Alvesson & Sandberg (2011); Palmer, Dick & Freiburger (2009); Baldridge, Floyd & Maroczy (2004); Daft, Griffin & Yates. (1987); Davis (1971); Weiss & Bucuvalas (1977); Dunn (1980); Duncan (1974); Shrivastava & Mitroff (1984)		
PCSC: Perceived Content by Society and Citizens (Society – relevance)	Interestingness – different context IT: Interest in the Topic Justification – different context PPSA: Could make an improvement to Personal Productivity and Solutions Assembly RWC: Relevance to the Whole Community	Bornmann (2012a,b); Hodgkinson and Starkey (2011); Willmott (2012); Baldridge, Floyd & Maroczy (2004); Daft, Griffin & Yates. (1987); Davis (1971); Weiss and Bucuvalas (1977); Dunn (1980); Duncan (1974); Shrivastava and Mitroff (1984)		
IR: Implications and Recommendations (Business and society – relevance)	JP _{BS} : Judgment Perceptions by Business Systems JP _{CIT} : Judgment Perceptions by CITizens	Bartunek & Rynes (2014); Scherer & Palazzo (2011); Antonacopoulou, Dehlin & Zundel (2011); Pedersen (2010)		
CIF: Citations and Impact Factors (Academics, secondary data – rigour)	CIT: Number of CITations IF: Impact Factor of the journal	Kaur, Radicchi & Menczer (2013); Mingers & Liptakis (2014); Simsek, Heavey & Jansen (2013); Bornmann & Mutz (2011); Garfield (1972)		

Table 2. Weights of the parameters and variables, assessed using the AHP method

Parameter	Weight	Variable	Weight
SC: Significance of the Contribution	0.2166	CR: Classification by the Reviewer	0.0722
		PR: Perception by the Reviewer	0.1444
ASI: Academic Scholarly Intelligence	0.1404	P _A R: PAttern Recognition of the topic	0.0468
		GDST: Growth, Decline, Stability of the Topic	0.0936
RBS: Relevance to Business Systems	0.3374	RE: Read by Executives	0.1230
		EI: Executive Interest	0.0208
		CM: Change Mindsets	0.0722
		TA: Take Action	0.1000
		ISE: Impact to Society by Executives	0.0215
PCSC: Perceived			
Content by Society and Citizens	0.1486	IT: Interest in the Topic	0.0357
		PPSA: Could make an improvement to Personal Productivity and Solutions Assembly	0.0312
		RWC: Relevance to the Whole Community	0.0817
IR: Implications and Recommendations	0.1074	JP _{BS} : Judgment Perceptions by Business Systems	0.0859
		JP _{CIT} : Judgment Perceptions by CITizens	0.0215
CIF: Citations and Impact Factors	0.0497	CIT/IF: Number of CITations / Impact Factor of the journal	0.0497

Table 3. Central classification of the variables used in the simulations, for an average article

	-	Article profile				
Variables	Who answers?	1	2	3	4	
Significance of the contribution (SC)						
CR = Classification by the reviewer	Pre- existing data	70%	70%	70%	70%	
PR = Perception by the reviewer	Reviewer	-1/0	-1	-1/0	-1	
Acaden	nic scholarly i	intelligenc	e (ASI)			
PAR = Pattern recognition of the topic	Academic	1	-1	1	-1	
GDST = Growth, decline, stability of the topic	Academic	0/1	-1/0	0/1	-1/0	
	nce to busines	ss systems	(RBS)			
RE = Read by executives (or would you read it?)	Business	0	-1	0	-1	
EI = Executive interest	Business	0/-1	-1/-2	0	-1	
CM = Change mindsets	Business	0/-1	-1/-2	0/-1	-1/-2	
TA = Take action	Business	0/-1	-1/-2	0/-1	-1/-2	
ISE = Perceived impact to society by executives	Business	0	-1	0	-1	
Perceived co.	ntent by socie	ety and cit	izens (PSSC)		
IT = Interest in the topic PPSA = Could make an	Citizen	1	-1	1	-1	
improvement to personal productivity and solutions assembly	Citizen	0/1	-1/-2	1/2	-1/0	
RWC=Relevance to the whole community	Citizen	0/1	-1/-2	1/2	-1/0	
Implications and recommendations (IR)						
JP _{BS} = Judgment perceptions by business systems	Business	0	-1	0	-1	
JP _{CIT} = Judgment perceptions by citizens	Citizen	0/1	-1/-2	1/2	-1/0	
Citations and impact factors (CIF)						
CIT/IF = Number of	Pre-					
citations/Impact factor of the journal	existing data	1.2	.8	1.2	.8	

The values in this table concern an average article. The numbers used for the article profiles are defined in Figure 2. For the variables regarding ratings measured in a -3—+3 scale, an above average article has a central classification one point above an average article, and a below average article has a central classification one point below an average article. For the initial reviewer classification, the central value is 75% for an above average article and 65% for a below average article, for all article profiles. For the Number of citations/Impact factor (CIT/IF), the central value for an above average article is 50% higher than the one used for an average article and, for a below average article, this value is 50% lower than the one used for an average article.

Table 4. Probability distributions for the behaviour model used in the simulations

First layer:	distribution of the g	eneral opinion (pre	liminary values of th	e variables)
Dispersion of the general opinion	one central value (v)	Variables with	the reviewer (distribution for a percentage variation over the	factor to which the
Small	Discrete distribution: $P(v)=50\%$ $P(v-1)=P(v+1)=20$ % $P(v-2)=$ $P(v+2)=5\%$	Discrete distribution: $P(v_1)=P(v_2)=35\%$ $P(v_1-1)=P(v_2+1)=1$ 5%	distribution with	Pert-style beta distribution parameters (0.5, 1.0, 1.5)
Medium	Discrete distribution: $P(v)=40\%$ $P(v-1)=P(v+1)=20$ % $P(v-2)=$ $P(v+2)=10\%$	Discrete distribution: $P(v_1)=P(v_2)=1/6$ $P(v_1-1)=P(v_2+1)=1/6$ $P(v_1-2)=P(v_2+2)=1/6$	(-30%, 0%, +30%)	Pert-style beta distribution with parameters (0, 1, 2)
Large	P(v)=20% P(v-1)=P(v+1)=20 % $P(v-2)=P(v+2)=20%$	Discrete distribution: $P(v_1)=P(v_2)=30\%$ $P(v_1-1)=P(v_2+1)=15\%$ $P(v_1-2)=P(v_2+2)=5\%$	Average rigour/relevance: Uniform (-30%, +30%) Above/below avg. rigour/relevance: Uniform (-25%, +25%)	
Second layer by Δ)	r: distribution of th	ne perturbation to b	be added to the gener	ral opinion (denoted
Dispersion	Ratings measured i		-	Citations / Impact Factor (CIT/IF)
Small	Discrete distribution $P(\Delta=-1)=P(\Delta=0)=1$		Not perturbed	Not perturbed
Large	Discrete distribution $P(\Delta=-2)=P(\Delta=-1)=P(\Delta=0)=P(\Delta=+1)$	on:	Not perturbed	Not perturbed

Table 5. Monte Carlo simulation results for the AR2I classification of an average article, for large specific perturbations, based on 3,000 iterations

		Equal weights for each parameter		Equal weights for each variable		AHP weights	
Article profile	Dispersion of general opinion	the Mean	Standard Dev.	¹ Mean	Standard Dev.	¹ Mean	Standard Dev.
1: Theoretical	Small	0.5413	0.0248	0.5630	0.0270	0.5235	0.0253
development with	Medium	0.5404	0.0328	0.5616	0.0440	0.5228	0.0323
simulated data, about a fashionable subject	Large	0.5379	0.0446	0.5568	0.0628	0.5218	0.0425
2: Theoretical	Small	0.3467	0.0222	0.3665	0.0221	0.3543	0.0235
development with	Medium	0.3516	0.0287	0.3704	0.0345	0.3584	0.0296
simulated data, about a non-fashionable subject	Large	0.3627	0.0394	0.3790	0.0490	0.3681	0.0385
3: Theoretical	Small	0.5765	0.0242	0.5945	0.0268	0.5456	0.0257
development with real	Medium	0.5744	0.0335	0.5920	0.0441	0.5442	0.0319
data, about a fashionable subject	Large	0.5692	0.0434	0.5844	0.0626	0.5406	0.0425
4: Theoretical development with real data, about a non-fashionable subject	Small	0.3811	0.0232	0.3980	0.0230	0.3759	0.0242
	Medium	0.3848	0.0292	0.4007	0.0345	0.3792	0.0297
	Large	0.3927	0.0395	0.4064	0.0492	0.3872	0.0398

Table 6. Monte Carlo simulation results for the AR2I classification of above average and below average articles, for AHP weights and large specific perturbations, based on 3,000 iterations

		Above article	averag	e Below article	average
Article profile	Dispersion the gen- opinion	of eral Mean	Standard Dev.	Mean	Standard Dev.
1: Theoretical	Small	0.6878	0.0244	0.3553	0.0236
development with	Medium	0.6775	0.0306	0.3601	0.0290
simulated data, about a fashionable subject	Large	0.6567	0.0400	0.3713	0.0378
2: Theoretical	Small	0.5165	0.0255	0.2124	0.0192
development with	Medium	0.5141	0.0316	0.2201	0.0227
simulated data, about a non-fashionable subject	Large	0.5077	0.0404	0.2381	0.0297
3: Theoretical	Small	0.7050	0.0240	0.3783	0.0235
development with real	Medium	0.6948	0.0296	0.3824	0.0286
data, about a fashionable subject	Large	0.6745	0.0381	0.3908	0.0379
4: Theoretical	Small	0.5396	0.0251	0.2291	0.0195
development with real	Medium	0.5363	0.0312	0.2362	0.0236
data, about a non- fashionable subject	Large	0.5291	0.0404	0.2534	0.0311