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AIM & SCOPE OF RESEARCH

• Can ‘altmetrics’ - in the form of Mendeley Readership statistics - reveal knowledge diffusion patterns?
• Can data from ‘altmetrics’ - in combination with traditional metrics - help us create quality profiles of conference papers?
ALTMETRICS

• A new portfolio of metrics, based on automatically processed web interactions and transactions.
  • Downloads, Views, Shares, Likes, Tweets, etc.
  • Alternative: contradiction with the existing system of calculation and assessment.
  • Complementary: relation of ‘altmetrics’ with citations.
CONFERENCE LITERATURE

• An overlooked publication venue
• Hard to index / calculate
  • differences in periodicity
  • unavailability of a commonly agreed quality system
  • superabundance of events
MENDELEY : WHY

• A reference management system.
• A social network for scholars.
• Mendeley’s coverage, especially in cases of very specific venues, such as the conferences, has proven to be very broad.
• www.mendeley.com
RESEARCH SETTING

- Corpus
  - number of papers: 224
  - domain: digital library evaluation
  - sources: two conferences, JCDL and ECDL
  - period: 2001-2011

- Data
  - Mendeley Readership statistics
  - Google Scholar citations
READERSHIP NETWORK

- nodes = countries
  - reader’s country ($v_{ai}$)
  - paper’s country ($v_{bi}$)
- edges ($v_{ai}$, $v_{bi}$) = state of readership
  - the inclusion of a paper $b$ in the collection of a Mendeley reader $a$. 

Enhancing digital libraries with TechLens [2004]

Disambiguating Geographic Names in a Historical Digital Library [2001]
**ALTMETRICS AS ‘CONFMETRICS’?**

- An altmetrics powered impact indicator
  - readers
  - citations
  - acceptance rate
  - year
- The harmonic mean of two quality rates, the readers’ and the citations’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conf.</th>
<th>Cites</th>
<th>Reads</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acpt. Rate</th>
<th>Indic.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ECDL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>JCDL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLOSING REMARKS

• Readership: a balanced kind of metric in the landscape of ‘altmetrics’
• More elaborate statistics are needed - at least in the case of Mendeley.
• We were able to see which countries produce and which consume knowledge on digital library evaluation.
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