

GLOBAL INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES PROJECT



ACADEMIC REPUTATION SURVEY

STAGE 2 METHODOLOGY

This document concerns the reputational survey instrument and not the data validations (normalization, weighting, etc) that will inform the final league tables for the times higher education world university rankings (stages 4 and 5).

OVERVIEW

When setting out to create the new survey instrument, we reviewed methods of capturing and reporting academic reputation, drawing from [community feedback](#) and internal analyses. This document outlines five major criticisms from previous surveys that we sought to address in our methodology. After our 2010 survey closes, we will post the instrument to the project website and offer further review of the problems we identified, our proposed methodological solutions, and how things played out in real-world logistics. In the interim, this outline will help survey respondents briefly review our approach, while providing the community substantive background for future discussion.

We understand that this annual process requires constant (re)evaluation and engagement, and we look forward to sharing our 2010 survey experience to facilitate discussion and continued evolution for next year's venture.

Five major criticisms stood out when reviewing both community feedback and internal analyses. We noted that existing surveys....

1. Overrepresented "the West" – North America and Western Europe in particular
2. Were biased toward English speakers
3. Asked unrealistic questions that perpetuated high scores – across all disciplines – for the traditionally "elite" institutions year after year
4. Did not allow respondents to choose lesser-known institutions, only the traditionally elite
5. Did not take teaching into account

APPROPRIATE REPRESENTATION OF ALL REGIONS

To help better balance regional representation, we sought an independent source to help outline the "expected" global distribution of researchers around the world. For 2010, we relied on UNESCO figures provided in the [Global Perspective on Research & Development report](#). Our goal was to help control any regional bias inherent to either our source lists (internal and external) or final submission tallies by bringing expected results to the forefront.

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCHERS:(UNESCO; LAST MEASURED IN 2007)

North America	22.20%
Europe	28.40%
Asia	41.40%
Oceania	2.10%
Latin America	3.60%
Africa	2.30%

We made every attempt to develop the sample plan based on these proportions, and the data analysis will likewise take them into account. Our primary sample source was a list of authors publishing in journals covered by the *Web of Science*SM, which is comprised of the *Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE)*, *Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI)* and *Arts & Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI)*. To boost our reach into Social Sciences and Arts & Humanities, we also drew from the IBIS Worldwide Academic and Library File, produced by Mardev. This source provided academic scholars who may or may not have published their work in scholarly media.



