

Tony's success is connected to an opportunity his predecessor saw and snatched. Back in the 1960s, the US Federal Government sought to establish centers on Excellence in Developmental Disabilities in every state. The Feds supported them with small grants and intentionally tried to place them not in flagship or Ivy League schools but those second-tier teaching universities. Tony was able to use the really small advantage by positioning his group as the center of expertise within the entire state and gain national recognition. Success breeds success, and later he was able to bring in very significant, highly competitive federal grants, as well as state training grants. One of the secret of his success is that his unit is somewhat independent of the university's bureaucracies, and thus can behave as a true entrepreneurial organization, with its own small staff, its own budget, and schedule. Yet he is also very helpful to colleagues within the university's Special Education department, and involves them in grant-writing and projects. What's the moral of these stories?

1. It is highly unlikely that faculty will all have the same strategies in building their scholarly identities. So, be prepared for a variety of scholarly engagements, and keep tweaking your faculty evaluation and promotion policies until they are flexible enough to accommodate the diversity of academic careers. Those systems can be both flexible and rigorous. Moreover, faculty need to be made aware of different paths to excellence and explicitly informed about their existence.
2. It is also unlikely that the entire faculty of any university will achieve scholarship excellence all at once. Perhaps it is wise to focus on a few break-throughs areas or individuals first and make sure they gradually enlarge the orbit of influence to give opportunity to others. Or, more likely, your university has such champions already; it is only a matter of allowing/expecting them to include others. Scholarship is, as we all know, a network of ideas, practices, and individuals. One person can provide access to many but that requires strong institutional support and encouragement, otherwise islands of excellence will remain isolated.
3. It is important to recognize that none of my three heroes would be doing well at a top research-intensive university. Their scholarship does not fit well, and some of them were actually late bloomers. They would have been denied tenure at a highly competitive place, and would not have the freedom to pursue their interests. Second-tier and international universities must recognize their unique niche in the talent market, and try to specifically attract the kind of passionate, talented, self-directed people by promises of freedom and independence unobtainable at research-intensive schools. It was easy to make tenure at the places where Susan, Mike and Tony started their careers, and that is the point. Some people flourish in a highly competitive rigorous place; others do better in a more relaxed atmosphere.

4. All three learned to capitalize on a specific resource. Without resources, there is no development. But those do not have to be monetary or even tangible resources. Connections, reputations, unique experiences — all of these can be used. People need help in recognizing such resources and latching onto them.

Here is a story illustrating the last point. Many years ago, our dean was talking to a group of young faculty about a new program we proposed. He looked at us and said, "Together you probably speak 7 or 8 languages, and come from four different countries. Why don't you build your new program using your strength?" It just did not occur to us but an experienced administrator should be good at spotting a resource when he sees it.

Who are these lessons for? I am thinking here about both second-tier universities in the US and other rich countries and top universities in emerging economies, such as Russia. All of them are trying to change their organizational structures to increase their scholarly output. Both groups are playing in very crowded and competitive fields. In my opinion, one of the mistakes of the Russian excellence initiative, for example, is its attempt to directly emulate the world's leading universities. I argue for a more flexible, more realistic approach to change. We cannot expect all faculty overnight becoming top scholars in their fields. Unlike highly selective universities in countries with huge pools of talent, we cannot recruit the best only. But we can allow for more diversity in academic careers and use our strengths. We need to look for unique and idiosyncratic people like Susan, Michael, and Tony, and let them grow as scholars in their peculiar ways. Let us call this the authentic improvement theory.

.....

Essential Information about Predatory Publishers and Journals

Jeffrey Beall

*Associate Professor / Scholarly Communications Librarian,
University of Colorado Denver, USA
jeffrey.beall@ucdenver.edu*

Predatory publishers threaten the integrity of research and victimize honest researchers.

My first experience with predatory publishers was in 2008, when I began to receive strange emails — mostly from South Asia — inviting me to submit research manuscripts to journals I had never heard of before. The spam emails had headlines like "Call for Paper," which is incorrect English (it should be "Call for Papers"). What surprised

me the most was that the journals' websites stated that they charged authors to publish in the journals, a radical change from subscription journals, in which authors were not charged to publish.

The emails signaled to me the beginning of gold open-access publishing. In gold open access, the publishing costs are covered by fees charged to the authors upon acceptance of their manuscripts for publication. The advantage of this publishing model is that the published articles are free for anyone to access.

While open access (OA) was initially promising, its weaknesses quickly began to appear. Publishers soon realized that they could make more money from author fees if they accepted more papers. Peer review began to be seen as a threat to a publisher's income, because when it is conducted properly, papers are often rejected for publication. Rejection means the loss of revenue for publishers using the gold OA model.

Accordingly, many gold open-access publishers began to perform only cursory peer reviews, accepting most papers submitted and pocketing the fees paid by the authors. Now, they typically do everything they can to trick authors into submitting papers in order to get the author fees from them. So, by definition, predatory journals and publishers are those that exploit the gold open-access model to profit from scholarly publishing in a dishonest way.

Indeed, predatory publishers are dishonest, they lack transparency, and they do not follow scholarly publishing industry standards. Many of them misrepresent their true headquarters locations, claiming they are based in London or New York when they are really based in Pakistan or India.

I already mentioned their practice of spamming, and this has reached epidemic proportions, with researchers sometimes receiving several spam emails from scholarly publishers every hour. Publishers using the gold open-access model especially target researchers with grant money, for these funds can be used to pay article processing charges. Thus, authors in the bio-medical sciences, where grants are more common, are frequently targeted by predatory journals.

Why They Are a Problem

Predatory publishers hurt scientists, science, and the communication of science. As mentioned, they trick scientists, pretending to operate as legitimate publishers when they are essentially counterfeit and only seeking to earn a quick profit. Busy scientists often lack time to sufficiently investigate a publisher and can mistakenly submit a paper to one of their journals or accept an editorial board invitation.

Low quality journals pollute science with junk science and unvetted research. Some scholarly indexes aim to have a broad coverage of journals and include these predatory journals in their indexes. One example is Google Scholar, which indexes articles from hundreds of low-quality and predatory journals.

Researchers preparing literature reviews are faced with da-

tabases that include junk journals in them, so they have to carefully select whether a given article should be cited or not. Moreover, students frequently use these databases, but they lack the experience and credentials to sort out the authentic science from the junk science.

Junk science is also called pseudo-science, and it represents theories and conclusions that cannot be supported by science-based research. Many political activists are now using predatory journals to publish their ideas as science. For example, anti-nuclear activists write articles making nuclear energy appear more dangerous than the data really indicates. Also, people creating medical compounds, such as new drugs, now regularly write articles in predatory journals that "find" that the drugs they invented are very effective.

Because the journals only care about getting the money, one can use a predatory journal to make any claim one wants. Indeed, one published article even describes[1] civilizations on the planet Mars.

Complicit authors

Sometimes scholarly authors take advantage of the easy publishing that predatory journals offer for their own benefit. In many cases, universities base faculty evaluations and promotions only on the number of articles published, and they don't distinguish between high quality and predatory journals. It is pretty easy to write up a scholarly article and get it quickly published in a predatory journal. Here the victims are the honest researchers, those who submit their work to selective scholarly journals, where it is more difficult to publish and the process is slower. Increasingly, there are predatory publishers that specialize in quick, easy, and cheap publishing.

Approved scholarly indexes

Many universities base their evaluation on faculty publications in journals included in prestigious indexes, such as Web of Science or Scopus. This "whitelist" approach is not without its flaws, as the indexes sometimes make mistakes and include easy-acceptance, pay-to-publish journals. In some cases, respected journals cannot resist the temptation to generate much revenue, so they lower their standards, accepting most submitted papers.

Geographic Focus

Predatory publishers have been more successful in some regions of the world than in others. One broad area that has seen many victims of predatory journals is Eastern Europe, the former Soviet republics, and Russia. In these regions, academic evaluation is often based merely on counting the number of papers published. This matches perfectly with predatory journals, who offer quick, easy, and cheap publishing. Many researchers submit papers to predatory journals but fail to realize they are counterfeit journals. Their work is quickly accepted and published, and they soon receive an invoice, usually an unexpected one, from the publisher.

When a few predatory journals invade a region and be-

come successful at attracting articles and payments from researchers, others quickly follow. Then the number of publisher multiplies, and the number of spam emails grows also. We are now beginning to see low-quality and predatory open-access publishers being established in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Republics.

Identifying Predatory Journals

The characteristics of predatory journals are becoming well known. As mentioned, predatory journals use spam email to solicit articles, they have a fast and often fake peer review process, and they supply false information about their locations. Many now also make false claims about having impact factors or being included in prestigious academic indexes. Now it's important to verify all claims made by open-access journals, for many are dishonest.

The lists I publish also identify predatory journals and publishers, and many researchers find them useful. These lists are found at < scholarlyoa.com >. Compiled with the help and advice of many active researchers, the lists include publishers and journals that ought to be avoided by honest researchers.

Long-Term View

While publishing one's research in a predatory journal may bring temporary gain, the long-term consequences are likely to damage a researcher's reputation. It is not uncommon for predatory journals to disappear from the internet after several years. Most are one-man operations, and the published articles have no backups. Researchers may be stigmatized for publishing in easy-acceptance, pay-to-publish journals. Potential employers may reject applicants who have published articles in predatory journals.

For all researchers, the best course of action is to avoid predatory journals. Carry out high-quality research and submit it to the best possible journals. This strategy is more difficult and time-consuming, but it eliminates the risks predatory journals bring and offers researchers better and more secure long-term benefits.

References

[1] Arulmani, M. and Latha, V. (2013) *Three Principles of Akkie Management*. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 3, 453-465. doi: 10.4236/ajibm.2013.34052.

.....

Riding with the Metric Tide: 'Predatory' Journals in Scopus

Ivan Sterligov

*Head of the Scientometrics Center,
National Research University
Higher School of Economics,
Russian Federation
isterligov@hse.ru*

Tatiana Savina

*Expert at the Scientometrics Center,
National Research University
Higher School of Economics,
Russian Federation
tsavina@hse.ru*

Metrics usage in higher education management has clearly become an issue of great importance. A recent high-profile policy report on this topic, commissioned by the Higher Education Funding Council for England, is aptly named *The Metric Tide*. It reiterates a number of basic principles like "don't evaluate individuals using journal impact factors" or "peer review can't be substituted by metrics," and stresses that, "those involved in research assessment and management should behave responsibly, considering and preempting negative consequences [of metrics usage] wherever possible" (Wilson 2015).

One of the obvious consequences is gaming with indicators, which comes in various types and level of severity. This paper deals with one particular technique centered around so-called "predatory" journals indexed in Scopus database. It is a part of a broader research on the impact of metrics-based policy measures on various university systems. See the introductory article about "predatory" publishing by the foremost authority on this topic prof. Jeffrey Beall, p. 07.

The Roots

Scopus is one of the two standard bibliometric databases widely used in research assessment across the world. It is a reputable source backing Excellence in Research for Australia and British Research Excellence Framework nation-wide university evaluation systems amongst others. None of them actually use Scopus publication counts as direct metrics. That is natural because the objective of these evaluations is to measure quality, not quantity.

Yet, for those nations that lack a culture of elaborate — and expensive — academic evaluations but strive to develop "world-class research universities," Scopus or Web of Science metrics seem to be an affordable substitute. What's more, ignorant officials tend to oversimplify even the most