

CITATION AND KOHA OPEN SOURCE LEARNING: STRUCTURE BASED

* Satender Kumar

Introduction

Citation counts can be considered an indicator of the impact a paper has. Papers attracting a large number of citations are of interest, because their citation suggests a particular influence on the development of science. In 2001, Paul Poulain (of Marseille, France) began adding many new features to Koha, most significantly support for multiple languages. By 2010, Koha has been translated from its original English into French, Chinese, Arabic and several other languages. Support for the cataloguing and search standards was added in 2002 and later sponsored by the Athens County Public Libraries. In France Paul Poulain co-founded BibLibre in 2007.

In 2005, an Ohio-based company, Metavore, Inc., trading was established to support Koha and added many new features, including support for Zebra sponsored by the Crawford County Federated Library System. Zebra support increased the speed of searches as well as improving scalability to support tens of millions of bibliographic records.

However, using citation counts as a base of research evaluation requires normalization, because differences in time intervals for attracting citations, different citation patterns in research fields, and different coverage of the discipline-specific literature in multidisciplinary databases bias the numbers (Levitt & Thelwall, 2009; Podlubny & Kassayova, 2006). Percentiles of citations have been proposed for normalizing citations (Bornmann, Leydesdorff, & Mutz, 2013). They are especially appropriate to identify excellent papers, because they can be used to indicate the ranks of papers in their database years and in their categories as defined in the Essential Science Indicators (ESI) or the Web of Science (WoS) (Bornmann, 2014). Papers considered to be excellent allow the analysis of the affiliations of highly cited authors as well as topics prevailing in journals of a WoS category of interest at the time of analysis (Bornmann, 2014; Abramo, et al., 2014; Tang 2004). Koha.org serves as a landing page for librarians who are interested in the most advanced and cost effective open source automation solution on the market, LibLime Koha. Koha.org offers a functionally advanced version of Koha and ready access to the most experienced Koha software support company in the industry, LibLime of the libraries worldwide using a variation of Koha, over 700 use the version supported by LibLime. Since the original implementation in 1999, Koha functionality has been adopted by thousands of libraries world wide, each adding features and

functions, deepening the capability of the system. With the 3.0 release in 2005, and the integration of the powerful Zebra indexing engine, Koha became a viable, scalable solution for libraries of all kinds. LibLime Koha is built on this foundation. With its advanced feature set, LibLime Koha is the most functionally advanced open source ILS on the market today.

Review of Literature

Bornmann & Bauer, 2014; Networks were generated on the basis of co-authorship relations among the 798 disambiguated author names and at the aggregated level among the 275 unified institutional addresses combined all individual universities of the University of California System as well as the various subunits of the NIH as in ESI. A number of the highly-cited researchers are affiliated not just to a single, but up to three different institutions. For this reason, we generated institutional ranking lists, which are based either on only the first-named institution

Leydesdorff, Khan, 2012; For the purpose of visualization, the resulting Pajek files were separated into eight groups of ten or more co-authors ($n = 347$ of the total of 798 authors) and two groups of four or more institutions ($n = 186$ of the total of 275 institutions) co-authoring within the set. The algorithm of Kamada & Kawai (1989) is used for the layout of the networks one database to be used by libraries. This database was rolled out in 2011. Fifty-seven libraries have chosen to adopt Koha and moved to the shared production environment hosted.

Disputes with Liblime and Koha

In 2009 a dispute arose between liblime and other members of the Koha community. The dispute centred on LibLime's apparent reluctance to be inclusive with the content of the sites^[25] and the non-contribution of software patches back to the community. A number of participants declared that they believed that LibLime had forked the software and the community. A separate web presence, source code repository and community was established. The fork continued after March 2010, when LibLime was purchased by PTFS.

In November, 2011, LibLime announced they had been granted a provisional trademark on the use of the name *koha* in new Zealand by intellectual property office of new Zealand. The provisional trademark grant was successfully appealed by the

* Librarian, Directorate of Education, Delhi

Koha community as well as by Catalyst, with a decision handed down.

Conclusion

This study deals with highly-cited papers Koha their authors and affiliations in LIS. Being (co)-author of one highly-cited paper rarely qualifies for an inclusion in a top-ranked list of authors. In order to find the authors of the 305 highly-cited papers, who have particular impact on research in the field of LIS, Authors, whose affiliations are mainly located at the NIH and a few other American institutions. Among them are the most-highly cited authors Glasgow and Aurora. Together the 24 authors coauthored three highly-cited publications. These three publications appeared in journals assigned to LIS and also to the categories “Communication” (2) or “Medical Informatics” (1). The studies focus on the collection of patient data and their exploitation.

References

1. Abramo, G., Cicero, T., & D’Angelo, C.A. (2014). Are the authors of highly cited articles also the most productive ones? *Journal of Informetrics*, 8(1), 89-97.
2. Bidault, F., & Hildebrand, T. (2014). The distribution of partnership returns: Evidence from coauthorships in economics journals. *Research Policy*, 43(6), 1002-1013.
3. Bornmann, L. (2014). How are excellent (highly cited) papers defined in bibliometrics? A quantitative analysis of the literature. *Research Evaluation*, 23(2), 166-173.
4. Bornmann, L., & Bauer, J. (2015). Which of the world’s institutions employ the most highly cited researchers? An analysis of the data from highlycited.com. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*. In press.
5. Bornmann, L., de Moya Anegón, F., & Leydesdorff, L. (2010). Do scientific advancements lean on the shoulders of mediocre research? An investigation of the Ortega hypothesis. *PLoS ONE*, 5(10), e13327.
6. Bornmann, L., Leydesdorff, L., & Mutz, R. (2013). The use of percentiles and percentile rank classes in the analysis of bibliometric data: opportunities and limits. *Journal of Informetrics*, 7(1), 158-165.