

Letter to the Editor

DOI:10.5771/0943-7444-2020-1-92

Popularity of entries in *ISKO Encyclopedia of Knowledge Organization*

The *ISKO Encyclopedia of Knowledge Organization* (*IEKO*) was launched in 2016 by Birger Hjørland, its Editor-in-chief, as an official ISKO initiative; Claudio Gnoli joined soon as co-editor and web editor. Peer-reviewed articles are published online at <http://www.isko.org/cyclo/> then printed in the *Knowledge Organization* journal (Dextre Clarke 2017).

Since 2018, the Web version of new entries includes a counter of independent visits provided by Digits.net; the counter has also been progressively introduced for all previously-published entries, keeping track of the date when the count has started. After a couple of years, such statistics offer an interesting hint to assess which topics are the most popular in our field. Obviously, this is not an objective measure of the absolute relevance of a topic or quality of a page: for example, an entry on a very specific topic can be expected to be consulted less often than those on more general topics, yet still be a necessary component in the documentation of knowledge organization (KO) concepts.

On 8 November 2019, we have tabulated the current value of counters for 46 *IEKO* entries. The other 11 entries available at that time have not been considered, as they still had not had a counter for a period significant enough (at least 40 days). Visits for an individual page ranged between 113 and 9010. As these values are clearly biased by the different age of each counter, we have weighed them by the number of days elapsed since the introduction of the counter (often, though not always, coinciding with the entry creation). Number of elapsed days ranged between 44 and 604.

Dividing the former value by the latter, we got a visit rate v for every entry. Resulting values of v range between 0.89 and 17.36 visits per day per entry, with a mean of 4.11. The ten most often visited entries are as shown in Table 1.

There are many possible ways to explain these results. A first observation is that the most visited entries concern very general topics in KO and the broader field of library-and-information science (LIS)—as opposed to, for example, knowledge organization systems (KOSS) in specific fields or biographical articles on individual KO authors. This may reflect a use of *IEKO* in educational contexts, contributing to a greater awareness of the basics of our field among non-specialists.

Exceptions to this are the entries on Hornbostel-Sachs and on the classification of psychology, which may have been largely used due to the popularity of the subject as taught in specific KO courses or to the renown of their authors. In general, humanities may be of greater interest to the KO community than other covered fields, such as physics or astronomy, although this hypothesis would need further evidence.

The systematic index of *IEKO* is organized by broad categories that are identified by capital letters (compatible with the Integrative Levels Classification (ILC) notational system for special and local schemes) and used in anchor links. We have aggregated data on visit rates by such categories and calculated the average v for each category and subcategory. Results are shown in Table 2.

As can be seen, general entries on the discipline itself (entry on “KO”) and adjacent disciplines (entry on “LIS”) have by far the highest average v , confirming that users’ interests focus on introductory resources. Apart from this,

| | |
|-------|--|
| 17.36 | Knowledge pyramid: the DIKW hierarchy |
| 14.83 | Library and information science (LIS) |
| 11.60 | Knowledge organization (KO) |
| 11.49 | Classification |
| 6.92 | Hornbostel-Sachs Classification of Musical Instruments |
| 6.91 | Literary warrant |
| 6.58 | Citation indexing and indexes |
| 6.27 | Knowledge organization system (KOS) |
| 6.17 | Indexing: concepts and theory |
| 6.13 | Classification of psychology |

Table 1.

| | | | |
|-------------|-----------|--|---|
| 5.53 | A | KO: general and historical issues | |
| 13.21 | <i>AD</i> | | Discipline and adjacent disciplines |
| 1.68 | <i>AR</i> | | Biographical articles |
| 5.35 | C | Core concepts in KO | |
| 5.46 | <i>CC</i> | | Theoretical concepts |
| 4.16 | <i>CS</i> | | Specific document types, genres and media |
| 3.29 | K | Knowledge organization systems (KOS) | |
| 4.98 | <i>KA</i> | | KOS general issues |
| 5.21 | <i>KD</i> | | KOS kinds |
| 1.87 | <i>KG</i> | | Specific KOSs, general/universal |
| 2.85 | <i>KL</i> | | Specific KOSs, domain/specific |
| 2.90 | <i>KN</i> | | KO in specific domains |
| 2.87 | <i>KS</i> | | Standards and formats for representing data |
| 4.83 | P | Knowledge organizing processes (KOP) | |
| 2.48 | R | Methods, approaches and philosophies | |
| 2.09 | T | KO in different contexts and applications | |

Table 2.

the average values for all broad categories do not differ very much. The low value for general KOSs can be explained by the fact that entries for the most renowned systems (*DDC*, *UDC*, *BC2* ...) are still in preparation or (in the case of *Colon Classification*) have lacked a counter until recently so are not included in this survey.

Claudio Gnoli and Edoardo Manelli

Library Service, University of Pavia

Via Ferrata 1, 27100 Pavia, Italy
 <claudio.gnoli@unipv.it>
 <emanel@alice.it>

Reference

Dextre Clarke, Stella. 2017. “Babel, Babble and Info-speak: Could an Encyclopedia Help?”. *Catalogue and Index* 188: 59-60.

Letter to the Editor

DOI:10.5771/0943-7444-2020-1-93

Databases should Keep Pace with the Needs of scientific Exploration: “Nationality” should be added to scientific Research Databases

The rapid development of science and technology has shortened the distances among people from different countries and regions. Many people study or work abroad rather than in their home countries. According to Decoding Global Talent 2018 (<https://on.bcg.com/2tB3qy7>), 57% of respondents expressed willingness to work abroad. Working abroad has become a global trend. At the same time, research

on countries or regions has always been a hot topic. A large number of results can be obtained when searching for a country, a region, developing country, or developed country in Google Scholar. The question arises: How do we consider the impact of those who work abroad on related research?

It is difficult to assess the specific impact of talents on national development and social progress. Even the most intuitive literature analysis work is also facing difficulties. A great deal of literature analysis is based on *Science Citation Index* and *Social Sciences Citation Index* in the *Web of Science* database. However, it should be noted that the “Count-