

## Library Research Support – alla Ungherese

Zsuzsanna Nagy  
Corvinus University of Budapest Library and Archives

**EBSLG Conference**  
**St. Gallen, June 10. 2015**

# The Hungarian Scientific Bibliography

## A national project ... or too much of a good thing?

- **What is this?** - The Hungarian Scientific Bibliography (HSB) is a comprehensive national database of scientific/scholarly publications and citations of Hungarian researchers.
- **Goal:** to create a reliable bibliographic database of **all researchers** affiliated to Hungarian institutions and **all research output** funded by state money (directly or indirectly)
- **Scope and volume:** time span varying, mandatory since 2007, ≈ 4 million records (36.000 researchers, 1,2 m publications, 3,7 m citations)

## Used for

- individual evaluation (tenure decisions, applications for grants, doctoral degrees Ph.D and DSc)
- supplies data to official bodies (National Statistical Office, Ministries, Research Funding Agencies, etc.)
- evaluation of research excellence of institutions, institutional units – criterium of state financing

## Content

- scientific/scholarly works (articles, books, book chapters, dissertations)
- all item published (textbooks, journalistic papers, essays, opinions, obituaries, laudations, commentaries...)
- works of art (coming soon!) (architecture, paintings, sculpture, music, literature...) for DLA programs

## Legal context

- launched as a project of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences other participants joining freely
- soon after mandatory for research-related institutions
- Act on Higher Education (2011) - uploading dissertations metadata
- Act on the HAS (2015) – mandatory for every researcher funded by public money

## Philosophy

- researchers upload their publications and citations data
- librarians/administrators control and validate data
- algorithm-based data import whenever possible (control is still necessary)

## Organisation

- coordination and infrastructure - HAS Library through own budget
- participating institutions contribute to funding + high workload (1500 administrators, more than 100 FTE librarians)

## Additional features

- connected to the repository of the Academy of Sciences
- connected to university IRs
- full-text upload via SWORD protocol

## Plans

- English interface
- using ORCIDiDs to harvest data
- metadata import from CrossRef
- data access via an open API.....

## Pros

- reliable data on research output at one place (individuals, institutions, units)
- easily obtainable data for different purposes and procedures (statistics, assessment, data supply, etc)
- customizable lists by different criteria
- ready-made evaluative tables for individual researchers with metrics (cumulated IF, h-index, citations number, etc.)
- SSH in national language is covered
- publication list for individuals, embeddable to personal website

## Cons

- complicated manual data upload
- heavy workload on researchers
- heavy workload on librarians (288.000 man-hour per year)
- deskilling librarians („bibliographic factory workers“)
- unnecessary complexity, many features (one-stop shop)
- high costs – whole project, esp. on university libraries
- biased - evaluation tools are embedded
- centralized, bureaucratic organisation (centre – periphery model, institutional framework of science) lack of cooperation
- obsolete, 20th century model