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The Technical University of Munich (TUM)

40,000 students
10,000 staff members
550 professors
14 departments
The Department of Architecture

1,500 students
200 academic staff
29 professors
Research at the Department of Architecture

Research Lab

Centre for Urban Ecology and Climate Adaption

http://www.ar.tum.de/en/research-development/research-networks/research-lab/
TUM: Research output in major databases

Number of professors with publications in WoS and Scopus
Why is this?

Architectural researchers from TUM tend to publish…

… in German

… in non-academic journals

… books and other publication types

Architectural works can be building projects, case studies, architectural competitions, exhibitions, computer modelling, etc. and are documented through other means.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Linkedin</th>
<th>Xing</th>
<th>ResearchGate</th>
<th>Academia.edu</th>
<th>Mendeley</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target group</td>
<td>professionals</td>
<td>professionals</td>
<td>academics</td>
<td>academics and students</td>
<td>international</td>
<td>international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>international, emphasis on US</td>
<td>mainly established in German speaking countries</td>
<td>mainly established among STEM, emphasis on US</td>
<td>all subjects, mainly established among the humanities</td>
<td>international</td>
<td>international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Rank (June 2016)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>9635</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of registered users 2016</td>
<td>43 million (1st quarter 2016)</td>
<td>&gt; 9 million (1st quarter 2016)</td>
<td>&gt; 38 million (1st quarter 2016)</td>
<td>&gt; 4 million (April 2016)</td>
<td>1,000 million unique visits/month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly active users (MAU) / visitors</td>
<td>10 million</td>
<td>7.5 million (DACH*)</td>
<td>13 million (Sept. 2014)</td>
<td>ca. 1,500 (June 2016)</td>
<td>36 million (unique visitors/month - 1st quarter 2016)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUM-affiliation</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users 2014</td>
<td>206 million</td>
<td>7.5 million (DACH*)</td>
<td>5 million (Nov. 2014)</td>
<td>&gt; 5 million (Nov. 2014)</td>
<td>13 million (Sept. 2014)</td>
<td>36 million (unique visitors/month - 1st quarter 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users 2012</td>
<td>161 million</td>
<td>6 million (DACH*); 12,9 million (worldwide)</td>
<td>&gt; 2.3 million (Jan. 2012)</td>
<td>&gt; 2 million (Jan. 2012)</td>
<td>2.5 million (Sept. 2013)</td>
<td>138 million MAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>profile services, contacts, endorsements, recommendations</td>
<td>profile services, contacts, recommendations, groups</td>
<td>profile services, contacts, list of publications, discussions</td>
<td>profile services, contacts, list of publications</td>
<td>list of publications, reference management, groups, trends</td>
<td>short message service and communication platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes, as separate document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.V.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research interests</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts visible?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications (list of references)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of publications</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>81 million (1st quarter 2016)</td>
<td>23 million (Juni 2016)</td>
<td>n.s. - (in 2013: 460 million)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full text</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of full text</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19 million</td>
<td>13.8 million (Juni 2016)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other document types</td>
<td>yes: presentation, awards, patents, projects</td>
<td>yes: awards, images, videos, PDFs</td>
<td>yes: e.g. experiment findings, negative results, raw data, technical report; focus on SE</td>
<td>yes: e.g. book reviews, talks, teaching documents; focus on humanities</td>
<td>yes: e.g. case, encyclopedia article, data, film; all subject areas</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Review</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations from within platform</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations from external sources</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes, sources not transparent</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes: Scopus</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other metrics</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes: RG Score; Impact Points and h-Index, not completely transparent</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes: readers, h-Index</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifics</td>
<td>wide distribution</td>
<td>mainly established in German speaking countries</td>
<td>mostly established among STEM, metrics</td>
<td>support Open Science and Open Access</td>
<td>combination with reference management</td>
<td>completely open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* DACH = Germany, Austria and Switzerland

“Academic Networking Sites” by Tina Hohmann, https://mediatum.ub.tum.de/node?id=1320996

TUM: Visibility on alternative academic platforms

- 2 professors have a profile in Google Scholar
- 8 professors are in ResearchGate
- 5 professors are in Academia.edu
- 21 out of 29 have no presence in any of these

Number of professors with profiles in Google Scholar, ResearchGate and Academia.edu
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Looking for **Best Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)</td>
<td>🇺🇸</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UCL (University College London)</td>
<td>🇬🇧</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Delft University of Technology</td>
<td>🇳🇱</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent are architectural researchers from top institutions represented in the databases Web of Science (WoS) and Scopus?
Top institutions in WoS

Number of professors with publications in WoS

Comparison: TUM
Top institutions in Scopus

Number of professors with publications in Scopus

Comparison: TUM
To what extent are architectural researchers from top institutions represented in Google Scholar, ResearchGate and Academia.edu?
Out of 35 researchers
15 have a profile in Google Scholar
17 researchers are in ResearchGate
24 researchers are in Academia.edu

Comparison: TUM
Are there differences among the architectural sub-disciplines?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Architecture / Design / Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Planning / Urban Studies / Landscape / Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Building Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Computation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>History / Theory / Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub-disciplines / Research areas compared

- A: Architecture / Design / Arts
- B: Planning / Urban Studies / Landscape / Built Environment
- C: Building Technology
- D: Computation
- E: History / Theory / Criticism
- F: Project Management
Sub-disciplines in databases

Based on a selection of architectural researchers from M.I.T., UCL, TU Delft, and TUM

Average number of publications per person (rounded) in WoS

Average number of publications per person (rounded) in Scopus
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Sub-disciplines and alternative academic platforms

Based on a selection of architectural researchers from M.I.T., TU Delft, UCL and TUM
Is there a relation between the presence on databases and academic alternative platforms?
High profile researchers on alternative platforms

Out of 18 researchers

Comparison: distribution across top 35

Professors with at least 10 publications in WoS and Scopus
Highly active researchers in databases

Professors with profiles on all academic platforms
What potential do alternative academic platforms offer to architectural researchers?
1. Open Access and Visibility

“...to avoid pay-walls, to be able to read papers by colleagues as well as make all my papers accessible in one place.“*

* Quoted from TUM researchers, translated by the author
2. Publication types

Professor A from TUM, Architectural Computing
2. Publication types

Professor B from TUM, Landscape Architecture
3. Academic communication

Current Awareness

Discussions (ResearchGate)

Open review (Academia.edu and ResearchGate)
Different views

„Using Academia resulted in a completely new dimension for my research.“*

„both platforms seem to be some game, most of all with personal vanities; I focus more time and energy on developing content than using these superficial and short-lived platforms.“*

* Quoted from TUM and TUD researchers, translated by the author
Researchers that are well presented in databases tend to be also well presented on alternative academic platforms, and vice versa.

There are significant differences for the architectural sub-disciplines.

Academic platforms can‘t substitute major databases, but have the potential to improve visibility for architects and their works.
Implication at TUM Department of Architecture
Research Support Programme

(faculty board, 17.5.2017)
Contact: Tina Hohmann (tina.hohmann@ub.tum.de)