Information and Knowledge Management (2025)
Clausius Scientific Press, Canada

DOI: 10.23977/infkm.2025.060114
ISSN 2523-5893 Vol. 6 Num. 1

From "Impact Factor Hegemony" to "Multi-dimensional Quality Perspective": The Transformation of Theoretical Paradigm in Academic Evaluation of Scientific Journals

Xiao Xiong

Editorial Office of Water Resources and Power, Wuhan, Hubei, China
edtxiaoxiong@163.com

Keywords: Impact Factor; scientific journals; academic evaluation; paradigm shift

Abstract: In an era of exponential growth in research outputs, the academic quality evaluation of scientific journals has become increasingly significant. The traditional evaluation paradigm dominated by the impact factor has gradually revealed numerous drawbacks. This paper conducts an in-depth analysis of the connotation, manifestations, and disadvantages of "impact factor hegemony," constructs a theoretical framework of the "multi-dimensional quality perspective," and comprehensively evaluates the academic quality of scientific journals from multiple dimensions such as academic innovation, research method rigor, social influence, and peer recognition. Meanwhile, it explores the paths for realizing the transformation of the theoretical paradigm, including conceptual shifts, methodological innovations, and institutional guarantees, providing a more scientific and rational theoretical basis for the academic evaluation of scientific journals and promoting the development of academic research and technological innovation.

1. Introduction

In an era characterized by the exponential growth of research outputs, scientific journals, as core platforms for presenting and disseminating research achievements, play a vital role in academic quality evaluation[1]. This evaluation not only influences the development orientation of journals themselves but also affects the rational allocation of research resources, the career development of researchers, and the direction and quality of academic inquiry. For a long time, the evaluation paradigm dominated by the impact factor has held a dominant position in academic evaluations of scientific journals[2]. The impact factor, with its simplicity in calculation and data accessibility, has rapidly become the core metric for measuring journal influence and is widely applied in journal rankings, research performance assessments, and other fields. However, with the deepening and diversification of academic research, this single-indicator evaluation paradigm has gradually exposed multiple issues [3]. In this context, critically re-examining the traditional "impact factor-dominated" evaluation paradigm and exploring the theoretical transformation toward a "multi-dimensional quality perspective" have become urgent tasks in the field of academic evaluation of scientific journals.

2. Criticism of the "Impact Factor-Dominated" Evaluation Paradigm

2.1 The Connotation and Development of Impact Factor

The impact factor was first proposed by Eugene Garfield in 1955 as a quantitative method to assess journal influence [4]. It is calculated as the total number of citations received by articles published in a journal over the previous two years divided by the total number of citable articles published during the same period. In 2009, Thomson Reuters released a new version of the Journal Citation Reports (JCR), introducing new metrics such as the 5-Year Impact Factor (IF5)[5]. The emergence of the impact factor provided a relatively objective and quantifiable approach for journal evaluation. In an environment of limited academic resources requiring rapid journal screening and comparison, it was quickly adopted. Over time, the impact factor has evolved from one of many evaluation metrics to the core indicator for measuring journal quality and influence, playing a pivotal role in resource allocation and academic reputation building.

2.2 Manifestations of "Impact Factor Hegemony"

In the allocation of academic resources, journals with high impact factors often secure more research funding, high-quality submissions, and greater academic visibility. Research institutions frequently use impact factors as a key criterion when distributing research project funds, favoring projects published in high-impact journals. In the evaluation of researchers, many universities and research institutions directly link the impact factors of journals where researchers publish their work to promotion, performance appraisals, and bonus distributions. This incentivizes researchers to prioritize journal impact factors over the alignment between their research and the journal's scope when selecting publication venues. In journal classification systems, impact factors serve as a critical criterion. Major evaluation systems like SCI (Science Citation Index) use impact factors to rank and categorize journals into different tiers, further reinforcing the dominance of impact factors in academic evaluations. This leads researchers and institutions to excessively pursue high-tier journals while overlooking niche journals with significant academic value in specific fields.

2.3 Disadvantages of "Impact Factor Hegemony"

This impact factor-dominated evaluation paradigm has triggered a series of short-term behaviors. To publish in high-impact journals, researchers often gravitate toward trendy research areas, neglecting long-term projects with potential but limited short-term impact [6]. Some researchers even resort to unethical practices such as citation stacking or inappropriate self-citation to inflate their citation counts, fostering academic misconduct [7]. Additionally, disciplines vary significantly in citation patterns and citation half-lives. For example, life sciences have rapid literature turnover and shorter half-lives, while mathematics and other foundational disciplines have more stable research outputs with longer half-lives. The impact factor's one-size-fits-all approach fails to account for these disciplinary differences, resulting in unequal evaluations across fields. Furthermore, the impact factor focuses solely on citation counts, ignoring critical aspects such as the originality of research, methodological rigor, and societal contributions, leading to incomplete and inaccurate assessments of journal quality [8].

3. Construction of the "Multi-dimensional Quality Perspective" Theoretical Framework

3.1 Connotation of the Multi-dimensional Quality Perspective

The multi-dimensional quality perspective transcends the limitations of the traditional single impact factor, advocating for a comprehensive evaluation of journal quality across multiple dimensions. It emphasizes that scientific journals are not merely repositories of research but also drivers of academic progress and societal development. Therefore, evaluating journals should not rely solely on citation counts but should encompass the academic value of their content, real-world contributions to research and society, and their standing within the academic community[9]. This multi-dimensional approach provides a more accurate and holistic understanding of journals' roles in the academic ecosystem, offering a scientific basis for evaluation.

3.2 Dimensions of the Multi-dimensional Quality Perspective

The academic quality of scientific journals is a complex and multifaceted concept that cannot be captured by a single indicator. This paper evaluates journal quality across several dimensions, including the originality of published research, methodological rigor, societal impact, peer recognition, and ethical standards.

1) Academic Innovation Dimension: This is a core metric for assessing journal quality. Innovation can manifest in theoretical breakthroughs, such as proposing new theoretical frameworks or revising existing theories, as well as methodological advancements, including novel research methods, experimental techniques, or data analysis approaches. Fresh research perspectives that uncover new research questions are also critical.

2) Methodological Rigor Dimension: Rigorous research methods are essential for ensuring the reliability and validity of findings. This dimension evaluates the soundness of study design, including sample selection, variable control, and logical coherence; the accuracy of data collection and analysis, with a focus on data integrity and appropriate analytical methods; and the reproducibility of research, as demonstrated by others' ability to replicate experiments and achieve consistent results.

3) Social Impact Dimension: The societal impact of a journal extends beyond academic circles. It includes influencing policy-making by providing evidence-based insights, driving technological innovation and industrial upgrading in relevant fields, and contributing to public scientific literacy and societal awareness.

4) Peer Recognition Dimension: Peer review is a cornerstone of academic evaluation. Peer recognition reflects a journal's reputation within the academic community, based on assessments of research originality, scientific validity, and practical relevance. Robust peer review processes, involving expert reviewers and transparent feedback mechanisms, enhance a journal's credibility.

5) Ethical Standards Dimension: Journals must enforce strict ethical guidelines to prevent misconduct such as plagiarism, data fabrication, and unethical authorship practices. Rigorous manuscript screening, protection of intellectual property, impartial peer review, and transparent reporting of research findings are essential components of ethical journal operations.

3.3 Advantages of the Multi-dimensional Quality Perspective

Compared to the traditional impact factor-dominated paradigm, the multi-dimensional quality perspective offers significant advantages. First, it provides a comprehensive evaluation by incorporating multiple dimensions, avoiding the narrowness of single-indicator assessments. Second, it enhances objectivity by reducing the influence of random factors through

multi-dimensional analysis. Third, it demonstrates dynamic adaptability, allowing for adjustments to evaluation criteria and weights as academic landscapes and societal needs evolve. This flexibility ensures that evaluations remain relevant and reflective of journals'changing roles in the academic ecosystem.

4. Pathways for Theoretical Paradigm Transformation

4.1 Conceptual Shifts

Researchers, as the primary agents of academic inquiry, must recognize the limitations of single-indicator evaluations and adopt a holistic view of academic quality. When selecting research topics, they should prioritize originality, significance, and real-world relevance over short-term citation metrics. For example, encouraging basic research with long-term potential, even if it yields fewer citations initially, emphasizes quality over quantity.

Academic institutions should revise their policies to move away from impact factor-centric evaluations. In research project evaluations, they should adopt diverse criteria, including innovation, feasibility, and societal impact. In personnel evaluations, institutions should consider multiple factors such as academic contributions, research capabilities, and teamwork, ensuring a more accurate assessment of researchers' abilities beyond publication metrics.

Policy-makers should play a guiding role by fostering an academic environment conducive to multi-dimensional evaluations. This includes allocating research funding to projects that prioritize quality and long-term goals and integrating societal impact and practical applications into reward systems, encouraging the entire academic community to embrace multi-dimensional quality assessments.

4.2 Methodological Innovations

To transition to a multi-dimensional evaluation framework, integrating advanced methodologies is essential. For instance, big data and artificial intelligence (AI) can analyze vast amounts of journal data, including citation counts, downloads, and readership, to provide a holistic view of journal influence. AI-driven natural language processing can assess the originality and methodological rigor of research by analyzing text content. Social Network Analysis (SNA) can map citation networks and author collaborations to evaluate a journal's position and influence within academic communities. Dynamic evaluation models can track temporal changes in journal quality and impact, providing insights into long-term trends [10]. Collectively, these innovative methods enhance the accuracy and fairness of evaluations, guiding journal development strategies.

4.3 Institutional Guarantees

Establishing robust institutional frameworks is critical for implementing the multi-dimensional quality perspective. First, evaluation processes must be standardized, with clear definitions of stakeholders, evaluation cycles, and procedures to ensure transparency and fairness. For example, involving diverse stakeholders such as experts, researchers, and policy-makers ensures comprehensive and specialized evaluations. Evaluation cycles should be tailored to disciplinary characteristics to avoid disrupting research continuity. Second, feedback mechanisms should be established to communicate evaluation results to journals and researchers, enabling them to identify areas for improvement. Appeals processes should also be in place to address concerns and rectify errors. Finally, evaluation outcomes should be linked to resource allocation and journal support, incentivizing continuous quality improvement.

5. Conclusion

In an era of explosive growth in academic outputs, the scientific validity of evaluation systems for scientific journals is paramount. While the traditional impact factor-dominated paradigm has its merits, its limitations—such as unequal resource allocation, narrow evaluations, disciplinary biases, and incentives for misconduct—have become increasingly evident, necessitating transformative change. The "multi-dimensional quality perspective" offers a comprehensive framework that evaluates journals across dimensions including innovation, rigor, impact, and ethics. By overcoming the drawbacks of single-indicator evaluations, this approach provides a more accurate reflection of journal quality and adaptability. Achieving this paradigmatic shift requires concerted efforts from researchers, institutions, and policy-makers to embrace new concepts, adopt innovative methods, and establish supportive institutions. This transformation not only benefits journal development but also reshapes the academic research ecosystem. As the multi-dimensional quality perspective gains traction, academic evaluations will become more equitable and science-driven, fostering advancements in research and innovation.

References

[1] Lindgreen A, Di Benedetto C A, Brodie R J. Research quality: What it is, and how to achieve it[J]. Industrial marketing management, 2021, 99: A13-A19.

[2] Wang Yongchao; Fu Jinrui; Wang Xuefen; Sun Lin; Yu Ying. Research on Relationship between Academic Influence and Impact Factor in Sci-tech Periodicals (in Chinese)[J]. Tianjin Science & Technology, 2019, 46(5):93-96.

[3] LIU Xueli; WEI Yahui; MENG Jun. Limitations of journal impact factor percentile in interdisciplinary evaluation of academic journals (in Chinese) [J]. Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals, 2018,29(10):1018-1021.

[4] Garfield E. The history and meaning of the journal impact factor[J]. JAMA, 2006, 295(1): 90-93.

[5] Zhao Xing. An Analysis of the 5-Year Impact Factor in JCR (in Chinese) [J]. Journal of Library Science in China, 2010,36(3):120-126.

[6] Paulus F M, Rademacher L, Schäfer T A J, et al. Journal impact factor shapes scientists' reward signal in the prospect of publication[J]. PloS one, 2015, 10(11): e0142537.

[7] Zhang Lingzhi. Analyses of functions of impact factor in evaluation of Chinese scientific journals (in Chinese) [J]. Acta Editologica, 2003,15(2):126-127.

[8] Dong P, Loh M, Mondry A. The" impact factor" revisited[J]. Biomedical digital libraries, 2005, 2: 1-8.

[9] Ochsner M, Hug S, Galleron I. The future of research assessment in the humanities: bottom-up assessment procedures[J]. Palgrave communications, 2017, 3(1): 1-12.

[10] He Xuefeng, Peng Chaoqun.Dynamic evaluation model of academic influence of sci-tech periodicals (in Chinese) [J].Acta Editologica, 2002,14(04):238-240.