

# Feedback on IRUS item types report



Feedback received 18/12/12 – 28/1/13

---

This is something we'd love to see 'got right' at the University of Lincoln.

Unfortunately I don't have much time to read the report in detail before the 11th January, so here are some hastily thrown-together comments from the repository team at Lincoln. I'm not sure if this is exactly what you were after, but nevertheless...

1. We wholeheartedly support the move to a standardised list of item types!
2. We're about to upgrade/relaunch the Lincoln Repository; we'd love to be able to use a standardised set of item types in our new version, particularly if the list came with guidelines for its use.
3. In particular, we spotted some item types that we don't currently use in our Repo., but which we can see a use for ("Journal"; "Review"; "Website"). There's nothing to stop us 'hacking' those extra three item types into our own Repository, but see (2).
4. On the other hand, we have three item types that we rely on fairly heavily. We're not sure how we'd map any of these to the list given in the report, without resorting to 'uncategorized'. They are:
  - 4a) "Artefact"
  - 4b) "Performance"
  - 4c) "Dataset"(We suspect that "Musical Composition" may offer the same headache to other institutions, though it's not one we rely on ourselves.)
5. In particular we'd like guidance on the use of "Preprint". When is a preprint \*not\* one of the other specified item types (Article/Monograph/Report etc.)

Paul Stainthorp / Bev Jones

University of Lincoln

---

I would like to see Performance as one of the item types – repositories are about research activity, and not all research outputs are bibliographic in nature.

Stephen Grace

University of East London

---

I absolutely agree that a standardised list of item types would be really useful.

Here at Bath Spa we are just in the process of setting up our institutional repository, we are using EPrints and have pretty much gone with the standard item types. Your report has got me thinking about the item types we will be using and how these would map onto the IRUS list. As we are quite a creative institution, I think we will have quite a number of items that fall into the Artefact, Composition and Performance item types.

I've had a look at the IRS Search function for these item types and agree that they fall below the 900 cut off point. However, you could consolidate Artifact - 491 items, and Art Object - 802 items into the Kultur item type of Art/Design item.

I would therefore ask you to consider including the Kultur agreed item types of Art/Design item; Show/Exhibition and Performance.

I think that mainly text based outputs have traditionally been the focus of IR's but there is increasingly more content available from creative outputs. My argument is that as text based item types have had much longer to establish themselves there are obviously going to be more content available in these item types.

Laura Moss

Bath Spa University

---

I would suggest you include the Versions toolkit in the Appendices:

[http://www2.lse.ac.uk/library/versions/VERSIONS\\_Toolkit\\_v1\\_final.pdf](http://www2.lse.ac.uk/library/versions/VERSIONS_Toolkit_v1_final.pdf)

We always use the suggested version names for journal articles over any other guidelines as they make sense to our academics.

You say: **The IRUS list will contain the following item types: Article; Audio; Book; Book Section; Conference or Workshop Item; Exam Paper; Exhibition; Image; Journal; Learning Object; Moving Image; Other; Patent; Preprint, Report; Review; Text; Thesis or Dissertation; Unclassified; Website; Working Paper.**

I would strongly suggest you factor in the three types from Kultur too: Art/Design item; Show/Exhibition; Performance – although I realise there is cross over.

Graham Stone

University of Huddersfield

---

Lots of folk have been doing work on standardising categories and definitions and it would be really good to get to a generic agreed understanding. Presumably IRUS are liaising with EuroCRIS, CASRAI etc or maybe they (facilitated by JISC) are incorporating additional views from your report into their classifications and definitions.

Here is a link to some of my ponderings:

<http://researchoutcomes.wordpress.com/2012/02/08/non-publications-outputs/>

Audio, Conference, Exhibition, Image, Learning Object, Other, Patent, Website cross over with RCUK 'non-publication' research output types and RCUK and other bodies are working on clear definitions.

Presumably IRUS is planning to issue a list of entities and definitions of these. Could/will these incorporate definitions used elsewhere or refer to them? E.g. it is very useful if a definition makes clear 'this is the same definition used by REF' or 'this differs from the HEBCIS definition in that...' or 'this covers all requirements for REF, RCUK, HEBCIS....' individual fields will also need definitions and some might be captured just for a specific purpose (e.g. REF or HEBCIS) and this could be mentioned in the definition.

I think we should not speak about the repository community but more generically - not all organisations store these items in repositories - wider audience – topic oriented rather than organisational gives more clout to the findings.

Happy to chat further as it is something I have been trying to get resourced for many years.

Valerie McCutcheon

University of Glasgow

---

Thanks for the link to the report. The idea of mapping to standard types as proposed is going to be useful, especially if it can be developed to work with other systems. If that can be implemented, it actually gives us the freedom to develop some more types, although I don't think that this is the intended outcome of the project! Better than that it would be useful if repository developers could include a much more extensive number of types as a standard. We have an EPrints repository and have adapted/added only a few new types so as not to depart too much from the standard types that come with EPrints.

The problem we have with types is that there is a difference between type of reference (as in data type and fit) and type of output as perceived by the author/institution.

e.g. conference papers are distributed between the types Articles, Book Sections and Conference items, depending on their published data type.

e.g. types of creative writing also cause problems –poem, short etc story can be published as different metadata types such as Article or Book section.

Alison Sutton

University of Reading

---

I think this is a really useful document that can be built on as it gives a good understanding of landscape. I'm planning to share this with the JISC Digital Infrastructure Team with the view to making them aware that in terms of measuring usage of content types (measuring impact) there is a disparity of how things are expressed in repositories - and make them aware that IRUS will contain particular content types and some work may need to be done on vocabularies in this area.

At the RSP RepNet event on the 21<sup>st</sup> Jan – a question came up about IRUS and the ability to count items in creative arts repositories. My reply was that the focus for RepNet is on research papers but certainly we are looking at the feasibility of counting other types of usage and wanting the gauge overall usage of content in repositories.

I know you looked at Kulture project but the follow on project from that was Kultivate (same people). It might be worth getting in touch with Marie-Therese Gramstadt [mtg@vads.ac.uk](mailto:mtg@vads.ac.uk) – just to check if there was further thinking on item types for creative arts repositories. As part of this work they did modifications to ePrints (via Kulture and Kultivate) and also modifications to mePrints (via the eNova project) Marie-Terese can tell you all about it.

Balviar Notay, Jisc