

# **BOOK OF ABSTRACTS**

## **SEVENTH BUSINESS SYSTEMS LABORATORY INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM 2020**

### **SOCIO ECONOMIC ECOSYSTEMS CHALLENGES FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE DIGITAL ERA**



**EDITOR  
GANDOLFO DOMINICI**

**BOOK OF ABSTRACTS**

***SOCIO-ECONOMIC  
ECOSYSTEMS:***

***Challenges for Sustainable Development  
in the Digital Era***

***7<sup>TH</sup> BUSINESS SYSTEMS LABORATORY  
INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM***

***UNIVERSITY OF ALICANTE - POLYTECHNIC SCHOOL***

***SPAIN***

***January 22-24, 2020***

Editor: *Gandolfo Dominici*

Copyright © 2020 Business Systems Laboratory

All rights reserved.

ISBN: 9788890824296



## **BUSINESS SYSTEMS BOOK SERIES**

The book series "Business Systems" publishes research and essays, coming from the scientific and consulting activity of the members of the nonprofit scientific organization Business Systems Laboratory (Italy) as well as from invited well-known scientists in the business systems field.

The book series aims to attract the cutting edge research at international level and to make it available for academics and practitioners.

The official languages of the Business Systems books series are: English, Spanish and Italian.

The main topics include, but not are limited to, the following areas of knowledge: *Systems Theory; Systemic Approach for Business; Complex Systems Theory; Managerial Cybernetics; Economic and Social Systems; Business Communication Systems; Innovation Systems; Action Research; Financial Systems; Service Science; Sustainability; Corporate Social Responsibility; Knowledge Management; Supply Chain Management; Strategic Management; Consumer Behavior; Marketing; Corporate Finance; Banking; e-Business; e-Learning; Business Process Management.*

The book proposals will be evaluated by the Scientific Board on the basis of double blind peer review.

## **BOOK SERIES SCIENTIFIC BOARD**

### **Scientific Director:**

Gandolfo Dominici – Scientific Director Business Systems Laboratory

### **Board members:**

- Gianpaolo Basile – Presidente B.S.Lab- Univ. of Salerno (Italy)
- Gerhard Chroust - J. Kepler University Linz (Austria)
- Valeria Delgado - GESI (Argentina)
- José Rodolfo Hernández-Carrión - Univ. of Valencia (Spain)
- Ignacio Martinez de Lejarza - Univ. of Valencia (Spain)
- Matjaz Mulej - Univ. of Maribor (Slovenia)
- Piero Mella - Univ. of Pavia (Italy)
- Mauro Sciarelli – Federico II University, Naples (Italy)
- Maurice Yolles - Centre for Creating Coherent Change and Knowledge (UK).

## **SYMPOSIUM SCOPE**

The Business Systems Laboratory International Symposia aim to address the global economic and social challenges of our times by systemic perspectives; shedding light on the various interactions between natural social and economic systems. The challenges and the opportunities faced in our times require cutting edge research and practices in social science.

This multidisciplinary perspective includes a wide range of fields such as: management, psychology, economics, engineering and sociology.

The Symposium is designed to create a friendly atmosphere among senior scholars, PhD students, researchers and business practitioners.

The Symposium 2020 will consider how Socio-economical Ecosystems can be developed and managed to foster Sustainable Development by considering the challenges and opportunities of digital tools.

With this premise the Symposium 2020 focuses on the epistemological, theoretical, methodological, technical and practical contributions that can represent advancements in theory and practice for sustainable well-being in the global era in and by different perspectives.

While focusing on Systemic methodology the Symposium is also open to all scientific approaches in order to foster constructive debates and confrontations to create new paths of research and practice.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>ADVANCES IN SYSTEMIC THEORIES</i>		
<b>pp.1-27</b>	- Utopian and Dystopian Ideological Systems and Unintended and Adverses Consequences	1
	- An Epistemological Look at several 3rd Order Cybernetics	3
	- Structure and resolution of systemic problems	10
	- Smart Ports and Sustainability: The Case of Puerto Madryn using Multi Methodologies	17
	- A Systemic Thinking in Digital Transformation	23
<i>RESPONSIBILITY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT FOR THE SMART ECONOMY</i>		
<b>pp.28-72</b>	- Big data and sustainable tourism	29
	- The benefits of Risk Management strategies for the CSR in healthcare	34
	- Sustainability in wine sector: a survey focused on consumers' perception	37
	- The challenge for innovators: how to combine digital technology and sustainability	40
	- An Historical Instance of Urban Unsustainability that Astounds to this Day	43
	- Risk factors for sustainable development of socio-economic ecosystems	60
	- Religious tourism as a driver for sustainable development, Italian and Spanish experience	63
	- Fashion Industry & Sustainability	66
	- The determining relationship between corporate social responsibility programs and managerial sustainable development strategies	70
<i>EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS AND SOCIAL RESPOSABILITY OF UNIVERSITIES</i>		
<b>pp.73-114</b>	- Exploring the Impact of Fake News among University Students	74
	- NLP technologies for analyzing user generated Twitter data to identify the reputation of universities in the Valencian Community, Spain	78
	- Innovative Educational Technologies and Digital Culture: a model of End-to-End Outrunning Learning in a Digital Future	81
	- Role & Impact of Universities' Education on CSR's Culture	88
	- Interdisciplinarity and SDGs: a quantitative text-mining and social network analysis for accounting research in universities	91
	- Education for the Future: a necessary redesign	95
	- Role of Knowledge Management in Developing Higher Education Partnerships: Towards a Conceptual Model	98
	- Application of a Transdisciplinary Cybersystemic Method for the sus-tainability of Higher Education in Mexico	105
	- Expanding people's real freedoms through the evaluation of a university policy: a dialogue between system thinking and human capabilities	109
	- Engineering Students and Projects with Social Impact: A Systemic Approach	113



<i>ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) IN MANAGEMENT</i>		
<b>pp.115-152</b>	- Digital multi-sided platform and the chicken and egg issue: some evidences from the MyTaxi/Freenow case study	116
	- Analyzing the Intrinsic Bias in Job Postings	122
	- Security Online system by using Blockchain and Machine Learning	125
	- A methodology based on information and communication technologies to face the challenges of urban planning before the new uses of public space	128
	- Method for identifying accessibility city issues by comparing routes	131
	- Towards an Enterprise Artificial Intelligence Maturity	134
	- Social Crypto-Currency: a Bridge to Social Entrepreneurship	136
	- Convergent Autopoiesis in Complex AI and Kauffman Law	139
	- A software tool to visualize the impact of intangible assets on business models	141
	- Computational model to approach the spread of plant pests	148
<i>INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL SYSTEMS</i>		
<b>pp.153-180</b>	- The impact of managers' cultural intelligence on SMEs internationalization	154
	- The influence of value networks on sustainable competitive advantage attainment	158
	- Capitalizing on CSR disclosure. Evidence on the organizations' use of digital media for revealing CSR	161
	- SMEs internationalization challenges: from tangible towards intangible resource	164
	- Preparing for tomorrow? The impact of the digital transformation on IT jobs	168
	- Interdisciplinary research - an instrument for measuring knowledge, skills and attitudes	171
	- Organizing knowledge transfer between university and agri-business firms	173
	- The importance of intangible resources for creating value in the context of the digital revolution	176
	- The role of e-WOM in the cinema marketing system	179
<i>KNOWLEDGE ECOSYSTEMS IN THE DIGITAL ERA</i>		
<b>pp.181-200</b>	- Virtues as Key Enablers for Scaling Generative Knowledge Management Systems: Inquisitiveness, Appreciation, and Trust	182
	- Reliable Signals and Limit Conditions using Trigonometric Interpolation for Algorithmic Capital Investments	187
	- Digital Signature: A Key Tool for Technological Transformation in Global Economy	188
	- Diagnosing nations' wealth creation potential in the knowledge economy context. Theoretical foundations, framework proposal and practical implications	196
	- Using artificial intelligence to change conversation about public safety among young people	198

<i>ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL SYSTEMS</i>		
<b>pp.201-222</b>	- Financial knowledge and investment behaviour: the case of young financial markets during the economic crisis	202
	- Corporate Cost of Capital: The Effective Costs of Long-Term Debt Financing	205
	- Digital Divide in the Focus of Economic Policy	210
	- Anomaly Detection of Interval Time Series with Application to US House Price Index	214
	- Measuring and Forecasting Investor Information Demand using Time Series Factor Analysis and A Neural Networks Forecast Combination	217
	- A Novel View on Financial Distress: Estimating the Probability of Financial Difficulties	220
<i>TECHNIQUES FOR PROJECT CYCLE MANAGEMENT IN THE DIGITAL ERA</i>		
<b>pp.223-234</b>	- A demand forecasting approach for the grocery retail industry: combining traditional time-series methods and neural networks	224
	- Digital Platforms and Big Data-Driven Sustainable Innovation in Smart Healthcare Investments	226
	- Energy Performance Contracting and Public-Private Partnership: the importance of Technological Advanced Systems for Performance Monitoring	230
<i>POSTER SESSION</i>		
<b>pp.235-291</b>	- The role of social media marketing in attitude towards Georgian consumers to travel agencies	236
	- The Most Important Elements of Knowledge in Sales and the Necessity of Acquiring Them	242
	- Some Legal Aspects of Achievement of Sustainable Consumption and Production in Georgia	246
	- For the purpose of stimulation policy for social entrepreneurship in Georgia	252
	- Education – the Tool for the Challenges of Sustainable Development in Digital era	258
	- The impact of digitalization on the economic policies of small countries	262
	- Rethinking the System of Research Assessment in Higher Education in the Digital Era	268
	- Contemporary World Trends of Organic Agriculture Development and Georgia: Problems and Perspectives	273
	- Studying Socio-Economic Outcomes of Unemployment in Georgia	276
	- One of the ways of cooperation between the businesses and the universities – Unified data management using the Business Intelligence portal	282
	- Digital Economy and Society index	289
<b>ABSTRACTS ADDED AFTER DEADLINE</b>		
<b>292-300</b>	- Scientific mapping on the convergence of innovation and sustainability (innovability). 1990-2018	293
	- Some principles of creating of Technical Thinking Systems	295
	- Developing ecosystem for decentralized business models	297
	- Developing public open spaces ecosystems: measuring co-creative initiatives	299



# **Rethinking the System of Research Assessment in Higher Education in the Digital Era**

**Ia Natsvlishvili**

*Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia*

**Rusudan Seturidze**

*Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia*

## **ABSTRACT**

Around the world specific methods are employed to evaluate the quantity and quality of universities' research output. Because of increased competition between institutions research assessment plays useful role in giving incentives to increase quality of research. As scientific literature suggests research output is a function of resources spent and the microeconomic incentive structure [1]. Countries that perform well and introduced the system of research assessment have methods to evaluate research output. They strengthened their systems by introducing improved incentives. Evaluations are important as incentives and at the same time they provide data on the research activity within a country. If there is no transparent and objective way of examining research activity. Without such data it is not possible to see whether the research system is functioning and how it can be improved [1]. Nowadays in institutions of higher education that have scientists from many fields assessing the research performance requires from evaluators the aggregation of the performance measures of the various fields. Two methods of aggregation are applied that are based on: (a) the performance of the individual scientists or (b) the performance of the scientific fields present in the institution [2]. The choice depends on context and the objectives. The two methods creates differences in performance scores as well as rankings. Many countries have introduced evaluations of university research that reflects global demands for greater accountability. These countries also introduced

the system of performance based funding of research projects. The examination the advantages and disadvantages of performance-based funding in comparison with other approaches to funding indicates disputable results that can be interpreted in various manner. Despite the fact that research assessment systems has been working successfully for decades researchers have found that on the one hand initial benefits may outweigh the costs but on the other hand over time such a system seems to produce diminishing returns [3]. This raises important questions about continued use of existing practice and highlights the need for rethinking of systems of research assessment.

In modern globalized world in digital era research evaluations generally must be guided by discipline-specific criteria and by policy incentives. The process itself, methods and standards being applied whether they are bibliometrics based or peer review based or a mix of these must be chosen in line with the purpose of the evaluation. The choice of an appropriate evaluation method must coincide with the objective of the evaluation and must take into account the diversity between disciplines. The evaluation must be based on intended academic, economic, societal, or a combination of these impact of the research. The simplicity of the evaluation procedure must be considered and the evaluation criteria are developed and communicated to all stakeholders in advance. Evaluation committee must be comprised of sufficient experts that adequately assess the quality of research. Smart choice of evaluation indicators must be made and holistic approach to peer review must be adopted [4].

The biggest challenge of research assessment in modern era is that assessment systems must reflect the qualities that Open Science requires from modern researchers. Existing research assessment practices do not reward researchers for making research outcomes openly available mostly due to the competitive pressure put on them by assessment procedures. This leads to frequent collateral damage in the form of over-publication, fragmentation and even, occasionally, fraud. The digital era on the one hand, created opportunities for the dissemination of research results but on the other hand digitalisation reinforced the “belief” of objectivity in numbers, reducing research quality to a few quantitative indicators, which naturally results in false assumption [5]. Many juries and commissions still use simplistic and misleading approach and evaluate researchers on the basis of the sum of the ‘journal impact factors’ attributed to each of their published articles [6]. To stimulate the openness in research commitment to the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment [7] and to the Leiden Manifesto [8] must be

encouraged. Multiple criteria evaluation with each criterion carrying different weights must thus prevail taking into the consideration of the research field and the nature of the assessment (individual, team or project). “Proxy” assessment tools like the journal impact factor should not be considered as a direct measure for research quality[5].

The European Commission’s Expert Group on Altmetrics developed a useful framework (see Table 1) in which metrics are categorised according to what they measure [9]. At first stage conventional metrics measure research output and collaborations based on information derived from journal publications. This is the dominant category of metrics now used. Second step is usage-based metrics and alternative metrics attempt to broaden the scope of conventional metrics. On the third stage alternative metrics aspire to measure social outreach. Lastly, next-generation metrics are yet to be developed and provide more accurate, transparent and responsible tools for research evaluation [5].

*Table 1 – Basic overview and categorisation of metrics by the European Commission Expert Group on Altmetrics*

	Measure	Based on	Examples
Conventional metrics	Research output	Number of publications and number of citations, based on bibliometric databases, e.g. Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar	Journal Impact Factor (JIF), h-index, field normalised citation index, Eigenfactor, SCImago Journal Rank (SJR), Source Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP), CiteScore, etc.
	Collaborations	Co-authorship	Leiden Ranking, etc.
Usage-based metrics	Usage, i.e. uptake and attention	Number of views or downloads of an item	Usage Impact Factor (UIF), Libcitations, etc.
Alternative metrics	Social outreach	Social media (Twitter, blogs, etc.) and scientific social networks (ResearchGate, Mendeley, etc.)	Altmetric.com, PLUMx, ImpactStory, Bookmetrix, Datacite, etc.
Next-generation metrics	Yet to be developed “open metrics” going beyond alternative metrics		

Revisiting research assessment procedures is a shared responsibility and requires a concerted approach uniting major actors such as researchers and universities, research funding organizations, policymakers and non-governmental organizations. In this process leading role can be played by The European University Association (EUA) since it is the representative organization of universities and national rectors’ conferences in 48 European countries. EUA plays a crucial role in the Bologna Process and in influencing European Union policies on higher education, research and innovation. The Expert Group and EUA Secretariat developed the EUA

Roadmap on Research Assessment in the Transition to Open Science and launched an Expert Subgroup on Research Assessment in 2018 [10]. International collaborations through various networks and non-governmental organizations such as EUA should make considerable contribution to gather and share information, to initiate dialogue between key actors, to formulate good practice and make policy recommendations for the next step in revising the system of research assessment.

**Keywords:** *Research Assessment, Higher Education Conventional Metrics, Usage-Based Metrics, Alternative Metrics, Next Generation Metrics.*

## References

- Aled ab Iorwerth., (2005). Methods of Evaluating University Research Around the World. Department of Finance. Working Paper 2005-04. March 2005 .  
<https://www.fin.gc.ca/pub/pdfs/wp2005-04e.pdf>
- Giovanni Abramo., Ciriaco Andrea D'Angelo. (2015) Evaluating university research: Same performance indicator, different rankings. Journal of Informetrics. Volume 9, Issue 3, July 2015, Pages 514-525 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2015.04.002>
- Geuna, Aldo., Martin, Ben. (2003). University Research Evaluation and Funding: An International Comparison. Minerva. 41. 277-304. 10.1023/B:MINE.00000005155.70870.bd.
- Ghent University., Principles for the evaluation of research.  
<https://www.ugent.be/en/research/research-ugent/research-strategy/research-evaluation.htm>
- European University Association. (2019). EUA BRIEFING. Reflections on University Research Assessment Key concepts, issues and actors. Dr Bregt Saenen., Dr Lidia Borrell-Damián. April 2019  
<https://eua.eu/downloads/publications/reflections%20on%20university%20research%20assessment%20key%20concepts%20issues%20and%20actors.pdf>
- European Commission Working Group on Rewards under Open Science (2017). Evaluation of Research Careers fully acknowledging Open Science Practices. Rewards, incentives and/or recognition for researchers practicing Open Science. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the

European Union, p. 20. Retrieved 25 March 2019, from: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/47a3a330-c9cb-11e7-8e69-01aa75ed71a1>.

DORA (2012). San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment. Retrieved 12 March 2019, from: <https://sfdora.org/read/>.

Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., de Rijcke, S., & Rafols, I. (2015). The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature*, 520, pp. 429-431. Retrieved 12 March 2019, from: <http://www.leidenmanifesto.org/>.

European Commission Expert Group on Altmetrics (2017). *Next-generation metrics: Responsible metrics and evaluation for open science*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, pp. 8-14. Retrieved 7 December 2018, from: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/b858d952-0a19-11e7-8a35-01aa75ed71a1>.

European University Association (2018). EUA Roadmap on Research Assessment in the Transition to Open Science. Brussels: EUA. Retrieved 12 March 2019, from: <https://eua.eu/resources/publications/316:eua-roadmap-on-researchassessment-in-the-transition-to-open-science.html>.