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ARTICLE INFO

Objective: The study aims to conduct a bibliometric assessment to analyze the Attributes and properties of the intellectual production of the female faculty members (Saudi women and non-Saudi women) at the Faculty of Arts at Imam Abdul Rahman bin Faisal University in Dammam, Saudi Arabia.

Methods: Data on the intellectual productivity of the faculty members have been collected and analyzed between 2010- 2017. This is by the bibliometric variables (linguistic distribution, formal distribution, time distribution, geographical distribution, objective dispersion, and productivity of authors).

Results: The most faculty members of the case sample were from the Department of Islamic Studies (11; 23.4%) The lowest number of faculty members was in the Department of Information and Communication Technology (2) with (4.3%). Arabic is the main language of publication (32; 68.1%). Single author ranked the highest (59,6; 28)

Conclusion: The core years of publication are (2015-2017 (% 55,3;26

Introduction

The College of Arts was opened in Dammam, the Saudi Arabia Kingdom under the supervision of the General Presidency for Women’s Education in 1979 and was one of the first academic institutions available to women in the Eastern Province. The College began with five departments: Islamic Studies, Arabic Language, English Language, History and Geography. In 2004 it came under the auspices of the Ministry of Higher Education when it became part of King Faisal University, which in 2009 became known as the University of Dammam. The College of Arts has recently expanded to include several new departments. In 2010 the Department of Library and Information Science was opened and in 2011 the Department of Sociology and Social Service was established. In 2013 the Department of Communication and Information Technology got its start. Yahia defines bibliometrics studies as: “Studies using statistical methods and mathematical methods in the analysis of bibliographic data related to information resources including books, documents, periodicals and periodical articles, evaluation of scientific works, authors and publishers, and study Common relations between the scientific disciplines [1].
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It is also known as: "science or research that goes to the study of general or specialized intellectual production, or which deals with a particular topic, quantity and quality study, in which the mathematical and statistical approaches are often applied [2]." The field of bibliometric studies is located in two broad groups: descriptive studies: that describe the attributes and features of intellectual productivity and behavioral studies: the studies that test the formation of relationships between intellectual production units, and this type of studies are referred to as a citation and reference studies [3]. The current study is placed in the field of descriptive studies focusing on the Attributes and characteristics of the intellectual production of faculty members.

The Importance of Research

This study seeks to find the following:
1) The level of dispersion of the linguistic distribution of the intellectual production of faculty members,
2) The formal diversity of the information resources in which the intellectual production studied was published, the geographical and temporal dispersion of the intellectual production of the faculty members, the extent to which the topics of published intellectual production are diversity, and what are the difficulties for the scientific productivity of the faculty members [4].

Methodology

The Bibliometric Method was used to identify the Attributes and properties of the academic’s productivity of faculty members (Saudi and non-Saudi) at the Faculty of Arts Imam Abdul Rahman bin Faisal University (2010-2017), the male was excluded from the sample because of the lack of communications [5].

Finding

The original community of the study was derived consisted of (47) faculty members from the female of the academic departments of the Faculty of Arts in Imam Abdul Rahman bin Faisal University, with following: Department of Islamic Studies, Department of History, Department of Arabic, Department of English language, Department of Geography, Department of Libraries and Information science, the Department of communication, the Department of Sociology and Community Service, the related results are reflected in the Table 1.

Table 1: The number of faculty members in the sample for each term, and the average.

| Phrase                                                                 | Number | Average |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Nationality                                                            | 47     | 2       |
| Department                                                             | 47     | 1       |
| Qualification                                                          | 37     | 3       |
| Number of years of experience in current work                         | 47     | 4       |
| What is the language of publishing your scientific Productivity?       | 47     | 1       |
| What kind of responsibility for authorship in your published scientific Productivity? | 44     | 1       |
| One of the most popular forms of information source in which my scientific Productivity is published | 45     | 2       |
| The names of the publishing cities (Place of publication) for your scientific Productivity. | 45     | 2       |
| The dates of my scientific research have been limited between years.  | 37     | 4       |
| The objective dispersion of published scientific Productivity was limited to the following topics: | 44     | 1       |
| How satisfied you are with your scientific output                      | 46     | 1       |
| If you choose unsatisfied, do you think the reasons are                | 17     | 2       |
| If you’re satisfied, the reasons that contributed to your satisfaction are | 19     | 1       |

Table 1 shows the faculty members in the sample of the study is (47 faculty) and the arithmetic means for each phrase by the questionnaire, where we noted that the arithmetic means of those phrases in the table range between (1-4). The highest is limited to the phrase “number of experience years in the current position” and “dates of publications of scientific research to faculty members (Tables 2 & 3). From Table 3, the majority of the sample were non-Saudi faculty members, with 28 faculty by (59.6%), followed by Saudi faculty with (19) by (40.4%). Table 4 shows that the largest faculty number in the sample was from the Department of Islamic Studies with 11 faculty by (23.4%) Followed equally by the faculty members of the Department of Arabic Language, the Department of Geography and Sociology, where the faculty number of (8) by (17%) And then the faculty members of the department of libraries and information, where they numbered (7) by (14.9%) The lowest number of faculty members was in the English department, with 3 faculty by (6.4%) Members, then the Department of Information and Communication Technology (2) and by (4.3%).
Table 2: The sample of the study.

| Type       | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Female     | 47        | 100.0   | 100.0         | 100.0              |

Table 3: The nationality of study sample.

| Responses    | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------|-----------|---------|
| Saudi        | 19        | 40.4    |
| Non-Saudi    | 28        | 59.6    |
| Total        | 47        | 100.0   |

Table 4: The departments of the Faculty of Arts for Girls illustrate the sample of the study.

| Department                          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Islamic Studies                     | 11        | 23.4    | 23.4          | 23.4               |
| Arabic Language                     | 8         | 17.0    | 17.0          | 40.4               |
| English Language                    | 3         | 6.4     | 6.4           | 46.8               |
| Geography                           | 8         | 17.0    | 17.0          | 63.8               |
| Libraries                           | 7         | 14.9    | 14.9          | 78.7               |
| Social Science                      | 8         | 17.0    | 17.0          | 95.7               |
| Information and Communication Tech | 2         | 4.3     | 4.3           | 100.0              |
| Total                               | 47        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table 5: The degree of faculty members shows the sample of the study.

| Department     | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Professor      | 4         | 8.5     | 8.5           | 8.5                |
| Associate Prof | 12        | 25.5    | 25.5          | 34.0               |
| Assistant Prof | 26        | 55.3    | 55.3          | 89.4               |
| Lecture        | 5         | 10.6    | 10.6          | 100.0              |
| Total          | 47        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table 5 shows that the largest number of those holding the Assistant Professor’s degree were (26 faculty) by (55.3%) Followed by associate professor (12 faculty) by (25.5%) The lowest number of those with a lecture degree were (5) faculty (10.6%). Followed by those with a professorship of 4 faculty and by (8.5%). Table 6 shows that all faculty members of the sample have limited their work experience to (0-5) years. Table 7 shows that the largest publications of the faculty members was published in Arabic language, with 32 faculty by (68 %). Followed by non-Arabic was 13 faculty by (27.7%), while the lowest number of translated scientific productivity was 2 faculty by (4.3%). Table 8 shows that the largest number of faculty relied on individual authorship and their publications, by 28 members (59.6%) Followed by the tow author, was 9 faculty numbers with (19.1%) The Institution author was (4) faculty members by (8.5%) The lowest number of them turned to co-authoring, with 3 faculty with (6.4%) There are faculty members who did not specify any type of their publications, with a total of 3 faculty by (6.4%).

Table 6: Shows the number of years of experience in the current work.

| Years of Experience | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|
| Valid Less than 5   | 47        | 100.0   |

From Table 9, Local Journal topped the list of Type of sources, with (15 ;31.9%) followed by Foreign Journals ( 14;29.8%) The number of faculty members sample who published their
productivity Conference papers by (15;31.9). From Table 10 shows that the largest faculty members their scientific Productivity limited from (2015 to 2017) where their number by (26;55.3%) Followed From(2010 to 2015) and numbered (9) by (12;25.5%) While the lowest number of faculty members published their productivity equally between (2010-2005) by (4;8.5%). From Table 11, The largest number of the faculty members of the sample limited the Subject dispersion of their scientific productivity to specialized subjects, with a ratio (41 ;87.2%) then whose interests in topics related to their specialization by (5;10.6%), while only one member from the study sample was interested in other topics (1;2.1%). Table 12 shows that the largest number of faculty members were very satisfied with their scientific Productivity (18;36.2%). and (12;25.5%) followed by neither agree nor disagree faculty members who accounted for (11;23.4%) Then the faculty members were dissatisfied with their scientific Productivity and their number were (6;12.8%) [6].

Table 9: Shows the most information resources which published the studied scientific productivity.

| Type of Sources       | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Monograph (Books)     | 3         | 6.4     |
| Local journals        | 13        | 27.7    |
| Foreign Journals      | 12        | 25.5    |
| Conference papers     | 11        | 23.4    |
| Reports               | 6         | 12.7    |
| Other                 | 2         | 4.3     |
| Total                 | 47        | 100.0   |

Table 10: Shows the years of publication of the scientific productivity of the faculty members.

| Years                | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| 2000-2005            | 5         | 10.6    |
| 2005-2010            | 4         | 8.5     |
| 2010-2015            | 12        | 25.5    |
| 2015-2017            | 26        | 55.3    |
| Total                | 47        | 100.0   |

Table 11: Shows the most information resources which published the studied scientific productivity.

| Subject Dispersion    | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Topics in specialization | 41        | 87.3    |
| Related topics to be identified | 5   | 10.6 |
| Other interests’ topic | 1         | 2.1     |
| Total                 | 47        | 100.0   |

Table 12: Shows how the faculty member satisfied for their scientific productivity.

| Causes of Satisfaction      | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Strongly agree               | 18        | 38.3%   |
| Agree                       | 12        | 25.5%   |
| Neither agree nor disagree   | 11        | 23.4%   |
| Disagree                    | 6         | 12.8%   |
| Total                       | 47        | 100.00% |

From the Table 13, The largest number of members did not disclose reasons for their dissatisfaction, were (30;63.8%) Some members attributed their dissatisfaction with their scientific Productivity to some reasons, including administrative loads, and their number was (8;17%). Those who were attributed to social reasons accounted for (5;10.6%), and some few who have deferred the reason to the administrative bureaucracy. Table 14 shows that the largest number of faculty members were not satisfied for these reasons (28;59.6%) While there is faculty members I believe that contributed significantly to their scientific Productivity, including the development of research services at their university, they (10;21.3%) As well as full-time education and their number (36.4%) There were an equal number of faculty members who were given reason for financial support and sufficient time, were (2;4.3%), only one faculty member felt that she was because of the right environment. Table 15 Explains the faculty member proposals for the development of the scientific research process in their colleges, where the proposal represents of “reducing administrative loads”, received the largest number (13;28%), Followed by the “Save time” proposal with (8;17%), Then the proposal “facilitation of scientific sabbatical”, where the number of faculty members is (7;15%), and then the proposal “ Ease of promotion procedures (11%)” [7].

Table 13: Explains why faculty members are dissatisfied with their scientific Productivity.

| Causes of Dissatisfied                      | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Administrative bureaucracy of scientific departments | 4         | 8.5     |
| Administrative load                         | 8         | 17.0    |
| Social conditions                           | 5         | 10.6    |
| Total                                       | 17        | 36.2    |
| Missing System                              | 30        | 63.8    |
| Total                                       | 47        | 100.0   |

Table 14: Explains why faculty members are satisfied with their scientific Productivity.

| Causes of Satisfaction                      | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| The development of research services at the university | 10        | 21.3    |
| Providing the right scientific environment for the member | 1         | 2.1     |
| Financial support                           | 2         | 4.3     |
| Enough time                                 | 2         | 4.3     |
| full-time education                         | 3         | 6.4     |
| Easy scientific upgrade procedures          | 1         | 2.1     |
| Total                                       | 19        | 40.4    |
| Missing System                              | 28        | 59.6    |
| Total                                       | 47        | 100.0   |
Table 15: Explains the proposals of faculty members to develop the process of scientific research.

| No | Proposals for the Development of the Scientific Research Process | Frequency | Percentage(%) |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| 1  | Reducing administrative loads                                 | 13        | 28%           |
| 2  | Save enough time                                              | 8         | 17%           |
| 3  | Facilitating of full-time science                             | 7         | 15%           |
| 4  | Ease of promotion procedures                                  | 5         | 11%           |
| 5  | Provide the right environment                                 | 3         | 6%            |
| 6  | Holding seminars, conferences and scientific posters          | 2         | 4%            |
| 7  | Availability of scientific journals to publish Intellectual productivity | 2         | 4%            |
| 8  | Reducing the teaching loads                                   | 2         | 4%            |

Conclusion

In the results, scientific research is necessary to enrich knowledge and several scientific disciplines, and it was found in this study that there are reasons why faculty members at the Faculty of Arts at Imam Abdul Rahman Bin Faisal University are not arranged to intellectual production, the most of them which has been concentrated in the many administrative loads, which imposed them, in addition to the lack of sufficient time as a result of those loads.

Important Results

a) Periodical articles topped the list of information sources of the published study sample on which intellectual production was published, with 15 by (31.9%), followed by conferences papers was (14) members of the sample by (29.8%).

b) Most members of the study sample were published in their countries, where they numbered (13) faculty members by (27.7%).

c) The scientific productivity of the most faculty members was limited to the period (2015 - 2017) where number (26) faculty by (55.3%).

d) The number of faculty members who did not disclose reasons of dissatisfaction were (17) by (63.8%) Some faculty members were dissatisfied with their scientific productivity due to some reasons, including administrative loads, and their number was 8 faculty by (17%).

e) The most proposals of the faculty members for develop their intellectual production focused on reducing administrative loads, saving enough time, and the lack of enough time.

Recommendations

1) The need to balance the degrees distribution among the academic departments of the colleges.

2) Encourage faculty member for writing their research in English and other languages.

3) Encourage group publishing among faculty members.

4) The need for faculty members to publish their scientific productivity in high impact factor journals regional and international.

5) The need to prepare interdisciplinary studies between the university departments to exchange experiences and skills in scientific research, in addition to the specialization topics.

6) Reducing administrative loads, saving enough time and facilitating scientific time, so that faculty members can write and enrich the Intellectual productivity of departments.
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