RESEARCH THAT RESONATES: CITATION MOMENTUM, SCHOLARLY VISIBILITY, AND RESEARCH SUSTAINABILITY AT SAN PABLO COLLEGES

Kim Dexter A. Villanueva
SPC Non-Teaching Personnel

Angelique D. Perez
SPC Collegiate Faculty
Co-Author

Noemi L. Lunar
SPC Collegiate Faculty
Co-Author

This study examined the emerging citation structure of San Pablo Colleges (SPC) and its implications for sustainable institutional research development. It extends an earlier longitudinal analysis of institutional rankings by shifting attention from ordinal position to the distribution, recency, and disciplinary breadth of researcher-level impact. A descriptive scientometric case-study design was used. Publicly displayed AD Scientific Index records for all three SPC-affiliated researchers listed on September 14, 2026 were enumerated. H-index, i10-index, total citations, five-year citations, disciplinary classification, citation share, recent-citation ratio, top-two concentration, and the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index were analyzed. The profiles collectively recorded 104 citations, of which 85 (81.7%) occurred within the most recent five-year window. BL had the highest total citations (50), JDV the highest H-index (4) and i10-index (2), and ED an emerging profile with seven citations and an H-index of 1. The two leading profiles accounted for 93.3% of displayed citations, while the citation HHI was .440, indicating a concentrated visible footprint. The findings portray an institution with strong recent citation momentum but limited breadth across researchers and disciplines. A Productivity-Visibility-Impact-Sustainability pathway is proposed to guide mentoring, profile integrity, publication conversion, collaboration, and research-use monitoring. Citation indicators are interpreted as partial evidence of scholarly uptake rather than proxies for research quality. SPC should therefore broaden researcher representation while pairing metrics with peer judgment and evidence of educational, professional, policy, and community use.

Keywords: citation concentration, citation impact, research visibility, scientometrics, San Pablo Colleges.

Introduction

Higher education institutions increasingly confront two related but distinct questions regarding their scholarship: how much they produce and how far that work travels. Publication counts document scholarly output, whereas discoverability, citation, reuse, and practical uptake indicate whether those outputs enter wider scholarly conversations. Citation-based indicators can illuminate this circulation, yet they are shaped by discipline, career length, publication age, database coverage, language, access, collaboration patterns, and profile accuracy. Consequently, citation indicators are most informative when interpreted contextually alongside qualitative evidence of research quality and societal use (Bornmann & Daniel, 2008; Moed, 2005; Waltman, 2016).

Single metrics such as the h-index, which combines productivity and citation influence into one figure (Hirsch, 2005), or the i10-index and raw citation counts capture only partial dimensions of a scholar's visible record. Responsible research assessment requires multiple indicators, transparency about their construction, and expert judgment (Sugimoto & Larivière, 2018). Both the Leiden Manifesto and the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment emphasize that quantitative evaluation should support rather than replace qualitative assessment, account for disciplinary variation, protect locally relevant scholarship, and recognize influence on policy and practice rather than relying solely on publication metrics (DORA, 2012; Hicks, Wouters, Waltman, de Rijcke, & Rafols, 2015).

These cautions are especially vital for small, teaching-oriented higher education institutions whose research often addresses local educational, health, organizational, and community needs that carry substantial practical value despite limited coverage in commercial indexes. Institutional research development is therefore better understood as a Productivity-Visibility-Impact-Sustainability (PVIS) pathway: institutional capacity supports credible scholarly productivity; accurate profiles, persistent identifiers, repositories, indexing systems, and appropriate publication venues enable visibility; visibility fosters scholarly, educational, professional, policy, and community impact; and broad participation across people, disciplines, and time makes that performance sustainable rather than dependent on isolated high performers. At San Pablo Colleges (SPC), earlier studies examined educational innovation initiatives (Lunar & Eala, 2023) and quality-assurance practices, processes, and perspectives (Lunar,

Perez, & Eala, 2024) as foundations for institutional sustainability, while Lunar and Lunar (2026) mapped SPC's positional movement in AD Scientific Index rankings from 2024 to 2026.

The literature consulted for this study establishes responsible-metrics principles and documents SPC's longitudinal ranking trajectory, yet it does not examine the internal researcher-level citation structure, recency, concentration, and disciplinary breadth underlying the institution's visible footprint. Because ordinal rankings shift whenever database coverage or the comparison universe changes, even when an institution's own output or citations improve, rank alone cannot reveal whether visibility is institution-wide or dependent on a few scholars, nor can it capture the productivity-visibility gap between active institutional research and indexed discoverability.

This study was delimited to publicly displayed AD Scientific Index records for SPC-affiliated researchers retrieved on September 14, 2026, and did not represent a census of all SPC faculty or a direct measure of intrinsic research quality. Specifically, the study sought to address five objectives: (a) describe the current scientometric profiles of SPC researchers listed in AD Scientific Index; (b) quantify citation recency and concentration; (c) examine disciplinary breadth across the listed profiles; (d) interpret institutional strengths and risks through the PVIS diagnostic pathway; and (e) propose evidence-based actions for widening sustainable research visibility. Because the study was a descriptive scientometric case analysis, no hypotheses were tested. The purpose of the study was to examine SPC's emerging citation structure and its strategic implications for sustainable institutional research development.

Method

A descriptive, cross-sectional scientometric case-study design was employed to analyze the structure of SPC's publicly displayed citation profile at a single retrieval point and interpret those quantitative indicators within the institution's research context. Rather than estimating causal effects or reconstructing a new longitudinal ranking series, the case-study boundary allowed researcher-level metrics to be evaluated against SPC's academic portfolio and quality-assurance framework.

Data were retrieved on September 14, 2026, from the public AD Scientific Index citation-ranking page filtered for San Pablo Colleges, which indicated a near-real-time ranking update dated September 13, 2026, and labeled the release as the 2027 edition (AD Scientific Index, 2026). The institutional unit of analysis was San Pablo Colleges, and the researcher-level units comprised all three affiliated profiles displayed under the institutional filter. Total enumeration of the displayed roster was performed without sampling, bounded strictly to database-visible profiles rather than all active SPC faculty researchers.

Recorded variables extracted from each profile included disciplinary field or subfield, total and recent five-year h-index, total and recent five-year i10-index, total citations, and recent five-year citations. Four derived indicators were computed by the researchers: citation share (each researcher's total citations divided by the displayed institutional aggregate), the recent-citation ratio (recent five-year citations divided by total citations), the top-two concentration ratio (the combined citation share of the two largest profiles), and the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI), calculated as the sum of squared citation shares across the three profiles, where .333 denotes equal distribution and 1.000 denotes complete concentration.

Frequencies, ranks, percentages, ratios, and HHI were computed from the displayed values, and arithmetic totals were independently verified. Because the visible population comprised only three profiles, interpretive claims were limited to descriptive analysis without inferential statistical testing. To prevent overinterpretation, indicators were triangulated conceptually: total citations represented accumulated scholarly attention, h-index represented citation depth across outputs, the recent-citation ratio represented citation momentum, and concentration measures represented institutional dependence. Only publicly available aggregate professional records were analyzed without collecting private or sensitive information, and researcher names were retained solely as published in the public ranking context to permit verification of the reported calculations.

Results and Discussion

Analysis of the September 14, 2026 AD Scientific Index snapshot revealed an emerging citation footprint characterized by strong recent momentum alongside pronounced concentration across researchers and

disciplines. These findings are presented and discussed below in relation to the study's objectives and the PVIS diagnostic pathway.

Scientometric Profiles and Citation Momentum

The three SPC-affiliated profiles displayed complementary forms of visible scholarly influence. Lunar (BL, classified under Others / Others) recorded the highest cumulative count with 50 total citations, 31 recent five-year citations, an h-index of 3 (recent h-index of 3), and an i10-index of 1 (recent i10-index of 1). Del Valle (JDV, classified under Social Sciences / Linguistics and Literature) recorded the highest h-index of 4 (recent h-index of 4) and i10-index of 2 (recent i10-index of 2), alongside 47 total citations and 47 recent five-year citations. Duque (ED, classified under Education / Educational Psychology) presented an emerging profile with seven total citations, seven recent five-year citations, an h-index of 1 (recent h-index of 1), and an i10-index of 0. Notably, for every researcher, the recent five-year h-index and i10-index equaled their lifetime values, confirming that the publications determining their displayed index thresholds remained represented within the most recent five-year window.

Collectively, the three profiles accumulated 104 displayed citations, of which 85 occurred within the recent five-year period, yielding an aggregate recent-citation ratio of 81.7%. Del Valle and Duque each recorded 100.0% recent citation shares, whereas Lunar's 62.0% recent share reflected both an earlier citation history and continuing recent attention. Although citation counts cannot identify why works were cited or whether citations were favorable (Bornmann & Daniel, 2008), this high recency signals an emerging impact phase in which relatively recent SPC outputs are being discovered and cited. Furthermore, the contrast between Lunar's cumulative citation lead and Del Valle's higher h-index and i10-index illustrates why Hirsch (2005) designed the h-index to balance output and citation influence across multiple works rather than rewarding a single highly cited item, reinforcing the value of multi-indicator monitoring dashboards over single-metric leaderboards.

Citation Concentration and Sustainability Risks

Despite strong recent momentum, visible citation influence was heavily concentrated across the small roster. Lunar accounted for 48.1% of the 104 displayed citations and Del Valle accounted for 45.2%, whereas Duque

contributed 6.7%. Together, the top two profiles generated 93.3% of SPC's visible citation footprint, and the resulting citation HHI was .440—substantially higher than the .333 theoretical minimum representing equal distribution across three profiles.

Strategically, this concentration serves as both an institutional asset and a structural vulnerability. Visible anchors provide immediate mentoring capacity, peer-review leadership, and coauthorship opportunities for emerging colleagues, yet heavy reliance on two profiles leaves SPC's external visibility sensitive to changes in individual career trajectories, institutional affiliations, or database indexing rules. Extending Lunar and Lunar's (2026) longitudinal rank analysis, these findings demonstrate why research management should prioritize controllable internal conditions—research quality, mentoring, metadata accuracy, dissemination, collaboration, and research utilization—rather than chasing ordinal rankings that shift when database comparison sets change.

Disciplinary Breadth and the Productivity-Visibility Gap

The three listed profiles spanned Social Sciences (Linguistics and Literature), Education (Educational Psychology), and an interdisciplinary Others classification. While demonstrating initial multi-field presence, this visible breadth remained substantially narrower than SPC's full academic portfolio, which includes education, counseling, business, nursing, and allied health programs.

The presence of only three displayed profiles reflects a productivity-visibility gap rather than an absence of institutional research activity. Faculty studies, completed graduate theses, and conference papers frequently remain invisible in international indexes because manuscripts remain unpublished, Google Scholar and ORCID profiles are absent or unverified, institutional affiliation strings are inconsistent or outdated, metadata are incomplete, or local journals and repositories are poorly discoverable. Consistent with responsible-metrics guidance (Hicks et al., 2015; Waltman, 2016), closing this gap requires field-sensitive targets focused on verified researcher participation and discoverable quality outputs rather than uniform citation quotas across disciplines with distinct publication and citation norms.

Diagnostic Synthesis through the PVIS Pathway and Scope Limitations

Evaluated through the PVIS diagnostic lens, SPC exhibited identifiable scholarly productivity among three visible producers, partial visibility restricted to three disciplinary categories, strong recent impact momentum (104 citations; 81.7% recent), and fragile sustainability due to 93.3% top-two concentration (HHI = .440). Extending earlier SPC scholarship on educational innovation (Lunar & Eala, 2023) and quality assurance (Lunar et al., 2024), embedding quality controls, routine profile integrity checks, and a managed thesis-to-publication pipeline can systematically convert existing academic work into verifiable visibility. In alignment with DORA (2012), pairing citation indicators with qualitative evidence of curriculum revisions, clinical or educational protocols, institutional decisions, community interventions, external partnerships, and Sustainable Development Goal contributions ensures that research evaluation reflects SPC's teaching-and-community-oriented mission.

This study is bounded by a single database, one institution, one retrieval date (September 14, 2026), and a three-profile roster. Because AD Scientific Index is dynamic and relies on Google Scholar-linked records whose coverage and disciplinary classification can vary across fields and languages, the HHI serves strictly as a descriptive diagnostic signal rather than an inferential statistic. Furthermore, the analysis did not examine publication-level citation networks, citing-document quality, self-citations, coauthorship effects, field normalization, open-access status, or direct societal use, and displayed citations do not establish intrinsic research quality, causality, or social benefit.

Conclusion

San Pablo Colleges possesses an identifiable and strongly recent visible citation footprint—with 85 of 104 displayed citations (81.7%) occurring in the recent five-year window and lifetime h-index values sustained entirely by recent work—yet its external visibility remains heavily concentrated in two researchers (93.3% share; HHI = .440) and a narrow set of disciplines. Advancing toward sustainable research development requires closing the productivity-visibility gap by broadening verified researcher representation, standardizing profile metadata, and converting completed institutional and graduate studies into discoverable scholarly outputs guided by the PVIS pathway. These conclusions characterize the structure and distribution of SPC's publicly visible AD Scientific Index records as of September 14, 2026; they do not represent an institution-wide census of

faculty research activity, a measure of intrinsic scholarly quality, or proof of societal impact.

Recommendation

For institutional practice, SPC's Research, Evaluation, and Publication Office should institute an annual Research Visibility and Impact Audit with archived dated snapshots alongside a routine profile-integrity program covering standardized institutional affiliations, ORCID registration, Google Scholar verification, author-name variants, DOI metadata checks, and open-repository deposits. Currently visible scholars should be mobilized as mentors in discipline-based writing clusters across underrepresented programs such as nursing, allied health, business, and counseling, supported by a structured publication-to-impact pipeline and a balanced research dashboard that tracks verified researcher breadth, peer-assessed quality, curriculum and community utilization, and Sustainable Development Goal contributions rather than undifferentiated citation quotas.

For future research, investigators should triangulate AD Scientific Index records with verified Google Scholar profiles, Crossref, OpenAlex, Scopus or Web of Science where accessible, institutional repositories, and internal research office registries to capture unindexed scholarly outputs. Longitudinal follow-up studies using frozen annual snapshots should also examine how mentoring interventions, coauthorship networks, open-access publishing, and profile standardization alter researcher breadth, citation concentration, field-normalized impact, and documented educational or community utilization over time.

References

AD Scientific Index. (2026). San Pablo Colleges San Pablo City Laguna scientist citation rankings. Retrieved September 14, 2026, from https://adscientificindex.com/citation-ranking/?ft_university=19907

Bornmann, L., & Daniel, H.-D. (2008). What do citation counts measure? A review of studies on citing behavior. Journal of Documentation, 64(1), 45–80. doi:10.1108/00220410810844150

Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., de Rijcke, S., & Rafols, I. (2015). Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. Nature, 520, 429–431. doi:10.1038/520429a

Lunar, B. C., & Eala, M. S. M. (2023). Where are we and where are we going: Educational innovation initiatives in San Pablo Colleges. Education, Sustainability & Society, 6(2), 72–75.

Lunar, B. C., Perez, A., & Eala, C. (2024). Probing practices, processes, and perspectives on quality assurance: Towards institutional sustainability. Business, Organizations and Society, 2(2), 75–84.

Lunar, N. L., & Lunar, B. C. (2026). Mapping the research trajectory of San Pablo Colleges (2024–2026): A scientometric analysis of AD Scientific Index rankings. AJIMAS. Retrieved from https://epublications.myeduheart.com/publications/articles/mapping-the-research-trajectory-of-san-pablo-colleges-2024-2026-a-scientometric.pdf

Moed, H. F. (2005). Citation analysis in research evaluation. Springer. doi:10.1007/1-4020-3714-7

San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment. (2012). San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment. Retrieved from https://sfdora.org/read/

Sugimoto, C. R., & Larivière, V. (2018). Measuring research: What everyone needs to know. Oxford University Press.

Waltman, L. (2016). A review of the literature on citation impact indicators. Journal of Informetrics, 10(2), 365–391. doi:10.1016/j.joi.2016.02.007