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BibPro: Research Evaluation in Transition: The Institutionalization of Bibliometrics as a Research Field and Professionalization as an Expert Field
Professional jurisdiction (Abbott 1988)

Academic sector: Abstract knowledge system

Commodities: Knowledge stored in artefacts

Professionals: Diagnosis, inference, treatment

Clients: Complex individual cases

Professional jurisdiction
Expert organizations in evaluative bibliometrics

- Evaluative Bibliometrics as academic field
- Database providers (i.e. Clarivate, Elsevier)
- Contract research institutes and consultancies
- Research organizations, funding organizations

Professional jurisdiction
Dataset

Interview material
• 12 expert interviews with current and former CWTS members and science policy experts from KNAW, VSNU, Rathenau Institute and QANU

Archival material
• 492 CWTS contract research project reports
• CWTS Annual Reports 1986-2010
• Faculty Reports Leiden University 1995, 2000
• 295 evaluation reports issued during the VSNU protocol evaluations (1994, 1998) and SEP (2003, 2009)
• Legislative and policy documents
Emergence of quantitative research assessment as a jurisdiction

- Technological change: Science Citation Index

- Science policy demands: Funding decisions, priorities and accountability

  - Netherlands: expertise in policy-relevant science studies was built up in a ministerial department, an advisory council and in science studies group at Leiden University

  - Ministry of Education and Science and Research Council NWO fund long-term research programs in Science and Technology indicators
Professional claim of CWTS as an expert organization

Professional claim of CWTS – Bibliometrics as a diagnostic tool:

„The essence is that we came up with a tool that enabled experts in the field to identify emerging groups. That was what it was all about - emerging or declining.“ (Interview Henk Moed)

Bibliometrics as „quantitative core of peer review“ (van Raan 1996): „Therefore the support of peer review by bibliometrics is a (sic!) indispensable part of the evaluation procedure.“ (van Raan 1999: 418)
Cognitive basis of CWTS claim to expertise

Cognitive claim based on

• Meticulous collection and careful processing of publication and citation data
• method of field normalization
• the creation of a modified in-house version of the ISI-databases specifically adapted to purposes of research evaluation

(Moed et al. 1995)
Communication of CWTS cognitive claim in the academic field

- Begin of STI Conference Series 1987
- Handbook of Quantitative Studies of Science and Technology (Van Raan) 1988
- Database description & Mean Field Citation Score (Moed et al.) 1995
- Percentile (Tijssen)
Acceptance of CWTS social claims – client structure

N = 492
CWTS contract research reports


- COMPANY/OTHER
- MINIST/EU
- RES COUNCIL
- UNIV/RES INST
Formative phase 1986-1993

1986 - 1993

- 1 - 5 Reports
- 6-25 Reports
- 26+ Reports

Netherlands
Belgium
Germany
Expansion phase 1994-2007

1994 - 2007

- 1 - 5 Reports
- 6-25 Reports
- 26 + Reports

Map showing countries with different reporting frequencies.
Consolidation and diversification phase 2008-2015

2008 - 2015

1 - 5 Reports
6-25 Reports
26 + Reports
Threats to CWTS position in the expert field of evaluative bibliometrics

N= 295
Evaluation reports from VSNU Protocol and SEP evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
<th>Peer Review + Ready-made Bibliometric Analyses</th>
<th>Peer Review + Professional Bibliometric Analyses</th>
<th>Peer Review only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VSNU 1994</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSNU 1998</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 2003-2009</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP 2009-2015</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CWTS cognitive claims to consolidate its position in the expert field.
CWTS social claims to consolidate its position in the expert field
Thank you for your attention.

Questions and comments: petersohn@uni-wuppertal.de
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