“IN THE NAME OF” EUROPE

On the counterindications of social science and humanities research assessment criteria (in Serbia)

Miloš Milenković

1838
Department of Ethnology and Anthropology
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Belgrade

DOSIJE STUDIO

MEAN

Issues in Ethnology and Anthropology
MONOGRAPHS SERIES
No. 17
Miloš Milenković
"IN THE NAME OF" EUROPE
On the counterindications of social science and humanities research assessment criteria (in Serbia)

Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade
Department of Ethnology and Anthropology
Centre for Anthropology of Science and Education
Centre for Anthropology of Policy

Issues in Ethnology and Anthropology
MONOGRAPHS SERIES
No. 17

Miloš Milenković

“IN THE NAME OF” EUROPE
On the counterindications of social science and humanities research assessment criteria (in Serbia)

Belgrade, 2020

This book is based on research conducted within the following projects:

PERFORM – Performative and Responsive Social Sciences, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), implemented by HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation and the University of Fribourg (http://www.perform.network/)

"Identity Policies of the European Union: Adaptation and Application in Serbia" (177017), funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development, Republic of Serbia, University of Belgrade – Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Ethnology and Anthropology (177017)

ERASMUS+ Jean Monnet Module "Anthropology of European Union" at the University of Belgrade (2017-2020), funded by EU EACEA – Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

ENRESSH – European Network for Research Evaluation in Social Sciences and Humanities, COST 15137 (enressh.eu)

Open Access:
www.anthroserbia.org
www.eap-iea.org

CONTENTS

In Memoriam
Ivan Vuković (1970–2017)
thinker, dandy, friend

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is related to the author's engagement with various interconnected research platforms:

a) the 'European Network for Research Evaluation in the SSH (ENRESSH)', a HORIZON 2020 supported COST initiative (European Cooperation in Science and Technology, CA 15137);
b) the research project "Identity Policies of the European Union: Adaptation and Application in Serbia" (177017) funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development, Republic of Serbia, at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade;
c) regulatory and policy work with several bodies, such as the Council for Humanities at the Serbian Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development, and the Academic Council of Social Sciences and Humanities of the University of Belgrade (that has so far led to some diversification of evaluation criteria between academic fields);
d) myth-busting of politically instrumentalised EU-related narratives in Serbian society through ERASMUS+ "Anthropology of European Union Module" at the University of Belgrade;
e) teaching the Anthropology of Science to PhD students in the "History and Philosphy of Science" programe at the University of Belgrade,
f) the author's engagement with PERFORM in the capacity of research consultant and as a member of the Consultative Group and Workgroup for Social Sciences and Humanities.

The author appreciates the fact that PERFORM has recognised anthropological fieldwork as a valuable addition to already established methods in policy studies.

Many thanks to colleagues, without whose help this multi-sited fieldwork could not have been organised: Prof. Valentina Sokolovska, University of Novi Sad; Prof. Dragan Todorović, University of Niš; Dr. Vladan Ivanović, University of Kragujevac; Mr Elijas Rebronja and Ms Amela Škrijelj, Novi Pazar Public Library, and Dr. Predrag Šarčević, Chief Editor, Belgrade Radio Third Program.

Special thanks to: Dr. Marko Pišev, Associate Professor, University of Belgrade, who acted as junior fieldwork researcher, and to Dr. Ivo Staub, University of Fribourg/PERFORM and Nenad Čelarević, Deputy Project Manager of PERFORM, who not only monitored the dynamics of this research but were involved in continuous discussions which led to some of the conclusions and policy options recommended. Nenad was instrumental in making this multi-sited research possible.

Thanks to Staša, my stepdaughter and a student of political science, who found time to typewrite transcripts of dozens of interviews. My partner Valentina and our daughter Gala Djurdja were besides me, patiently, during the COVID-19 curfew, as I have been finishing the book.

Thanks to my friends and colleagues Ivan Kovačević, Bojan Žikić and the late Ivan Vuković, with whom I discussed both the need for this research to be done and the ways in which one should research one's own tribe.

The author is grateful to all who participated and provided information, SSH colleagues, for their time and openness to share important and at times unpleasant experiences as subjects of the regime of biased and derogatory research assessment. It has been a pleasure to contribute to resolving such an important issue which leaves the whole research community, not only that of SSH, stuck or even paralysed in mutual distrust.

INTRODUCTION

In this book, the findings of a bottom-up analysis of how research assessment in the Serbian academic system really works and what consequences it produces from the point of view of social science and humanities (SSH) scholars are contextualised in current theoretical debates in evaluation studies and juxtaposed with recent developments in SSH research assessment put forward by some of the leading European academic institutions and organisations. All three strains of analysis corroborated the main hypothesis – if SSH scholars are expected to engage with a knowledge-to-policy agenda, they need to re-establish their authority not only in society at large, but within the research and higher education sectors as well. Currently, the predominant Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)-based evaluative discourse frequently makes them feel insecure, personally ashamed, that their work is devalued and their disciplines considered inferior, and that their institutional and individual autonomy has been diminished. Scientometric assessment tools are widely perceived among scholars as detrimental to the overall quality of higher education and research, even threatening the essence of academic identity.

This argument links general and specific conclusions to the agenda of the PERFORM project as a principal funder, and recommends policy options aimed at either the abandonment of metric-based research assessment (an option preferred by the majority of the community) or at the fine-tuning of evaluation criteria and assessment indicators (a tolerable option). It is found that PERFORM should continue its unique mission or that PERFORM-like programs should be established. Intervention recommendations for both administrative and regulatory reforms of research and higher education sectors are offered in a separate policy-tailored sub-chapter.

***

This consultancy oriented research, comprising anthropological fieldwork, literature review and policy analysis, was conducted according to the following main goals – to enhance the relevance of social science research to society by strengthening the social science research community; to facilitate the building of systemic linkages between social science research and the policy domain; to enable a stable environment for the development of socially relevant social science and humanities (SSH) research.

The specific goal of the research project was to obtain a sound understanding of the impact of the current SSH research evaluation system and provide evidence-based recommendations for its revision which would contribute to the development of a strong, confident and publicly positioned SSH research community that could meaningfully contribute to socio-economic and political reform.

The PERFORM project (funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation and implemented by a consortium of HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation and the University of Fribourg) aimed to contribute to reforming the evaluation criteria for SSH researchers, in order to encourage and support research of both high quality and relevance. In that regard, this consultancy has confirmed previous research findings, demonstrating the main impediment to be the very notions of "quality" and "relevance" being imposed by Serbian academic administrators from STEM fields to all academic fields, including SSH (http://www.perform.network/).

The research is also part of a Europe-wide effort to introduce a bottom-up approach to research evaluation – the European Network for Research Evaluation in Social Sciences and Humanities (ENRESSH). This gathers SSH scholars' research evaluation from 35 countries to develop principled, appropriate, and transparent assessment methods for the SSH field in order to improve SSH research evaluation and to prove these disciplines' societal relevance (https://enressh.eu/).

The coordination of this research with the PERFORM and ENRESSH frameworks is accompanied by the implementation

of its results through the principal investigator's activities as a member of the Council for Humanities, Working Group for the development of criteria for funding SSH research projects, and Committee for journal rankings and categorisation, all under the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development, and within the Council for SSH at the University of Belgrade.

Background

In the Serbian science and technology sector, it is widely accepted that approaches to research assessment based on scientometry/bibliometry are strongly correlated with and adequate to the practices of the (natural) sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. Significant criticism of metric-based performance assessments by Serbian STEM researchers has not yet been articulated and published, although comparative examples prove this is not a standard reaction of natural scientists coming from STEM disciplines, especially in non-English speaking European countries and even in some English-speaking research communities (see the Los Angeles manifesto). On the other hand, Serbian SSH scholars, like their continental European and international colleagues, openly critique this system and advocate its change or even complete abandonment. This rift, a culture war of a kind, has lasted for nearly two decades.

This book focuses on the prolonged dispute over SSH research evaluation criteria in Serbia. As researchers working in SSH have asserted, the country's science policy is characterised by 1) highly biased research evaluation criteria defined by academic policymakers coming solely from STEM fields, and 2) misbalanced research funding that continually devalues SSH fields. The situation became additionally complex during the 2015–16 turmoil within the Serbian research community when multi-year funding call for academic research projects failed due to the fact that SSH were reduced to 12% of research funding (out of which the humanities were reduced to less than 5%). The rift continued in the following years despite significant efforts by PERFORM to facilitate dialogue and compromise between

the relevant actors. The most recent developments show that this dispute will continue to tear the academic community apart if it is not urgently addressed.

The "war over evaluation criteria" culminated in the mid-2000s, with STEM-rooted academic administrators having largely discarded SSH scholars from decision-making activities. During this process, academic policy was unified regardless of the substantive and instrumental differences between different fields. Consequently, social sciences, and especially the humanities, were both structurally and systematically subordinated. They have since been referred to as "weak," "irrelevant" and "underdeveloped because field-unspecific evaluation criteria, which left SSH specificities out of the Research and Development (R&D) policy framework, were applied. The evaluation standards were unified and imposed regardless of the differences within and across academic fields, national and regional academic traditions, historical and social specificities, or contextual variety in the social functions of academic knowledge.

Existing research on the topic shows that, although nominally appreciated in an ikebana-like manner, SSH research in Serbia lacks the policy attention and proper evaluation protocol capable of reflecting its societal potential and value. We are witnessing a complete lack of confidence toward evaluation procedures, as evaluation indicators and procedures are almost completely developed by (laboratory) scientists for (natural) sciences and technology. SSH scholars' general sentiment is that evaluation criteria are not only incompetently adapted to SSH research assessment, but purposively biased or even malicious. This is the context in which the war over evaluation has raged in Serbian academia for more than a decade.

Objectives, methodology and main hypotheses

The qualitative research of SSH scholars' perception of the Serbian evaluation system aimed to inform prospective impact assessments of the SSH research evaluation system in Serbia and thus contribute to its widely debated and desired evolution.

The three-year project (2016–2018) framework incorporated six months of field research work in five academic centres. Focus groups were organised in academic centres throughout Serbia (Belgrade, Novi Sad, Niš, Kragujevac, and Novi Pazar), with 1) academics who are also decision makers, 2) young researchers (up to 35 years old), 3) researchers who have been active in research policy debates, and 4) researchers who were inactive in relevant debates: over one hundred participants in total. In addition to the focus-group interviews, research techniques included individual interviews, participant observation of administrative practices, and surveys (in order to include otherwise unreachable participants).

Multi-sited fieldwork, the anthropological method of data collection and interpretation that 'follows' a topic or problem through geographically or socially different research contexts, was used. A bottom-up approach allowed the mapping of key shortcomings of the current evaluation criteria, incorporating the attitudes of the SSH research community. The list of selected proposals and ideas put forward by respondents was composed and interpreted in a way that aimed to address the problem inclusively and democratically.

The main hypothesis, developed on the basis of preliminary research, states that if SSH scholars are expected to play any notable public role in reshaping post-conflict, pauperised, and re-traditionalised societies, such as those in the Western Balkans, they need to re-establish their authority not only in society at large but also within academia.

An additional hypothesis, directly related to PERFORM's agenda, states that the empowerment of SSH scholars should be a focus of research and development (R&D) policy, as these scholars are systematically prevented from being "strong, confident and publicly positioned" by the very system that purportedly invites them to become so, especially by the rules and regulations of research assessment.

Data were analysed in relation to key contemporary debates in SSH research evaluation studies, and in relation to recent developments in the research evaluation climate across Europe, with pivotal institutions (academies of science and major evaluation

organisations) moving openly toward non-metric indicators. The argument concludes with reformative policy options, stressing the relevance and legitimacy of the assessment procedures and emphasising the administrative reform of the academic sector to reflect the major differences between STEM and SSH.

The author hopes this book contributes to three major mid-term goals:

1) To improve the regulatory framework conditions for social sciences and humanities: to suggest how this project's findings could be transformed into relevant evaluation criteria considered relevant and fair by the members of the SSH community, in order to contribute more responsively and relevantly, based on indicators specifically devised for the SSH field rather than imposed upon it.
2) To help build a framework providing SSH scholars with a clear policy incentive to publish their findings in Serbian and minority languages (this is especially relevant for the humanities), and to have their work evaluated on its social impact and not according solely to intra-academic excellence, which is nowadays mainly reduced to metric indicators such as impact factor. This will hopefully help research to be communicated in a publicly and policy-relevant language and not in the superficial and socially irrelevant environment of high IF journals.
3) To contribute to ending the war over evaluation in Serbian, and indeed Western Balkan, academia, with SSH scholars back on track and not feeling devalued i.e., unwilling to comply with the reformative agenda. SSH would thereby regain the capacity to perform high quality research that is relevant to reform processes in society.

MAJOR FIELDWORK FINDINGS

The interview protocol was structured over four main thematic clusters, and participants were asked to contemplate and discuss four groups of questions on:

1) the overall status of SSH in academia,
2) evaluation criteria for SSH,
3) the societal status and role of SSH,
4) recent developments.

The Overall Status of SSH in the Academic Setting

The first thematic cluster within each interview was devoted to the overall status of SSH within academia; this theme aimed to foster dialogue on issues such as: the status of SSH in the research and higher education sectors; whether participants felt equal to colleagues from STEM fields; their reaction to suggested administrative reform differentiating between the management and funding of STEM and SSH, and the prudence (if the opportunity arose) of differentiating between social sciences and humanities as well.

The participants almost unanimously shared the belief that the status of SSH in the larger research and higher education community is that of the "underdeveloped cousin" or "a child with special needs." They are disappointed in, some even disgusted by, their treatment by STEM-based academic administrators in particular. In addition, they do not feel equal, and are angry about the fact that most of their STEM colleagues pushed along the 2000s reform agenda that shunted SSH out of the policymaking framework. They consider that system of

false democracy and abuse of academic autonomy to be based on majority rule and not on the values of plurality and diversity. In this regard, they assert the need for administrative reform, with a regulatory body (the ministry or some prospective agency or foundation) preferably subdivided or "confederalised" across academic fields. Under such a scenario, the majority of participants do not think that the further separation of social sciences and humanities would be necessary.

Research Assessment Criteria and Quality Indicators

The second group of questions was devoted to the ongoing crisis of SSH evaluation: discerning each participant's stance on the war over evaluation and the prolonged dispute over STEM-derived indicators for SSH; if they feel research assessment tools other than scientometric should be used for SSH; if their personal work has been significantly influenced by research assessment in terms of publication behaviour (articles instead of books, English instead of Serbian), research methodology, or the selection of research topics; whether they plan to publish in Serbian and other languages used by most of our citizens in the future.

Most of the participants felt the prolonged dispute over research assessment criteria was detrimental to the academic community as a whole, and they wholeheartedly recommended the diversification of the criteria and indicators for the STEM and SSH disciplines. They do not believe that common ground can be found with STEM-based administrators as they see fundamental differences between the fields both in terms of methodology and social impact. No participant believed in the myth of academic unity that has been regularly employed by academic administrators to legitimate the homogeneity of assessment criteria for more than a decade. They also underlined the profoundly different social roles and cultural functions of the STEM and SSH disciplines. In that regard, they especially resent scientometric assessment of their research, consider it ridiculously incompetent, and maintain that it is purposively biased in order to degrade and pauperise both SSH institutions and individual

scholars. Humanities scholars in particular blame laboratory scientists for introducing research output quantification that 'values' a single article in a foreign journal more than a whole book published in Serbian or a minority language. They emphasised that this superficial objectification of research assessment criteria in fact arose to showcase the work of a certain group of politically prominent STEM scholars and that they have since seized all academic power.

Participants also indicated that assessment tools significantly changed their research and publishing behaviour, and agreed that such deep intrusion could no longer be considered objective. Grave polarisation was, however, detected within the SSH community – some were willing to comply with assessment criteria, while others were ready for prolonged dispute if necessary. Many types of reactive relational behaviour were detected, including reactive nationalism (interpretive sovereignty discourse) and reactive elitism (ivory tower syndrome). The community agreed that the dispute over research assessment criteria resembles the "Methodenstreit" of more than a century ago. Most SSH scholars are profoundly anti-positivistic, stressing the wider social context in which scientometric quantophrenia could gain its unfortunate reputation. They consider the standardisation of research assessment to be not a tool but a 'weapon'.

Interestingly, there is no consensus about what constitutes quality research – different actors, regardless of age and stature, consider innovation, cultural heritage protection, international visibility and erudition as equally important. Additional research is, however, needed in this regard, as distinguishing what is considered 'quality' could not be related solely to considerations of societal impact.

The Societal Status and Role of SSH

The third group of questions targeted issues linked to the societal relevance of SSH: how participants felt about the reputation, influence, and financial standing of SSH scholars in Serbia and of SSH institutions and disciplines in general; whether this status reflects SSH's impact on policy and in the public sphere;

and whether the war over evaluation would end if identity-related research (so called 'national sciences') were given special status in order not to confuse the system further?

The participants held that their societal reputation is reciprocally constituted by their reputation within academia and found it hard to discern whether their lower status in the policymakers' agenda is caused by overall distrust toward expert knowledge in society or by derogative practices within academic and research governing bodies. They perceive their influence on society at large to be correlated to their status and feel these two should be simultaneously improved through action aimed at advancing their public image and the respect they have unduly lost due to the distorted power relations within the academy. They generally perceive their financial status in relation to their qualifications as dreadful; likewise for the policy impact they are nominally encouraged to contrive – many of them realise that their societal impact is obsolete if their type of knowledge has lost its appeal. As for the suggested seclusion of nationally relevant research as a way of ending the funding war over evaluation criteria and indicators, half of the respondents were afraid that such a solution might tie up academic knowledge in another wave of destructive nationalistic ideology while others held that state-instituted, academic-based protection of cultural heritage would be an excellent counter-balance to primitive nationalism.

Views on Recent Developments

The fourth thematic cluster within the interviews was dedicated to crucial new developments in the research evaluation arena: respondents' feelings and thoughts about the recent promotion of socially relevant (applied) SSH research; their attitudes to applied research in general and directed fundamental research in particular; how they felt about the idea of Open Science, and the related notion of Open Evaluation; and what role extra-academic stakeholders should have in knowledge-to-policy processes.

Most of the participants felt reserved about turning the ship of academic knowledge solely towards the applied realm.

They mostly consider applied science as an area for professionals working outside academia – in museums, media, state and local administration, civil society or international organisations. However, most of them agreed that the introduction of directed fundamental research in the (revoked) call of 2016, with predefined topics of special interest to society, culture and the state, was an important breakthrough and a welcomed change. Most also hope this solution will be renewed and that the next call will encompass direct fundamental research as well. On the notion of Open Science and Open Evaluation, opinions are divided and deep reservations were brought up. While the majority of participants feel that transparency with research outputs or even the publicity of peer reviews would be an asset, they completely disagree with the idea of external stakeholders judging scholarship and scholars in terms of the worth of their outputs and the value of the knowledge they produce. "Even worse than scientometry" would be a shared stance on extra-academic open evaluation. However, they have no other reservations toward external stakeholders entering the academic field and see dialogue on economic, social, and cultural issues as an important channel for the dissemination of academic knowledge.

Issues Underlined and Proposals Made by the Interviewees

Full anonymity was guaranteed to interviewees and their identity is purposively and completely hidden (and not just altered by anonymisation or pseudonymisation). Pursuant to this all indicative references, such as English professor from the University of Novi Sad or Historiography researcher from an institute in Belgrade, have been removed.

The final section of each interview was devoted to summarising ideas put forward during the discussions. The interviewees were asked to share their thoughts and ideas on the topics freely, in a relatively unstructured manner. The main problems they addressed and proposals they made were recorded and are summarised as follows:

"SSH must receive proper treatment in strategic documents if the field is to be understood as equal to STEM."

"SSH must stay united in order to oppose biased research evaluation criteria and ever-shrinking funding."

"As a field, SSH should be independent from STEM in the administrative sense."

"Interdisciplinary research should be preserved at the level of funding, but it is hard or impossible to discern in terms of M-points."

"Continuous reform of the research and higher education sectors should be abandoned and replaced by adherence to the Constitution and laws."

"Reforms are unlawful, unconstitutional, and inhuman. The system just keeps shifting from one form of chaos to another."

"Humanities' specific link to the education and culture sector, and not to the technological sector, should be acknowledged in rules and regulations."

"It is unfortunate that our STEM colleagues share the general societal ignorance regarding social sciences and particularly regarding the arts and humanities – they openly ask what our purpose is."

"It is odd that archeological excavations and the history of art exhibitions are financed not by the ministry of science but by the ministry of culture, while the science ministry keeps asking for results that would be recognisable in an international context. It is unfair to ask for costly outputs when we are allocated funding that cannot cover basic research costs. And not just excavations and exhibitions – think of costly monographs. How do they expect us to compete with our western colleagues, who publish, well-illustrated, attractive editions?"

"In Germany, where I studied, the SSH are considered *Orchideenfächer* – degradation is not a local phenomenon, but a worldwide trend."

"It is probably the potential social and political harm that outweighs the benefit of dismissing researchers from the institutes that keeps us there still, and not some strategic planning that recognises our societal purpose."

"It is obvious that our system is based on false democracy and the abuse of academic autonomy – STEM-based delegates in all of the relevant bodies that govern science and higher education form a vast majority that ignores and suppresses academic minorities."

"The incompetence of those who are entitled to promote us is huge. Power to decide which researcher will be promoted is delegated to a committee consisting of colleagues who don't even understand the titles of our books and articles."

"It is assumed that a historian and a sociologist can evaluate each other. It's nonsense. Humanities should have autonomy in terms of criteria and funding."

"The ministry is huge; it covers all levels of education, from kindergarten to post-doctoral programmes. This situation is intolerable; it is the definition of incompetence. The very institution that promotes quality, merit, and competence is designed in direct opposition to it."

"For more than twenty years, the ministry has been dominated by people who are incompetent and uninterested in SSH. It is not that criteria are "too harsh" for us; the parameters have been ill-stated from the very beginning of the reform."

"We are constantly being outvoted. The ministry should be redesigned from scratch."

"It is most likely that [as humanities scholars] relocation of authority over our disciplines from the ministry of education and science to the ministry of culture would be even more disastrous. And it would certainly be used as an argument corroborating the current predominant view – that arts and humanities scholars are not scientists so they should be considered obsolete."

"It is far easier to get promoted in faculties than in research institutes."

"Our colleagues from Croatia are in a far better position due to the fact that they have politically well-positioned figures among them to push their agenda."

"It is my fear that our administrative separatism, so to speak, would not be tolerated in other academic fields, and even more fierce retribution could be expected compared to the problems we currently face."

"I feel that separation should be thorough and consistent – all fields must have their bylaws differentiated, not only SSH. By pushing that agenda we could aspire to greater support and probably establish our autonomy."

"State secretaries and assistant ministers should have their portfolios delegated thematically, in terms of academic fields, not by predefined sectors (e.g., finance, international cooperation) with "veto power" regarding substantive decisions that could seriously affect their representative fields."

"It is a common belief that SSH, and especially the humanities, are conservative. But there is nothing more conservative, even primitive, than scientometry."

"After my transfer from an American university, I was amazed by the orthodox approach to research assessment; it is positivistic and "exact" in a way that doesn't resemble the specificities of the humanities ... it is as if some time machine had landed me in the nineteenth century."

"Scientometry is not a social science. It is the direct opposite of any science. Its statistics are obsolete. Its maths are hilarious. Its philosophy ... well, there is nothing wise about it."

"The positivist notion of neutrality, embedded in scientometry, disguised the interests of those who insisted on it being proclaimed a measure of all things scientific."

"Closed promotions should be introduced instead of false open ones. All of us should be reviewed for promotion (or re-

jected) according to what we have actually done, published, how good we have been as professors, et cetera, and not against some imaginary criteria devised from the citation behaviour of thousands of researchers worldwide. The current system is based on imaginary numbers; they cannot be considered representations of anything real."

"The problem we have been encountering for years is not only that the criteria are wrong – they are not being correctly applied. We are all caught up in a scenario in which we are evading the system. The next system should be fairer and based on relevant indicators, but I am skeptical regarding its future, too."

"This system is perverse on so many levels. It should be dismantled for good."

"We should follow our colleagues in the natural sciences, even start replicating their behaviour. We should have our articles signed by a bunch of people and all ten or twenty of us get points for the work of one or two persons. It is not a question of honour and shame; it is a question of survival in their world."

"The whole issue of university lists that are based on journal impact factors is related to getting sponsored and attracting legions of foreign students. It is completely irrelevant for Serbia and other small, national cultures. We do not have a culture of academic sponsorship and we do not get foreign students applying – maybe 5 per year (per faculty). This whole academic administration circus is unnecessary. *It* should be disestablished, not the SSH departments or institutes, as is constantly threatened."

"Do they even know that not even REF [i.e., the British Research Excellence Framework] is scientometric-based and that it is far more complicated, in order to reflect a variety of academic fields?"

"What hurts us most is not the fact that they prevent our promotion with these committees, but the fact that they are not obliged to explain the reasons for doing so. They are self-per-

ceived small gods of a sort. This behaviour should be precluded and their power neutralised."

"The existing evaluation criteria in fact are pretty much appropriate to a certain type of SSH scholar, to those who don't want their work to be publicly visible, utilised, criticised ... It is a closed system of evaluation in which academics 'vote' for each other. But it is basically mistaken, as it presupposes that those results that are not 'voted for' count as irrelevant or even unscientific."

"We should keep our rhythm and let them chase their points. And they should read more, if they read at all ... They can start with Berg [i.e., Maggie Berg, the author of *The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in the Academy*]."

"The current funding system basically dictates two things: first, to work within research teams and second, to work on strict output-related science projects. But this is fundamentally wrong on so many levels. Our social purpose is precisely *not* to change our research topic every two or five years. And much of our work is individual. Both of these components are dictated by the STEM and we know that this system is good for their fields ... but it has proved damaging for ours."

"The impact that is expected from us is pointless – we are getting these points for publishing articles that are read by few, if any. This is a true waste of time, money, energy, and 'human potential', to phrase it in popular terms. Meanwhile, self-proclaimed messiahs are maddening our population from TV screens and on the Internet. It is a sad situation, not just in Serbia.

"This whole impact-speak has been huge nonsense, the way it was proclaimed, their expectations of us ... We must organise and teach them what SSH are here for."

"Our foreign colleagues feel honoured by the opportunity to give public lectures or seminars at other or foreign universities or institutes. In our system, it is considered a complete waste of time. One cannot get points by giving lectures – and not just public lectures, but academic visits, too."

"The whole system is one vicious circle. While we are expected by the ministry to get published and summon as many M-points as we can, most of our older colleagues, who developed their careers in the preceding system of academic promotion, consider us to be 'careerists' and 'immoral'. And they still have all the decision-making power."

"It is not surprising that SSH are not considered in the [official] Strategy [of scientific and technological development]. What is outrageous, in fact, is that SSH are not being given a proper place in our cultural policy."

"Bylaws keep changing. We do not have time to adapt to this change, let alone to think of the societal impact ..."

"Our purpose, significance, function, role ... this is all mixed up by that notion of impact. It's a buzzword, in a way. Our impact was long ago predefined and it does not need to be reinvented. We should not accept the game of defining our impact and explaining our purpose. They [i.e., the STEM fields] need to explain why they are getting funded while it should be obvious why we are funded – in order for our state to function, in order for our society to be civilised. Period."

"I spend more time calculating what to publish, and where, and when, than on reading other people. It is sad, but I have kids and I am aware that adaptation is necessary."

"Fundamental research is by definition 'impactless', as it were. It would be a grave mistake, with serious consequences, to reorient all of our scholarship to visible, tangible, publicly understandable goals. It is a question of dignity. And it is far less European to think of SSH in terms of their practical utility than in terms of their importance for democracy and culture. 'Uncivilised' may be the correct word."

"We should insist on getting funded to republish all of our articles that were published abroad again, in Serbian, in order for our impact to be properly valued. Otherwise, the whole impact issue will turn into another plot against us."

"Some of my most important works, which made me renowned in certain circles, were not published in journals that are listed with our ministry. It is not that publishing abroad is wrong – on the contrary – but the way that the value of our work is measured there is incorrect."

"'It is not science if it is not sexy'?! I have never heard of anything more stupid."

"My colleagues and I, from private universities, are discriminated against on many levels. It is outrageous, this whole discussion of quality as being somehow typical of state-owned institutions. The change that I am referring to should be positioned high on our common agenda. We can achieve much more together, in terms of getting adequate criteria for measuring the value and impact of SSH, than if we are in confrontation, as we are now."

"They keep pushing us to do research that will lead to innovations conceived of by technology-driven notions? Have they even heard of social innovations?"

"The current system is overly technocratic; that is the reason for unscientific quantophrenia being installed as a quasi-objective approach to academic reality."

"Quantification of research output should not form the basis for pay grades."

"M-points should not be considered a major measure of the worth of someone's academic work. Professors should be given space to work with students and have their real teaching load recognised."

"The rush for M-points is harmful, as it causes unethical behaviour, such as false authorship, publication in predatory journals, the segmentation or 'spectacularisation' or self-glorification of results, and it seriously threatens the book as a major form of publishing in SSH."

"The preference toward quantity lessens the overall quality of research, editing, peer review, and publishing. No one affected by this system has time to do a proper job any more."

"Researchers do not have time to think about the application of results and their dissemination to stakeholders outside academia. The whole system is designed to exhaust researchers. The quantification pressure is purposively developed in order to prevent us from being social critics."

"Careers are unpredictable and the regulatory environment unstable."

"Policy work is undervalued, both traditionally and by reform regulation; it does not "pay up" either way."

"The ministry is too large and the research sector too small; it is unnatural, so higher education and research should be separated."

"Existential insecurity prevents us from being normatively oriented, policy work included, as we spend most of our time writing in order to gather M-points ... We don't even have time to read each other's work properly."

"It is not unexpected that the general public sees us as incompetent, lazy or obsolete, as our STEM colleagues and their system of measurement put us in that position a decade ago.

"We were raised, in academic terms, according to the ideal of free intellectuals, a peculiar form of public thinkers from the period of socialism, so it is very hard to reorient to a policy-based agenda, as policies are per definition the open implementation of someone's interest and are hardly treated as a pursuit of the common good. Eastern bloc intellectuals, Yugoslavia included, were more like social theorists. Social theory is of no interest to capitalism."

"Society doesn't perceive alternative thinking as relevant, it is mainly consumerist and goal-oriented. There's no room for public intellectuals anymore; those who remain are mainly pundits.

We are governed by internalised fear, and constant derogation from natural scientists. My colleagues and I, especially

those who are mothers, have for years felt personally ashamed as we were unable to gather the points that natural scientists regularly did. But now we are not depressed anymore, just pissed off."

"The current system is a combination of dilettantism and evil-mindedness. Points are not just stupid; they fill someone else's pockets and boost others' vanity."

"Since the economic interpretation of value has prevailed, it has become normal that no one in the administration is interested in books, exhibitions, excavations or cultural heritage in general, except for tourism purposes. They remember us only when some pressing political goal is at stake."

"Pseudoscience is what the public wants and what politics needs. It is very hard to counter pseudoscience and get the public to like you at the same time – almost impossible. It is on the rise, and we are pushed to get published abroad instead of contributing to the body of academic knowledge in our society."

"If SSH could get those bloody points for public outreach instead, there would be far less pseudoscience publicly present. We are systematically prevented from countering myths and follies since we spend almost all of our time gathering points for articles that no one beyond a narrow circle of colleagues will read."

"It would be very dangerous for us to accept that we must define our social purpose and indicators for measurement of the societal impact of our work."

"Older colleagues warn us that we are being pushed to do someone else's job and that we should not accept being researchers, professors, journalists, blog writers, public intellectuals, and policymakers simultaneously. This whole idea of a 'super researcher' that is imposed on SSH scholars in order to survive in the field is detrimental to our vocational quality."

"In every research institution there are two camps – those who are ready to comply with whatever comes from the ministry and those who keep opposing the natural sciences and

strive for the dignity of the social sciences or arts and humanities at any cost. That prolonged situation is tearing the community apart."

"The Bologna system managed to tear apart the fabric of the research community and introduced the intergenerational rift. Younger researchers now defend their PhD theses in their late twenties or early thirties, while older researchers were obliged to defend magisterial theses of length similar to current PhDs first, and then to write dissertations that were expected to be 'masterpieces'. It used to take fifteen years for all of that, at least."

"What is most striking is that younger researchers are well adjusted to scientometry. They see publishing in international journals as quite normal and they are completely disinterested in public work, policies, social activism, institutional administration, and even the work of their colleagues. So the system has oriented them to exactly the opposite of what those of us from previous generations cherished as quality – to write and publish a book after serious research and reflection, to give public lectures, to criticise politicians, et cetera. They are simply ignorant of the whole war over evaluation that has been going on for years, and just trying to survive within the current system. I don't blame them, but I am disappointed in them."

"Scholars should be organised somehow and their consciousness raised regarding the effects of the existing system. It was long ago noted in the West, this trend towards the extinction of normative-oriented intellectuals who cherished values and guided society by advice and reflection. It is quite paradoxical that we must now push the policy agenda and at the same time be prevented from being social critics."

"It's all messed up – we are pushed into short-term projects instead of longitudinal research, which is far more appropriate to our fields. It would be much more effective if we were allowed to do our research within stable research programs and then to apply our findings to public interests in the

form of short-term policy projects. It is impossible to do serious research via short-term projects, as it is impossible to apply knowledge within longitudinal research programs. It is the other way around."

"It would be naïve to confine national sciences, and only national sciences, to an administrative 'reservation' of a sort. Every field should have its autonomy; technology, for instance, and medicine too. If identity oriented research were confined to a reservation, it would die out in a generation or so. Autonomy for SSH as a field is a far better solution."

"While the rules are unstable and the system dysfunctional, we won't be willing to change in some other direction. Simple as that."

"The way to simultaneously promote our science in terms of international visibility and to preserve its quality in terms of competent peer review and the national relevance of researched topics would be through publishing our journals in two languages. It would be considerably less costly."

"Social sciences, and especially humanities, have less predictive power than natural sciences – that is well known. We should not accept the very notion of science that is bestowed upon us because it is both irrelevant and dangerous. If accepted, the natural sciences model will serve as a rationale for abolishing our institutes and academic departments."

"Popular science is what is expected from us, so let's give them what they want. If this is the way to survive, we should push for a change in the M-points system in order for it to value more highly results that are socially oriented."

"The ideal structure of our minimal expected output would be as follows – three works (articles, chapters, etc.) per year: one for the international academic community, another for the domestic intellectual community, and one for the general public. Or a book instead, as equivalent to a number of those articles and chapters mentioned, in two or three years."

"It is impossible to counter pseudoscience at home by publishing in international scientific journals. And who is ever motivated to publish in domestic non-academic editions, or through the Internet, public lectures, and TV shows? The system of points should be changed in order to reflect the goals we are expected to achieve."

"Fields that are by definition not international (national history, ethnology, etc.) should be positively factored in terms of different M-points, but they should not be completely separated from other SSH. If they are, they will be absorbed by non-academic nationalistic think tanks and dangerous social movements."

"Research and higher education are now dissociated from the rest of society by the very reform that was nominally introduced under the developmental discourse. It's a paradox. And the fault is ours, too."

"It would be very dangerous to reduce all of our work to meet policy agendas, it should be balanced. Fundamental SSH research is as important as applied research. We are not raised as entrepreneurs for a reason, most importantly because social knowledge is prone to political instrumentalisation far more than knowledge produced by other sciences."

"Serbian Studies and Policy Studies should be established as state projects, and both national humanities and applied social sciences should be redirected purposively to this interdisciplinary field, as nodes on the spectrum. All of the other disciplines should remain academic."

"I am curious – is the open evaluation envisioned just for SSH? Shouldn't such an experiment be executed over the natural sciences, too?"

"Nothing should change – the system is well balanced, especially by recent changes that have assigned books and national academic journals more M-points. The problem is that the system is not respected and we are constantly trying to trick it. It

would be far more intelligent for us to respect the rules that are pushing us to change and develop in order to be prepared for foreign funding applications than to keep opposing the whole idea of the internationalisation of academia. That would be far less shameful than to reorient solely to applied science and become completely dependent on our underdeveloped and corrupt politics."

"Facilitating public dissemination is important, but are there any stakeholders interested in commissioning academic outputs?"

"The quota of SSH subjects should increase both in school and university curricula. Part of the current predicament in our field lies in the fact that our purpose is unrecognised by society at large."

"Austerity measures were ill applied and illegitimate. Capital investments are regularly being directed toward STEM fields. We need politically positioned SSH academics in order to change this imbalance in funding."

"The Croatian model is quite good, with different academic fields regulated by separate articles of the same bylaw. For instance, there are clearly defined different expectations from a historian and from a physicist."

"The types and quantities of publications requested per year or per project must not be homogenously imposed for different fields. It is normal for scientists to publish articles but in the humanities we prefer books and edited volumes. They were excluded from evaluation just because it is more difficult to calculate their impact factor based on citations."

"For the highest titles/pay grades (e.g., professors at universities, principal investigators/research professors at institutes) a synthetic study should be expected, demonstrating the true value of his/her work, and not just a bunch of points gathered here and there."

"As bibliometry is blind in terms of content, it should be completely abandoned in favour of peer review. As in Germany or England, the most important publications – say, five or ten – demonstrating the overall direction and quality of someone's work – should be submitted for review by an independent and competent panel."

"As we are a very small research community, it is unlikely that a truly double blind peer review can be expected. Open reviews that the academic community can access over the intranet should be introduced instead. The database that was recently introduced [i.e., the research output database "Dositej," which has since been replaced by another named "RIS"] should be upgraded in order to include reviews by competent peers and be accessible to the academic community."

"Peer review is subjective, everyone knows that. Yet, if assessment reports are made open for everyone from the discipline to review, they would be far more objective than bibliometry."

"Foreign editors and peer reviewers are mostly incompetent when it comes to research topics relevant to Serbia and the Balkans. They sometimes don't even possess a knowledge of basic facts or processes that our freshmen are expected to know in order to pass introductory courses."

"Societal stakeholders are welcome to suggest research topics and interests, but they are completely incompetent for evaluating research output. Their opinion should be considered but not be decisive. Autonomy and the integrity of academic work must be safeguarded at all costs."

"We regularly hide any consultancy contracts we may get, as they are considered unscholarly and suspicious. As if something commercial is by default unscholarly, as it were. The consultancy market should be developed and openly advertised for academic and independent researchers. Communism is over."

"Stakeholders must be educated too, as they constantly impose non-academic standards on commissioned academic re-

search. They do not understand the pace of true research, nor do they see a problem if someone fails to adhere to research integrity principles. As a consequence, anyone who works with them is considered non-academically inclined and all of their work may be disregarded as non-scientific in terms of receiving promotion and research funding."

"We should not expect someone in some ministry or company to understand academic work."

"We need a legally instituted standing state secretary for SSH. Otherwise, any change will be frivolous and will vanish into oblivion in just a few years."

"Persons in charge should be competent, honest, and transparent *at the same time*. This has never been the case, according to information I have."

"Our journals should have a higher value in terms of points. Those of us who write books and chapters should be allowed to publish what we are accustomed to and not what some natural scientist thinks we should according to their world view. If not, Serbian academia will cease to exist in just a generation."

"The current system of gathering points should be replaced by predefined norms – output expectations should be regulated on the level of a year or project."

"Each of the next reforms should be pre-tested. We are constantly regulated on the basis of someone else's opinion and not on the basis of proven best practices."

"Do they even know what it takes to write a book? It's a rhetorical question of course – they do not even read books."

"It is detrimental to the development and even to the survival of higher education that textbooks are considered irrelevant by the ministry of education."

"We are scorched. This system is driving us mad. And that's not good for anyone – our students, our families, the wider society ..."

"As a national minority, we are completely excluded from the system, not only on the grounds of our disciplinary background, but also on the grounds of the language we use and topics we suggest researching. Some regional-based committees with an understanding of relevant social issues and shared cultural needs should be introduced. And these should not be instituted according to administrative regions, as they currently are, but true cultural autonomy should be guaranteed [Bosniak humanities scholar]."

"Foreign editors are simply not interested in our region and in our country, and when they are, it is social and political problems that interest them and not the language, culture, history, and identity."

"My colleagues from other faculties think that anyone can write about history or identity. They do not even consider our disciplines as sciences in their own right and many are confused that we still exist at the university level. Most of them feel our doctoral studies are unnecessary."

"Our position is not as bad as we tend to interpret it. We are too concentrated on our own problems so we are unable to grasp the extent of the social devastation that surrounds us. And this is, maybe, deliberate."

"We (SSH) do not really exist as a community, it is a construct developed through our battle against the ministry for criteria and status. It is a regulatory construct, so to speak. So, the problems we currently have with the natural sciences will surely reappear among ourselves if we are given the autonomy proposed. I think it is better to stand united with all of the other fields and try to make things better for every academic in the country."

"Our Academy [Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, SASA] almost doesn't have a department for social sciences anymore, and the department of historical sciences is much smaller than it should be, too. It is a clear reflection of our position as

a community in wider society. There are no prominent public figures representing us who are able to influence political structures to acknowledge our existence and recognise our societal worth."

"As a semi-peripheral society, it is not expected of us to have strong social sciences. We are considered drones that are supposed to gather data, and someone else will do the thinking instead of us. It is degrading that our own ministry doesn't respect our work at all."

"Serbian scholarship is entrapped by two seemingly opposed concepts: isolationism (nationalism, traditionalism) and internationalism (competitivism, modernism). However, their common trait is the ideologisation of scholarship. And we are forced to choose between these two dogmatic models – the neoliberal pressure of impact-oriented research and the isolationist pressure of preserving national interests. But either way, true science is deprived. It is not unexpected that the very word *science* is replaced by "research" these days."

"I do not want to publish in foreign journals anymore, as some editors kept pushing me to cite their friends and colleagues. It is a highly unpleasant experience and completely unethical. We were told back in the 2000s that we must publish abroad in order for the corrupt system of domestic peer review to change, but the same situation exists elsewhere. It is a colossal fraud, global in its character."

"It is very hard to listen to STEM academics telling us that we are not scientists at all. And these same people come to me when they need their argumentation to be properly organised and general methodology reflected in their papers. We should be separated for good because we have been victims of hypocrisy."

"Each and every university and institute should be represented in the regulatory bodies. The circle that makes decisions is too narrow, and should be changed in order for any further decisions to have any legitimacy."

"Our position in connection with the wider public is a common predicament. Many natural sciences are not recognised as useful either. We should try to make it right together and not by distancing ourselves, as usual. Except for evaluation criteria, of course."

"Our perception of our own identity, and especially of our past, with an emphasis on the dissolution of Yugoslavia, is not politically correct in Western eyes. Their social science and especially historiography was too politically driven during the 1990s, so the very notion of what was happening to us was conceived in the media's terms... our works are proscribed, so to say,"

"Their academics often wrote as pundits. As such, editors and reviewers in Western journals are prone to exclude serious, archive-based, well-documented research from the global body of knowledge. This is clearly political but disguised under so-called quality control."

"It is obvious that science administrators sold us out to neo-imperial companies governing academic publishing and information management. It is not only criminal but utterly opposed to the humanist worldview."

"Metrics as a battleground in academic management circles is just a part of the overall banalisation of science and culture in general. The main goal of our generation should be to strive not to leave future generations this uncivilised mess."

"Nothing will prevent us from repeating mistakes better than knowing our own past, administrative history included. We should not forget what they did to us."

"Since the ministry is unwilling to make our outputs visible to the public, as promised, we should try to organise ourselves in that regard. It is naïve to expect empowerment from anyone else."

"It is the saddest fact that our state is considering organising and funding research according to the directives of foreign

institutions. The World Bank is popping up every now and then. It should be our strategic choice to cherish our own scholarship and not to conform to the multinational companies that the WB is openly advocating."

"This competition talk that is omnipresent, it is very dangerous for our disciplines if there is no thorough reorganisation of how our field borders are set ... Many publicly uninteresting disciplines and those whose research is not immediately popular will perish. Competition between scholars should be competition between a plurality of ideas and not a sports-like 'win or die' system. It will be as detrimental as was the introduction of journal impact factor as a measure of quality, back at the beginning of the reform. Incomparable disciplines are not supposed to enter into competition with each other in the first place."

"Our work is publicly funded so it should be a normal expectation that the public should have access to our outputs and even influence the topics we are hired to investigate. But how this will be researched and evaluated is a whole different matter ..."

"The public must not be given an opportunity to choose who is a good researcher and who is not or who will be a professor. It should be a question of merit and not of popularity."

"It should be noted that none of the reform laws, bylaws, strategies or policy decisions has ever been truly respected or implemented. We are, as a society, prone to evade the very regulation that was supposed to make us more developed, so we are getting along and trying to survive in any system by developing deceptive practices instead."

"The reforms made in the name of Europe have been mutated by the interests of certain domestic circles and have very little in common with the shared practices of our foreign colleagues, especially when it comes to research assessment. It's a deception, a scam made in the name of democracy and progress."

"The fact that evaluation criteria are harsh is not our biggest problem. It is that they are inadequate for our field and serve the interests of other disciplines. If we were to introduce our own criteria and impose it on all of the other academic fields, they would certainly consider these criteria harsh as well."

"Not only identity-oriented humanities are 'national sciences'. Research in psychology, economics or political science is regularly domestically oriented as well. It would be a mistake to establish a kind of reservation for history, ethnology, or Serbian or Hungarian language and literature, and let the rest of us be swept away by the technocrats. We should stand united because we are too small and the public doesn't give a damn about us."

"This whole science projects-based system has been imposed on us by people who do not think individually, or write books, or share a commitment to previous research and, all in all, don't understand what social sciences are ... and especially the function that the humanities serve. They don't even imagine that scholarship can be published in some language other than laboratory English, which is pidgin and reduced to 300–500 words. If we were given the chance to evaluate them, we would surely dismiss their work as non-academic and illiterate. Therefore, we should go our separate ways once and for all."

"Predefined project topics, this directed research that was introduced last year [i.e., the PERFORM-induced direct fundamental research open call in 2016], that was the right way to make a balance between our autonomy as academics and social needs and perceptions. My colleagues and I would surely greet with joy the inclusion of this semi-directed type of research in the next open competition for funding."

"We are forced to segment our results in order to gain points for them through articles, although they clearly form an integral whole as a book. Only a generation ago it would have been considered academic fraud, a type of ethical misconduct, and nowadays it is encouraged. This is among the most unpleasant shifts that reform bestowed upon us."

"Proclaimed reductions in public research funding are offensive and ridiculous. On the contrary, the EU expects us to increase and not to decrease the percentage of our GDP invested in research and innovation, so this solution must be someone's policy, even a private one, as usual, and not the strategic goal."

INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS

From the perspectives of the ongoing debates and recent developments in the research evaluation of social sciences and humanities

In this chapter, the results obtained by qualitative ethnographic fieldwork in the context of the ongoing international debate about the consequences of ill-applied metric-based research assessment are interpreted. It has been found that the predominant evaluation procedures – which construe 'quality' and 'impact' almost exclusively in the context of a) publishing in foreign academic journals, deemed "international," and b) publishing in English – had some striking implications for knowledge production in Serbian SSH. These resemble the documented consequences of those same procedures in other European societies and worldwide, and in different academic cultures. The interpretation is contextualised in a novel, bottom-up approach advocated by ENRESSH, in which the author participated:

> "Research assessment in the social sciences and humanities (SSH) is delicate. Assessment procedures meet strong criticisms from SSH scholars and bibliometric research shows that the methods that are usually applied are ill-adapted to SSH research ... While until recently research on assessment in the SSH disciplines focused on the deficiencies of the current assessment methods, we present some European initiatives that take a bottom-up approach. They focus on research practices in SSH and reflect on how to assess SSH research with its own approaches instead of applying and adjusting the methods developed for and in the natural and life sciences. This is an important development because we can learn from previous evaluation exercises that whenever scholars felt that assessment procedures were imposed in a top-down manner with-

> out proper adjustments to SSH research, it resulted in boycotts or resistance. Applying adequate evaluation methods not only helps foster a better valorization of SSH research within the research community, among policymakers and colleagues from the natural sciences, but it will also help society to better understand SSH's contributions to solving major societal challenges." (Ochsner, Hug and Galleron 2017, 1)

ENRESSH elegantly summarised the types of arguments present in the literature on the specificities of SSH that prevent them from being susceptible to standardisation and, therefore, to unified quality measurement (Ochsner, Hug and Galleron 2017, 5):

> "a) SSH research is interpretative, that is, humanities research is mainly text– and theory-driven and social sciences are more concept-driven, while the natural sciences set up their studies to answer specific questions and are progress-driven; b) it is reflective and introduces new perspectives in academia, by fostering discursive controversy and competing visions. With regard to the society, they bring a decisive contribution to the training of critical thinking as a prerequisite for democracy or to the critical examination of modern trends, such as technologisation; c) it is mainly individual, few publications are co-authored and research is often connected to the person conducting it; d) productivity is not that important for research performance in the SSH; e) societal orientation is important, i.e. research is meant to influence society, direct interaction with society is part of SSH research; but f) the influence of society or other stakeholders outside of academia, such as external funding, on SSH research is evaluated negatively".

This bottom-up type of research is important as it approaches "the crisis in the humanities" (and the social sciences), which is itself an ongoing issue that has popped up for decades – not from a normative standpoint stressing the intrinsic value of SSH for human development, peace and democracy, but as a crisis in their evaluation and impact assessment.

Data acquired via this fieldwork confirm that the SSH branch of the Serbian research sector is a standard part or typi-

cal representative of a scholarly community in the European Research Area. Reservation, opposition, criticism or open disgust toward academic governance by metric-based research assessment procedures are typical of SSH scholars both in Europe and worldwide, so Serbian scholars' reservations, boycotts or open criticism are neither an anomaly nor context-specific. These reservations have been bottom-up researched during the last decade or so and have been elegantly summarised (see Ochsner, Hug and Galleron 2017, 3) in four major streams of criticism.

The first objection is a standard, field-specific caution (that resembles earlier debates on the inappropriacy of the plain transplantation of ethical review standards from biomedical to social research; see Israel and Hay 2006) – research evaluation methods are developed for – and reflect – the research, dissemination, and assessment practices in and of the STEM fields. They cannot capture either the diversity of methods being used in SSH, or the genres, audiences and languages regularly used or produced by SSH scholars (for early caution on the variety of genres used by SSH scholars as equally valuable, which makes them unsusceptible to bibliometry and possible solutions, see Hicks 2004; Hicks and Wang 2009). They are also accustomed to a linear understanding of scientific knowledge, and unaccountable for the pluralism of competing ideas, diversity of sometimes opposed worldviews and the specific humanist concept of knowledge that is not supposed to "die out" and become "obsolete" in 2 to 5 years, as in the laboratory sciences. As Hicks put it, "citations accumulate at geological pace from the perspective of policy makers" (Hicks 2004, 474).

The second objection points to the fact that an evaluation focus on metrics inevitably loses all that is intrinsically valued in SSH, thus making the measurement obsolete for society. Quantification is, the argument goes, not only inappropriate but also unable to capture complex and non-mechanical thinking, especially present in the humanities. The third objection is brought against the fundamental change that STEM-based indicators for SSH research evaluation cause in the field: mainstreaming, a loss of diversity, secularisation, a decrease in

ethical standards, the loss of the institutional research profile, etc. ('negative steering effects').

The final type of objection reported worldwide can be seen as one that crosses the previous three – SSH are historically de-standardised, often purposively divergent and incoherent in terms of topical, methodological and institutional variety, including the very classification of fields and subfields that is less typical for STEM. This makes it impossible to develop standardised criteria for SSH as a whole.

All of these reservations about or objections to the use of metric-based research assessment methods in SSH evaluation are also present among Serbian SSH scholars. They traditionally strongly oppose the standardisation, quantification and change of the identity of their disciplines. Yet (and this is where contextual specificities come into play), they are also mostly reluctant to completely abandon all metric criteria, for two main reasons: a) the fear of the consequences of another "tectonic" reform (as they are exhausted by constant regulatory change and annoyed by the instability in their working environment), and 2) the fear of corruption and abuse of the peer review-based system for private, group or (party) political purposes.

Recent evaluation scholarship keeps producing arguments against the top-down, systematic, field-unspecific application of assessment procedures, especially with regard to the consequences such academic governance is having on the very research it was supposed to assess objectively. It is now common knowledge among evaluation and policy scholars that the notion of an inactive researcher, pure recipient or 'object' of evaluation is misplaced and that researchers themselves react to assessment practices and adapt to them in ways that fundamentally change their academic (and publishing) behaviour. Whenever pay grade, reputation or academic promotion is closely linked to 'objective' quantitative evaluation or to imposed, general indicators that are proclaimed as universal measures of quality and success, the research community and researchers as individuals tend to satisfy these criteria (or to strongly oppose the assessment as a block) in order to try to manage the consequences of 'objective' evaluation. As well-educated social actors, and knowing that they will

be judged on their behaviour, they tend to influence judgment by conforming to those standards (by 'tricking the system') or by denying the system its legitimacy and the administration its authority. In both cases (compliance/rebellion), the evaluation system fails in its main purpose and redirects academic behaviour in ways that significantly lessen scholars' engagement with society. That is precisely what is happening in Serbia and should be addressed immediately.

Evaluation researchers worldwide, and especially in Europe, report that complying with criteria tends to become an end in itself, the ultimate goal of scholars' behaviour both as researchers and authors, influencing not only the ways in which academic knowledge is communicated but also the selection of research topics and even theory and methodological selection (or abandonment). As such, it directly intervenes in the history of science in a way that allows knowledge assessment indicators to become powerful directive tools that replace traditional academic motivational structures (Aksnes and Rip 2009; Van Noorden 2010; Butler 2007; Mirković and Milenković, 2014; cf. de Rijcke 2015). Behavioural changes in individual researchers, research groups or even whole institutions, and in some cases of whole academic disciplines, is a worldwide phenomenon (Laudel 2006). It has been documented that directly linking funding to research output, as is the case in Serbia, favours quantity over quality and puts pressure on researchers to publish whatever they can. In such a regulatory environment, the pursuit of quality research becomes secondary to the production of academic works, or even obsolete (Colwell et al. 2012). In Norway (Aagard, Bloch and Schneider 2015) or Finland (Hammarfelt and de Rijcke 2015), for instance, it has been found that SSH disciplines tend to mimic STEM fields in terms of the most common type of output (i.e., research articles in high-impact journals); this is corroborated by the findings in Serbia as well.

Traditionally, academic institutions perceive themselves as relatively independent and critical of mainstream politics. By engaging in New Public Management evaluation practices, these institutions have started to comply with extra-academic mechanisms that are performance-based, while outputs are being

ripped out of original research contexts by their standardised and distanced evaluation. These 'conflicting values' and their consequences have also been reported in Estonia, based on a case study that compared physics and the humanities – scholars are complying with formal evaluation criteria and publishing articles that are irrelevant from the standpoint of both the scholarly community and society at large. Authors point to this situation as to the 'epistemic injustice' that produces serious consequences relevant for understanding processes outside academia (Lohkivi, Velbaum and Eigi 2012, 108–09):

> "We suggest that credibility is at stake when the cultural values and goals of a discipline contradict those presupposed by official evaluation standards. Disciplines that are better aligned with the epistemic assumptions of evaluation standards appear to produce more 'scientific' findings. To restore epistemic justice in research evaluation, we argue that the specificity of a discipline's epistemic aims, values, and cultural identities must be taken into account ... we use the concept of epistemic injustice to discuss the Estonian research evaluation model, because its criteria correspond to the interests of laboratory sciences better than the humanities. As a result, the latter fields suffer from unjust evaluation, losing their academic credibility. For the sake of epistemic justice we argue that cultural differences in disciplinary areas should be taken into account in their evaluations. A more just evaluation would prevent valuable contributions from being discounted or lost and would thus contribute to sustaining high quality of research".

The findings in Estonia coincide with previously published findings by Serbian SSH-based researchers analysing the myths and misconceptions embedded in the domestic research evaluation system (Baćević, 2006; Žikić, 2006; Kovačević 2013; Milenković, 2009; Milenković, 2010). These findings are strikingly different from those of authors who consider Serbian SSH simply underdeveloped (Urošević and Pavlović 2013; Pajić and Jevremov, 2014; Pajić 2015; Ejdus 2018).

Again, as in other academic cultures, the Serbian research evaluation system has devalued the traditionally expected re-

search activities and research outputs of SSH scholars, among whom publishing books and chapters in edited volumes were most common. Both early warnings (Thompson 2002; Williams et al. 2009) and more recent studies (Giminez-Toledo et al. 2015; Basso et al. 2016) underline the great value of a book as an essential indicator for establishing specialisation and pursuing academic promotion in the humanities and (in most of) the social sciences from the perspective of scholars. The most recent bottom-up study of scholars' perceptions confirmed that monographs have maintained a fundamental contribution within many disciplines; they are not only considered a communication channel for exchanging academic information but, above that, act as platforms for debate and paradigm shifting, key markers of esteem and quality from the scholars' point of view (Basso et al. 2016: 43, 62).

Of utmost importance for this argument is the tendency to devalue the transformation of academic knowledge into socially useful policies due to the system of rewarding individual 'productivity' in foreign academic journals. This unintended consequence of the 'publish or perish' culture, as authors name it, is present worldwide (Van Dalen and Henkens 2012), and not only among individual scholars – whole research institutions have been reported to reorient their organisational and financial priorities toward satisfying top-down, standardised indicators that are imposed on them as criteria of quality (Pfeffer and Salancik 2003; Shore 2008). This consequence is troublesome as both individual researchers and academic institutions are put onto 'lists' and 'ranked' based on quantitative information; this in turn produces war-like, unhealthy competition that significantly reconstructs academic subjectivities (Gačanović 2010).

This mode of governance has serious social consequences; namely, quantitative indicators are legitimised not on the basis of their actual accuracy but through competition for resources such as salaries, research funding, and public respect. This in turn changes the behaviour of academic institutions – they start to pursue a 'good image' among research governing bodies or private funders and not among the academic community itself (Espeland and Sauder 2007). Keeping in mind that those bod-

ies are not in themselves academic, and that they are in most cases related to the government or major companies, SSH scholarship consequently is becoming less and less critical and even apologetic to whatever ideological cause is currently in power or preferred by potential donors. A thorough analysis of this situation, carried out through the anthropology of policy and related scholarship, has pointed out the social and political consequences of this 'audit culture' (Shore 2008, 2010; Craig et al. 2014). And this is exactly what participants in this study point to in the Serbian case.

In addition, it has been reported that auditing discourse frequently makes SSH scholars feel devalued or even personally ashamed, and diminishes both institutional and individual autonomy, causing feelings of powerlessness among researchers, with more and more stress and anxiety reported by scholars worldwide (Burrows 2012; Knowles and Burrows, 2014; Chandler, Barry and Clark 2002; Sa, Kretz and Sigurdson 2013). In sum, audit-like research assessment procedures are widely perceived as detrimental to the overall quality of higher education and research, or even threatening to what could be considered the essence of academic identity (Clegg 2008). In this regard, the author's previous findings (Milenkovic and Milenkovic 2013; Milenković and Kovacević 2014) are confirmed – the ongoing systematic derogation of the status of professional expertise in public discourse, coupled with the lessening of the traditional status of SSH within academia prevents scholars from being critical of mainstream political discourse or economic ideology, and is significantly correlated to the rise of socio-cultural conservatism, which in turn prevents them from being policy-oriented and causes them to be reserved toward developmental goals.

Academic auditing – once proclaimed the ultimate instrument of quality assurance, aimed at controlling public spending on research and higher education – has been proven to be based on the obsolete presumption of the 'unity of science', which is especially ignorant of the differences between laboratory sciences and the humanities. This should not necessarily be seen as some organised conspiracy against SSH. The charm of academic auditing lies in its susceptibility to what has long been known

as the standard view of science and of scientific knowledge in society (Scheffler 1967; Mulkay 1979). In other words, research assessment feeds on the public perception of science. But the public perception of science is quite different from the public perception of arts and humanities. It is precisely those grave differences in the interpretations of the role of scholarly knowledge in society that are causing much of this longstanding problem.

As seminal work in anthropology and the sociology of policy has repeatedly shown (Shore and Roberts 1995; Strathern 1996, 2000; Power 1997; Shore and Wright 1999), audit culture has successfully established control of academic life and legitimised itself as the channel for exercising extra-academic power over scholars worldwide, based on established measurement and rankings, or "governing by numbers" (Shore and Wright 2015). According to this interpretation, academic auditing predominantly based on quantitative performance assessment has formalised output regardless of outcome, in order to present itself as a universal instrument for governing anything academic. This has also been confirmed for Serbia (Žikić, 2009; Gavrilović, 2009; Gačanović, 2009; Pavićević, 2009; Milenković, 2009; Baćević, 2010; Milenković, 2010; Kovačević, 2010; Gačanović, 2019).

It is widely argued by research evaluation scholars that the reasons for not using scientometrics in order to allocate funding or academic promotion in SSH are related to its inadequacy as a tool rather than to the intrinsic differences between the SSH and STEM fields in general. This view is shared by three of the interviewees who are also psychologists-turned-scientometricians. In this regard, a whole new research tradition in bibliometry and related fields is developing, in order to counter arguments developed by SSH scholars worldwide. It has been suggested, for instance, that indicators derived from citation metrics should be field normalised before application (Aksnes and Taxt 2004), although this has not happened in Serbia. For instance, 'lists' of academic journals have regularly been made on the basis of scientometrics applied regardless of differences in the number of researchers and nature of typical research output (i.e., history and ethnomusicology, or economics and adult education being listed in the same data pools).

Metric-based assessment not only changes the perceived role of SSH, and of humanities especially, both in academia and in wider society, but also the established relationships between various stakeholders interested in academic production. It is notable that when the use of metric-based assessment tools is delegated to people who are not researchers themselves (librarians, professional evaluators, administrators, managers, etc.), scholars tend to oppose it in a way they do not when they are reviewed by their perceived peers (Wouters 2014; Petersohn 2014; de Rijcke and Rushforth 2015). This high sensitivity toward the (perceived) incompetence of extra-academic actors, already noted in comparatively relevant contexts (for Czech Republic, see Linkova 2014) is precisely what should top the policy reform agenda in Serbia, as noted in the Recommendations section. Data gathered during this research clearly show that scholars are unanimously opposed to the evaluation of academic outputs by non-academic stakeholders.

While reducing complexity in order to achieve effectiveness was perceived by administrators as an end in itself (and thus highly desirable, especially in the context of austerity measures), in reality it has produced inverse effects – scholars, especially those from the humanities, tend to defend the irreducibility, diversity, and plurality of knowledge as valuable in itself. It is their opposition in 'defense of academia' types of discourse that is preventing the 'effectiveness' of research administration (Woelert 2013; Cronin and Sugimoto 2014; Collini 2015). But it also prevents their research from having any notable social impact, as the public is set on the notion of technology-based applicability. All these findings, both in Serbia and worldwide, suggest that orienting the effectiveness of evaluation data management and streamlining SSH research toward policy should be explicitly separated, as outlined in the Recommendations. Among the findings of this research, the fact that the effectiveness of the (STEM-derived, metric-based) assessment of SSH research outputs is inversely proportional to their policy impact should be considered most important. The data confirm that this harmful confounding of societal relevance with intra-academic excellence is omnipresent in the current Serbian research evaluation system.

Scholars, although ambivalent toward the current reward system based on output points (labelled "M"s in Serbia) and unwilling to engage "in another tiresome reform," are almost unanimously against the notion of the high concordance of citation-based impact (intra-academic excellence) with the societal/policy worth of their work products. Regardless of what they think of the capability of impact factors to represent the scientific contribution of their work, their notion of the societal worth of their research is based upon traditional academic beliefs and unaffected by evaluation. Their practice, enormously affected by the assessments, is in discord with what they hold true. Simply put, they do not believe in the policy mantra of impact factors as indicators of value and development, but as indicators of success (or survival). This coincides with comparative findings, which indicate that researchers tend to comply with (or oppose) metric-based views of themselves as imposed and obligatory, without actually believing in the worth of impact assessment (Aksnes and Rip 2009; Buela-Casal and Zych 2012). This ketman-like (the apparent sharing of the ideology of the oppressors) perception of one's own intellectual contribution as a consequence of the introduction of scientometric criteria is precisely what should be avoided when introducing policy-oriented research incentives, as it directly correlates to the anxiety, stress, and pessimism explained above. It is of the utmost importance to avoid the introduction of the impact measurement of extra-academically relevant research by academically illegitimate methods. How to overcome this situation of conflicting means and ends is outlined in the Recommendations section.

To conclude, the data gathered in this research confirm what was previously hypothesised: research institutions and individual researchers respond strategically to interventions designed to align them with policy priorities. This coincides with global findings (Whitley and Gläser 2007; Pinheiro et al. 2014). If the true reformative goal is to put Serbian SSH knowledge into practice (rather than consigning it to oblivion or pushing it toward anti-democratic political movements), then it is the outputs expected of researchers and not the system of incentives used to achieve them that ought to be changed. It would

be naïve to expect the introduction of a system that is not performance-based, as overall governance is performance-oriented, but incentives should be directed to socially relevant SSH research (instead of socially irrelevant publishing in high-impact foreign/international journals that publish knowledge that is inaccessible outside narrow circles of specialists, unusable by government, civil society or companies, and regionally or nationally mostly irrelevant in terms of socially recognisable topics or national interests). Instead of furthering the pointless, derogative, and expensive exhaustion of Serbian SSH scholars by requesting them to publish socially, nationally, and regionally irrelevant scholarship for the sake of (foreign) scholarship, their societal role and cultural functions should be re-established.

> "This 'evaluation gap' results in discrepancies at two levels. First, research has a variety of missions: to produce knowledge for its own sake; to help define and solve economic and social problems; to create the knowledge base for further technological and social innovation; and to give meaning to actual cultural and social developments. These different missions are strongly interrelated and can often be served within one research project. Yet, they do require different forms of communication and articulation work. The work needed to accomplish these missions is certainly not limited to the publication of articles in specialized scientific journals. Yet, it is this type of work that figures most prominently in research evaluations. This has the paradoxical effect that the requirements to be more active in 'valorization' and other forms of society-oriented scientific work is piled on top of the requirement to be excellent in publishing high impact articles and books. No wonder a lot of Dutch researchers regularly show signs of burn out... Hence, there is a need for diversification of quality criteria and a more refined set of evaluation criteria that take into account the real research mission of the group or institute that is being evaluated (instead of an ideal-typical research mission that is actually not much more than a pipe dream). Second, research has become a huge enterprise with enormous amounts of research results and an increased complexity of interdisciplinary connections between fields. The current routines in peer review cannot keep up with this vast increase in scale and complexity. Sometimes there is a lack of

> sufficient numbers of peers to check the quality of the new research. In addition, new forms of peer review of data quality are in increasing demand. A number of experiments with new forms of review to address these issues have been developed in response to these challenges. A common solution in massive review exercises (such as the REF in the UK or the judgement of large EU programmes) is the bureaucratisation of peer review. This effectively turns the substantive orientation of peer expert judgment into a procedure in which the main role of experts is ticking boxes and checking whether the researchers have fulfilled their procedural requirements. Will this in the long run undermine the nature of peer review in science?" (Wouters, 2014b)

The Leiden Manifesto, published by some of the leading scientometricians and science administrators (in the prestigious journal *Nature*), on the need for thorough reform of the use of metrics in research assessment, points exactly in that direction:

> "Data are increasingly used to govern science. Research evaluations that were once bespoke and performed by peers are now routine and reliant on metrics. The problem is that evaluation is now led by the data rather than by judgment. Metrics have proliferated: usually well intentioned, not always well informed, often ill applied. We risk damaging the system with the very tools designed to improve it, as evaluation is increasingly implemented by organizations organisations without knowledge of, or advice on, good practice and interpretation ... As scientometricians, social scientists and research administrators, we have watched with increasing alarm the pervasive misapplication of indicators to the evaluation of scientific performance ... Across the world, universities have become obsessed with their position in global rankings (such as the Shanghai Ranking and *Times Higher Education*'s list), even when such lists are based on what are, in our view, inaccurate data and arbitrary indicators ... Abuse of research metrics has become too widespread to ignore ... We offer this distillation of best practice in metrics-based research assessment so that researchers can hold evaluators to account, and evaluators can hold their indicators to account ... Abiding by these ten principles, research evaluation can play an important part in the development of science and its interactions with society.

> Research metrics can provide crucial information that would be difficult to gather or understand by means of individual expertise. But this quantitative information must not be allowed to morph from an instrument into the goal. The best decisions are taken by combining robust statistics with sensitivity to the aim and nature of the research that is evaluated. Both quantitative and qualitative evidence are needed; each is objective in its own way. Decision-making about science must be based on high-quality processes that are informed by the highest quality data." (Hicks et al. 2015, 429–430)

If we evaluate the Serbian research evaluation system against the ten principles of the Leiden manifesto, many sad truths appear:

1. "Quantitative evaluation should support qualitative, expert assessment." In Serbia, the situation is completely the contrary – the qualitative part of individual researchers' assessments, of projects' results, of project applications or even of whole institutions reviewed for research accreditation is considered supplementary and facultative. Its superficial character is widely reported by interviewees. Participant observation and personal experience confirm its incidental character.
2. "Measure performance against the research missions of the institution, group or researcher." The Serbian system relies heavily on the output 'points' individuals gather for achieving pay grades, research titles or academic promotions. A researcher's success is measured by simply adding up the points gathered, regardless of the individuals' or institutions' specialisation or profile. This is especially relevant for SSH, as the system that was introduced to assess research outputs objectively has significantly changed the very practices it was introduced to evaluate, thus proving itself not an objective evaluation tool but a pressure mechanism.
3. "Protect excellence in locally relevant research." This is another recommendation that should be applied swiftly and seriously in the Serbian case, as 'excellence' is

defined in narrow and misplaced terms, pertaining to foreign/international journals with very high impact factors. Nothing local, national or regional could be considered excellent under this definition, as this is reserved for foreign/international scholarship. Many participants consider this kind of policy solution as auto-colonial. It is considered unacceptable, especially by humanities scholars, and among them, particularly by those specialising in history, culture, and language.

4. "Keep data collection and analytical processes open, transparent and simple." None of these pertain to the Serbian case, except simplicity. Neither data collection nor the analytical process is open or transparent, with the national registry of researchers and their research outputs being incomplete for more than a decade (with the exception of Vojvodina). Recent developments, such as the introduction of the 'Dositej' and 'RIS' research output databases were followed by serious criticism.
5. "Allow those evaluated to verify data and analysis." Participants often stress that they are not a part of the system but its "subjects". They feel excluded by the distanced procedures aimed at quality control and consider themselves to be governed instead, so they must 'change or perish". This finding coincides with previous research on evaluation systems, which found such systems to be rigid, over-standardising and insensitive to academic nuance. This should not be considered as resulting from abuse of power or administrative malpractice but from those in charge lacking prior training.
6. "Account for variation by field in publication and citation practices." This is the most striking impediment of the current system. The lack of diversity in personnel selection has been reflected in the design of policies governing research assessment and funding. Both the goals of scientific research and the indicators for

measurement of its quality and impact are devised by STEM-based administrators. Neither the variety of genres traditionally used by SSH scholars, nor the specificities of citation practices in these fields, are considered to be important.

7. "Base assessment of individual researchers on a qualitative judgment of their portfolio." Information about an individual's expertise, experience, academic activities or social influence is considered second-rate. As a result, researchers who manage to segment or sensationalise their results, or who conform to the theoretical or methodological taste or political agenda of foreign editors or reviewers, are compensated by higher pay grades, while those who might be the only researcher of a locally or nationally relevant topic are considered passé; they are thus being offended, demotivated or even estranged in a way that is producing anti-developmental consequences.
8. "Avoid misplaced concreteness and false precision." Although the vast majority of SSH scholars feel there is an ideological background to their predicament, they also interpret the failure of the system in a politically insensitive way, as a consequence of the wholesale application of an empiricist, scientistic, and old-fashioned positivist style of thinking about academic knowledge and science in general, which has been technocratised in the contemporary context.
9. "Recognize the systemic effects of assessment and indicators." This research consultancy is among the rare efforts to recognise the effects of the current system. As pointed out by some of the participants, our reforms are not based on tested best practices from relevant comparative cases, but on the opinions and interests of groups that are putting forward a specific reformative agenda.
10. "Scrutinize indicators regularly and update them." This is an ambiguous moment. While the authors of the

> Manifesto tend to upgrade assessment to capture disciplinary differences, the Serbian case provides enough data to conclude that regulative updates are directed against SSH. For instance, the 2016 revoked call specifically outlined that one specific category of academic outputs (chapters in international edited volumes) would not be considered for pay grades, "as there are too many results of that type published by SSH in the previous period". Many of the interviewees underlined this as intolerable behaviour, the straw which finally broke the camel's back.

Both literature review and context-sensitive interpretation of the Leiden principles point to the fact that none of the recent developments within bibliometry circles seems able to solve the pressing problem of SSH research evaluation – how to correlate intra-academic excellence with regional, national or social relevance. Therefore, a novel approach is being suggested – not one of improving metric-based analysis but of research policy reorientation to the social role and cultural functions of SSH as defined by UNESCO, the Council of Europe, OSCE, the European Science Foundation, the national academies of leading European economies, and other institutions and organisations. These developments are relatively new but are gaining strong support among the most important research institutions and organisations, some of which have directly responded to the ongoing research assessment crisis (please consult Annexes).

***

In the early days of the introduction of scientometry in Serbia it was reduced to a positivist, magic-like fascination with numbers and numbering (which sociologists of science long ago termed quantophrenia and which has, more recently, been widely considered the "aestheticisation of banality"). Consequently, the potential value of its application has been directly prevented by the manner of its introduction. It was the most ill-advertised reform that the research community remembers. The improper use of scientometrics has tended to displace the history and

philosophy of science (and technology), sociological, anthropological, economic, legal and related science studies, and other important correctives, in favour of technocratic reductions and positivist misconceptions of the role, cultural functions, and value of scientific knowledge of which European academia is proud.

This was unexpected. Nominally, the official stance of academic administrators in Serbia for almost two decades has been pro-European. In fact, this goes for all Governments, as society is seemingly europeanising top-down (Žikić 2013; Brujić 2016). But, until recently, Serbian academic administrators systematically ignored the reservations, recommendations, and guidelines developed by leading European research institutions and organisations regarding the specificity of SSH, in terms of evaluation standards, including impact assessment and quality indicators. The interviewees, as informed and cultured scholars, are well aware of this trend of lagging behind in economy, politics and policies, typical for peripheral societies. They concur that this is precisely what keeps happening to our academic policy – in times when the most prestigious academies in Europe are openly discarding scientometry as detrimental, it is promoted in Serbia as "the international standard" that is "required by the EU."

Let us, then, at the end of this section, heed a warning from some of the most authoritative and prestigious European scientific institutions (see "Statement by three national academies [Académie des Sciences, Leopoldina and Royal Society] on good practice in the evaluation of researchers and research programmes," dated October 27, 2017, pp. 1–2):

> "With the increase in the number of evaluations and the emergence of easily accessible electronic databases, the use of bibliometric measures has become an additional tool. However, there has been too much reliance on bibliometric indices and indicator-based tools as measures of performance by many evaluation committees and exercises, leading to the danger of superficial, over-simplified and unreliable methods of evaluation. This bad practice involving the misuse of metrics has become a cause for serious concern ... Of particular concern are the widely used journal impact factors (IF) which are an estimate of the impact of the journal itself rather than the

> intrinsic scientific quality of a given article published within it ... There is a serious danger that undue emphasis on bibliometric indicators will not only fail to reflect correctly the quality of research, but may also hinder the appreciation of the work of excellent scientists outside the mainstream; it will also tend to promote those who follow current or fashionable research trends, rather than those whose work is highly novel and which might produce completely new directions of scientific research. Moreover, overreliance on citations as a measure of quality may encourage the formation of aggregates of researchers (or "citation clubs") who boost each others citation metrics by mutual citation. It thus becomes important to concentrate on better methods of evaluation, which promote good and innovative scientific research."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, both general conclusions and those of special relevance for PERFORM's mission are presented, alongside recommendations that may lead either to the fine tuning of the existing system (tolerable from the standpoint of the SSH community) or to its significant change (the preferred option).

General Conclusions

The research has confirmed the hypotheses outlined in the introductory chapter.

The currently predominant evaluative discourse frequently makes SSH scholars feel personally ashamed, and that their work is devalued and their disciplines are inferiorised, with both institutional and individual autonomy diminished. This is widely perceived among scholars as detrimental to the overall quality of higher education and research, or even threatening to what could be considered the essence of academic identity. Previous research findings are confirmed – the ongoing derogation of SSH within academia itself is counter-indicative in social and cultural terms. Among the grave extra-academic consequences of the intra-academic derogation of the authority of SSH, the most devastating is the fact that the currently predominant science policy is (tacitly but significantly) correlated to the rise of socio-cultural conservatism. It was nominally a liberal tool that has in reality produced conservative consequences. The public position of SSH scholars is now less pro-European or cosmopolitan than it was prior to the allegedly 'European' reforms in science and higher education policy. It is a clear case of 'inverse effect' that should be widely reflected upon. This latent implica-

tion is especially relevant given the post-traumatic character of Serbian society.

Previous 'best evaluation practices' from the 1990s were belatedly implemented in Serbia during the 2000s. They were advertised as 'reformative', 'developmental', 'contemporary, state of the art' and – the most dangerous epithet – as 'European.' In reality, they had not been introduced by the majority of research governing bodies in European countries nor by the EU, and in those countries in which they were actually introduced, their consequences have been highly contested. It has been found that for STEM fields they fall far short of delivering what was promised at their introduction, and for SSH they prove counter-indicative, significantly distorting the fields they were supposed to 'objectively' assess. Participants shared an opinion already present in the literature (Milenković 2009): this type of research evaluation, used in Serbia since the mid-2000s, wasn't introduced to monitor output but to incite change in the behaviour of SSH researchers in order to align their publication patterns with scientometrics – their outputs proved "of lesser quality" than those of STEM fields, which had instituted the change in the first place.

Followers of scientometrics usually stress that their methods are more objective than peer review assessment. But this study has confirmed that there is far less objectivity than is believed. The fieldwork shows that evaluation criteria have significantly changed the very perception of what scholarship is and how researchers behave. It has been proved that the metric-based system has changed the very nature of scientific endeavour and cannot be considered objective but highly intrusive and even dangerous in social and cultural terms. Encouraging superficiality, simplification and unreliability, the metric-based performance assessment of SSH scholars in Serbia has proved to be derogative and offensive, widely alienating scholars. By marginalising SSH as a field, it has turned part of them personally away from reformative processes.

This shared perception is the main driver of SSH scholars' resistance to complying with STEM-derived administration

procedures for their field. The overall perception in the SSH research community, confirmed by this fieldwork-based research, is that the current system of research assessment was introduced in the early 2000s on false pretenses, with the implied notion of SSH presumed underdeveloped until proven otherwise. Consequently, a decade and a half later, the system has proved highly biased against SSH, so now SSH scholars perceive STEM-based administrators to be guilty of unprofessionalism, incompetence, and political and financial abuse of power until proven otherwise. This spiral of mutual allegations and open displays of mistrust or even contempt calls for immediate policy intervention. Policy options, both preventive and remedial, are outlined in the final chapter.

Although comparatively clearly identified, well researched and highly criticised by the evaluation scholars themselves across Europe, the metric-based evaluation system is still being implemented in Serbia and keeps producing the same consequences it was nominally introduced to prevent. It has proven counter-indicative and can be considered failed in at least three paradoxical ways: it prevents the internationalisation of Serbian SSH scholarship; it discourages knowledge-to-policy types of academic endeavour, and it fosters unethical behaviour. As such, it presents a major challenge to the idea of building a publicly well-positioned scholarly community that contributes to the development of democracy, human rights, and overall economic and societal progress. In sum, the existing system was promoted as a liberal, cosmopolitan, European, cutting-edge/state-of-the-art reform but has instead caused some serious conservative consequences. In its place, an unadventurous approach is recommended here, in order to abrogate the existing consequences and to achieve liberal goals by both legitimate and feasible means.

Different perceptions among different types of participants regarding age– and status-specific issues are mostly irrelevant for the main topic of this research; almost all were united in the stance that assessment criteria should be changed in order to reflect differences between academic fields, in terms of a need to grasp both quality and impact by field-specific indicators

and adequate assessment procedures. They agree that the existing system is unsuitable for SSH, inapplicable to their field but forcefully imposed, irrelevant in terms of research quality and social impact, corruptive in its nature, and degrading to institutions and individual researchers in the SSH fields.

Most participants perceived the regulatory framework for research assessment as being construed in a manner of pseudo-ethnic cleansing that was introduced to 'improve' the field on false pretenses. It is widely considered that those who wanted to improve SSH were Serbian STEM-based administrators who wanted scholars to become "like them in order to be improved". The vast majority of the community stands firm on the position that such offensive and derogatory behaviour should not be tolerated. This is a most dangerous scenario that should be avoided by preventive segregation, i.e., by the diversification of regulation and management of academic fields. If not, a deepening intra-academic war over criteria will probably lead to: 1) the radicalisation of SSH identity politics, 2) judicial and media actions against perceived perpetrators, and 3) an increase in political activism of SSH scholars, followed by 4) advocacy for a decrease in public spending on STEM fields, and other as yet undisclosed retributive actions with predictable consequences, leading to the dissolution of the Serbian academic system in general. Recent open use of political influence in order to revoke the call for publicly funded research projects (as it was perceived as highly biased against SSH) is just a moderate example of what might happen if an intervention fell behind.

Due to misplaced incentives, researchers are systematically being pushed out of the social arena and almost completely focused into publishing journal articles. They regularly report that they are neither focused on quality teaching nor communicating their results to relevant stakeholders or to the general public. The existing system heavily favours publishing "science for the sake of science" and, except recent initiatives facilitated through the PERFORM platform to conduct policy-oriented research, it discourages researchers from concentrating on the social role, the cultural value and the political use of scholarship in reformative processes in society. In that regard, the system

introduced during the mid-2000s has proved to be discouraging for PERFORM-related goals (as discussed below, in a separate sub-chapter).

Data show the SSH community feels that indicators for research assessment and the strategic goals proclaimed are contradictory. While the 'value' of research results is measured by their internationalisation, the regulatory framework stresses their social utility at national/local levels. The link between the two is far-fetched. Therefore, the regulatory framework needs internal harmonisation – either SSH scholars shouldn't be expected to publish in international journals or they shouldn't be expected to contribute to societal change. Most interviewees reflected this discord between goals and means as discouraging and disappointing, and often ridiculed it.

Communication of research results, and more generally communication between non-academic stakeholders and the research community, is another unresolved issue that should be tackled in the near future. The impact of research on policy is a complex and debatable issue. Its implied linearity was long ago abandoned by policy scientists, as it was found that the results of scientific research cannot be disseminated to stakeholders, even to predefined targeted audiences, in such a way that their immediate impact could be reasonably expected. The interpretation, adaptation and integration of knowledge into policy are not simple, one-way processes: policymakers and those who implement policies are neither passive recipients nor always careful learners. It is naïve to presuppose that stakeholders will immediately accept and apply knowledge gained by research. And it is far from believable that they will draw policy-relevant knowledge from international scientific journals (which they don't even know exist, let alone have the time/skills to read, interpret and apply what is published there).

This naïve research-to-policy model is exactly what is currently expected from the Serbian SSH community. Instead, thorough research is needed in order to identify various stakeholders, their interests and perspectives, in order to facilitate SSH knowledge use in the policy realm. For now, the majority of

both the research community and the stakeholders themselves remain unacculturated to the knowledge-to-policy way of thinking. The linear model, based on good will and personal contacts, is thus doomed as illegitimate. It should be replaced by introducing a regulatory environment that motivates both researchers and stakeholders to with engage each other, as suggested in the Recommendations section.

Given this long-standing discord, it is quite surprising that not all of the non-experimental SSH scholars have been turned into fierce nationalists, Eurosceptics or even STEM-haters. Nevertheless, participants unanimously call for competence-based research administration reform to be introduced in short order, with administrators from each field solely administering that field as a priority.

This research confirms that important policy recommendations comparatively developed almost a decade ago for Central and Eastern European countries regarding the future of publicly funded research (Radosevic and Lepori 2009, 666) have remained unaddressed: 1) "Changes in public funding criteria without organisational restructuring at micro level will not suffice," and 2) "Diversifying funding bodies and R&D performers by itself will not suffice to meet the most important policy challenge: balance between R&D excellence and local relevance." Their implementation would stand as true social innovation in a knowledge society.

Special Relevance of the Data Obtained for PERFORM's Mission

As "the overarching goal of PERFORM is a strong, confident, and publicly positioned social science research community that meaningfully contributes to socio-economic and political reform processes," there are still many obstacles that need to be overcome if those objectives are to be fulfilled. Serbian SSH scholars in general neither share a strong sense of community nor have significant public influence (apart from their traditional occasional influence through political parties and interest

groups). Moreover, they do not perceive themselves as confident but in retreat (or rebellion), pressured by the constant rush to satisfy criteria and fulfil indicators that are set by administrators coming from STEM fields. In that regard, SSH could be considered a special type of vulnerable community that needs immediate empowerment.

Serbia is a clear example of an over-reformed society, with still more reforms yet to come. To tackle this paradox, it would be pertinent to establish fair, clear, legitimate and relevant research assessment criteria that the SSH community wouldn't reject or ridicule. It is also of utmost importance for indicators to remain largely constant. If they don't, with the continued implementation of metric-based research assessment built upon irrelevant indicators, coupled with shrinking funds and constant regulatory change, it is not likely that PERFORM, or forthcoming similar platforms, will be able to complete its mission. Instead, a regulatory environment (lobbied for by the business sector as well), based on stability, predictability and the rule of law should be introduced for the research and higher education sectors, if SSH are expected to achieve strong societal and economic impact. Continuous, never-ending reforms have proven provocative and are a direct cause of reactive anti-reformist sentiment among the scholars interviewed. In that regard, the research community needs a regulatory framework that can guarantee that policy-oriented research will not be swept away by some future change in science policy. Otherwise it may be considered risky, even adventurist.

The impact of the current evaluation system on the SSH community prevents it from having the societal impact it supposedly should. These findings should not be seen in a negative light: on the contrary, PERFORM has already played a significant role in establishing the power balance within the Serbian academic management system. Its interventions have proved both timely and relevant. PERFORM, as an external actor whose contribution isn't yet recognised by the majority of the SSH community, has managed to counterbalance the underdog position of Serbian SSH within our ministry for some time. PERFORM

should openly communicate its mission and achievements to the SSH community.

PERFORM may be considered a social innovation as well – an important dialogue-opening, discussion-promoting instrument that aligns with the world-renowned Swiss democratic participation tradition. This is especially relevant as STEM-based academic administrators had been unwilling to negotiate criteria for the evaluation of research and the structure of the academic system for more than a decade. This situation is still perceived by the most of SSH community as 'unbelievable', 'outrageous' and 'intolerable', as they are not aware of the current developments facilitated by PERFORM. PERFORM has managed to intervene in the power structure established over the last decade, and promote the idea of socially useful social sciences among academic administrators who, paradoxically, consider SSH scholars obsolete unless they publish in top academic journals – i.e. unless they publish something that no one outside academia will ever read, let alone apply!

It is hardly to be expected that the research community will embrace a knowledge-to-policy regulatory reorientation if they are constantly excluded from the policymaking process in their own field. The community is mostly reserved toward participation in policy-oriented reform in the context of their systematic exclusion from the very policy processes that would make them more policy-oriented. They consider it derogative nonsense. They also consider ad-hoc expert working groups, teams or panels as illegitimate and call for their inclusion under the new law that will regulate the realm of research. Since scholars are not passive recipients of regulatory reform and their dissatisfaction is easily transformed into political influence, as demonstrated by the swift revocation of the 2016 call, their dissatisfaction should be seriously reflected upon both by the ministry and PERFORM.

There is a view that only international academic publications are reflective of the strength of a scientific community and the measure of its contribution to social and economic development. But in countries such as Serbia, it is of the utmost importance to have a strong SSH as a control mechanism – not only

does the economy needs innovations, society and culture do as well. It is precisely applied SSH that can be seen as an instrument of cultural and political change – as interpreters of the reforms which our society needs in order for them not to be perceived as imperial, neo-colonial, fascist, etc. by radical left and right movements; as social thinkers who publish research and perform their analyses in the language of the relevant population. This problem is interwoven with the issue of the widely perceived incompetence of foreign peer reviewers that has haunted the domestic research community for more than a decade. It is another example of how PERFORM might intervene – by facilitating the engagement of experienced and competent foreign reviewers (in terms of language, cultural context and academic focus) within the next open call for public research funding.

Among significant impediments that are causing the social dysfunction of SSH is the fact that the linkage of the SSH community to extra-academic stakeholders is left to individual initiative. Creating evidence-based consultancy for decision makers is the cornerstone of the developmental agenda worldwide, yet SSH scholars in Serbia are systematically discouraged from producing outputs considered less worthy by the very ministry that strategically, officially invites them to engage their knowledge in the policy arena. Therefore, evaluation criteria should change and the overall institutional culture in higher education and the research and development sector needs a democratic intervention. This is precisely what PERFORM has managed to initiate in the past few years.

Our ministry has increased research output tremendously in the last decade and a half, in terms of international publications. But almost no one among the participants agrees with the received view of international development mechanisms – that international publications are reflective of economic development – and consider it a statistical fallacy. On the contrary, our SSH scholars believe that they were purposively left in ruins, as there is a kind of conspiracy to destroy the culture of research, developed in the 19th century, that considers SSH not only as research of, but as an integral part of cultural heritage. This

approach, advocated by UNESCO and the Council of Europe, is something that should be considered in any prospective regulatory reform (Milenković, 2014; 2016; 2019a; 2019b).

There is a further counterintuitive proposition: the decentralisation of our research governance could contribute to increasing the effectiveness of our academic policy. If an academic foundation is to be successfully established, it needs to be decentralised, with separate divisions ('sectors') governing STEM and SSH, as suggested in the Recommendations section.

PERFORM should continue to insist on principles of fairness and legitimacy. It has facilitated dialogue and debate – a processual way of policymaking. It has also insisted on legitimacy at the level of the academic community and not only at the level of decision makers. PERFORM tackled the most important problem first – the lack of exchange between governmental bodies and the research sector – and introduced testing, reflection and revision, which were also absent in the previous period.

It is recommended that PERFORM should concentrate on helping our government build the infrastructure that will establish fair and timely policies, including 1) a study program, and b) ethical guidelines for management in research and higher education. It is not only the responsibility of policy researchers to influence policy processes more effectively and to strengthen collaboration with government institutions, but the very institutions they address should be discouraged from commissioning policymaking that is not based on expert knowledge. It has also been found that there is a need for a study program that will introduce ways of transforming academic knowledge into policy design and implementation, and educate various stakeholders about the differences between styles and goals of research. It is important for this study program not to be confined to an economic value, because the return on investment in terms of money is just one of several elements that need to be considered when we think of the impact of research and its overall societal contribution.

Development needs social and political optimism – developmental logic is inherently optimistic (in terms of political

theory). Contrary to that, SSH scholars are "naturally" prone to pessimistic thinking in social and political terms, bearing in mind the vast knowledge of human history and its atrocities that they possess. Regulatory reform of research assessment, therefore, should be positioned at the top of the reformatory agenda and regularly advertised, as researchers are not informed about recent PERFORM-initiated changes, a fact that leads them still to perceive the ministry and its partners as enemies. A PR blog is needed if the ministry is going to retain its position as a relatively neutral actor that is trying to balance the criteria and stabilise its portfolio. PERFORM should consider facilitating the proper and timely sharing of information between regulatory bodies (ministries, agencies and offices) and the academic community. This could be achieved within PERFORM's wider endeavour to disseminate many of its existing achievements.

To conclude, we need PERFORM to continue its unique mission. The way it operates should be considered a model for our ministry of science or any prospective scientific/academic agency, foundation or other type of regulatory body. The most important change, among many, that PERFORM has managed to introduce in this very short period is that academic governors coming mostly from STEM fields have begun to listen to what we from SSH have to say. As they promote continuous learning, they are changing our policy culture – research and higher education policymakers have started to learn about the differences between academic fields and about the different functions SSH and STEM disciplines have in society at large. PERFORM has somehow managed to bridge the gap which had opened between researchers and policymakers thanks, among other things, to the significantly different definitions of such basic concepts as 'policy', 'research', 'evidence', 'development', and even 'democracy' itself that these two distinct professional cultures use.

One issue which PERFORM needs to address immediately is that of reservation towards utilised social research to which many, especially in the humanities, are acculturated. There are many reasons why this is so (relating especially to SSH's period of opposition to state-controlled academia in the preceding decades) but it should be changed simultaneously with the research

evaluation indicators, in order to overcome the conceptual gap between research and governance.

The comparative analysis of issues tackled by this research in the regional context of the Western Balkans could also be considered a priority. Due to many similarities in the evaluation practices among former Yugoslav republics, the findings of this project will be of relevance for other Western Balkan countries as well.

Highly Recommended Policy Options

In this subchapter, general policy recommendations present in public discourse or already put forward by other researchers/consultants, such as the need to increase overall public funding of research or the number of civil servants in Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development (MoESTD, are avoided. The following recommendations are instead specific to the SSH field and their prospective applied orientation.

***

The communication of research to the academic community and to extra-academic stakeholders is a problematic realm. To keep regulating it by simply postulating that there is a correlation between international publications and economic development is a dangerous misconception. As the existing model of research assessment doesn't contribute to building the capacity of Serbian researchers to communicate their results effectively to policymakers, the means for research assessment and the ends expected from research should be harmonised. Current assessment procedures have proved to be more like barricades to than agents of the societal impact of scholarship in general (and not only for SSH).

Researchers who are expected to contribute to social change shouldn't be motivated solely to publish internationally if they are to be given time to contribute to the policy realm. This would also be impossible if they were expected to switch to publication genres unusable in terms of societal application. Therefore, the

omnipresent mantra of the need to increase the percentage of international publications by Serbian SSH scholars in order to deepen their societal impact at home should be abandoned as an absurd and costly nonsense. It is based on the naïve misconception of scholarly communication as an end to itself. Instead, the communication of research results to stakeholders should be meaningfully regulated, and the communication of socially useful academic knowledge in genres and languages susceptible to stakeholders should be introduced. In this regard, publishing in international journals should be left as an option and not as an obligation, in order to give time and allocate resources for the majority of the SSH research community to start contributing to societal reforms and not wasting their time, energy, knowledge and social resources in socially-irrelevant publications. Moreover, the current system revives and perpetuates the 'Ivory Tower Syndrome' among scholars, which is contrary to its intentions.

One way out of this crisis is relatively simple – if SSH scholars are expected to contribute to social change, they should demonstrate research relevance as defined by local, regional, national, and international strategic priorities (to the definition of which they should be asked to contribute) and not research excellence as perceived by publishers, editors and reviewers of international journals. Otherwise, the proclaimed goals, such as economic development, political stability, the improvement of human and minority rights, and the safeguarding of cultural heritage would be left to non-academic actors (most of whom do not share developmental commitment).

This can be effectively achieved through the diversification of the management of academic fields (cf. Milenković 2009; Milenković and Kovačević 2014). In this regard, separate administrative sectors should be introduced, if not for every academic field (natural sciences, biomedicine, technology and engineering, social sciences, humanities), then at least for STEM and SSH. Diverse criteria for research assessment should next be devised and implemented, including the measurement of the impact on/value of research for society. The distribution of resources should be diversified accordingly. The data clearly show that, if not diversified in terms of field-specific delegated compe-

tencies, funding, research assessment and impact modeling, this future regulatory body would not gain the respect and allegiance of the SSH community, either. As the existing feud seems unsolvable to the majority of colleagues, such a novel organisational mode of research governance would most likely be considered biased by default, even if it were run with honesty, respect and according to the principles of good governance. It should first and foremost contribute to establishing reasonable, field-specific links between a) funding, b) career expectations, c) the publication system, and d) evaluation criteria.

As there is a great fear that the separation of management and finance along academic field lines would prevent interdisciplinary research, a separate regulation should be devised in that regard, stressing the administrative separateness of output evaluation criteria and not of the researchers or research teams themselves. Interdisciplinary, trans-disciplinary and multidisciplinary research as a "fifth academic field", with a separate budget and relevant council, should be re-established.

The administrative classification of relevant sectors should also be changed. Juxtaposing the research and innovations sectors, currently disjointed under different ministries (as research is under education, and innovations are under a recently established separate ministry), is recommended. Higher education and culture should be considered for connection, according to the classification of EU directorates, as most of the participants share the current global belief among humanities scholars that arts and humanities serve educational and cultural functions, and these areas should not be reduced to technological development. In relation to the issue of prospective administrative reform, it should be considered that most of the participants do not believe in the establishment of a mega-ministry in terms of the public good. Most of the informants coming from universities feel pressured to become researchers solely by the system that devalues their teaching load and public role as intellectuals, and advocate the administrative separation of higher education and research sectors, thereby putting an end to the present reduction of professorship. Most of the participants from universities, unlike those from research institutes, feel that the

current system is designed in order to 'subordinate' the societal and cultural functions of higher education and SSH research in general to the science sector, and advocate the reverse action of "abandoning scholarship for the sake of the science model" and the very notion of the university solely as a "research university". Administrative reform, if feasible, is therefore recommended. If the ministry insists on quantifying outputs, professorial engagement should be reclassified from qualitative to quantitative indicators.

Bearing all this in mind, it is suggested that the decisiveness of scientometrics should be abandoned for STEM fields also and not just for SSH. However, due to the sensitivity of inter-field relations and in the context of the need for diversification not just of the evaluation criteria but of academic field management in general, the commissioning of a separate research consultancy in that regard is proposed, with a STEM-based research evaluation scholar in charge, emphasising interdisciplinary, trans-disciplinary and multidisciplinary research involving SSH-based members of research teams.

These recommendations stand regardless of any prospective changes of delegated competencies; i.e., whatever form of academic administration would be introduced instead of the existing ministry (whether agency, foundation, public trust or some other type). This preventive separation and strategic diversification of indicators of excellence and impact is vital if further development is to be achieved, and should be considered a key recommendation.

The first step toward achieving such a change would be either to adopt a completely new Strategy for Research and Development for Social, State and Cultural Benefits or to devise a separate action plan for the implementation of the existing strategy of scientific and technological development with regard to notions of 'science', 'development', and even 'strategy' relevant for SSH (as the existing plan is widely perceived by the SSH community as having been adopted solely in the interest of STEM fields and of being purposively biased). In that regard, a working group of relevant SSH representatives, as internal stakeholders,

should be re-summoned to tailor strategic choices to pursue reasonable goals, introduce relevant indicators, and define preferable outputs for Serbian SSH.

***

In the case of the lack of the political will to bring peace to the research community by the "confederal" governance of science and the higher education sectors, there is some immediate fine-tuning that should be introduced in the existing system.

The Leiden recommendations should be strictly followed and assessment practices based on metrics should be a) field-normalised, b) single output-oriented, and c) made relevant to the individual researcher's specialisation. It is recommended that fine-tuning of the existing rules and regulations be commissioned in order to adapt the extensively ridiculed use of scientometrics in Serbia to the Leiden Manifesto and other state-of-the art European assessment practices. The current situation as reflected in the data gathered by this research is interpreted against the Leiden recommendations in the previous section, and the Manifesto itself is included in the Annexes to this book.

An ENRESSH-promoted, bottom-up, impact-oriented approach to SSH research assessment practices should be included in academic policymaking. As the existing top-down approach has proved to be both a failure and illegitimate, this type of field-specific defining of relevant indicators should be introduced regardless of whether the confederalisation of regulative bodies, suggested above, is enacted. The ENRESSH agenda for the European-wide reform of SSH research evaluation is included in the Annexes to this book, as well as the ENRESSH-endorsed Prague Manifesto.

The most recent "Statement by three national academies (Académie des Sciences, Leopoldina and Royal Society) on good practice in the evaluation of researchers and research programmes" should be seriously considered as "digested guidelines." It specifically stresses the deficiencies of metric-based research assessments compared to those based on competent peer review. Please refer to the Statement, as it is also included in the Annexes.

An SSH-specific approach to assessment should concentrate on the following:

- Assessment criteria should, above all, be field-specific, with regards to societal functions, historical background, publishing (or citation) patterns, and the size of the research community;
- quantitative indicators should inform (or enrich) qualitative assessment, not vice-versa;
- journal impact factors should be completely abandoned and replaced by a peer review of quality and impact of concrete outputs by the individual researcher;
- as categorisation of outputs in the 'excellence framework' is a necessity, competent councils should define the quality of publications according to the model defined by the European Science Foundation (ERIH+ criteria);
- selected works, submitted by a researcher for review (funding/promotion), should be valued according to the specialisation of that researcher; the simple summing of M-points should also be abandoned;
- individual contributions should be detected (when not clearly stated) for each and every author in multi-author publications;
- academic excellence and social impact should be treated as separate realms; as both are buzzwords, they should not be used carelessly;
- optimism regarding the understanding of the role of metric indicators should be generally avoided as naïve presumption, as metric indicators have proved to be generators of instability and pessimism in the first place;
- an honest and competent peer review system should be facilitated and supported, both financially and through the development of an open academic evaluation platform (such as an intranet).

***

There are also context-specific interventions, hereafter recommended as concrete policy options.

As applied research is historically and culturally considered "of less worth" in Serbian academic contexts, this needs to be addressed by intervention at the very core of the indicators expected to be fulfilled and incentives striven for by researchers and research institutions. Therefore, those M-indicators pointing to the conceptualisation and impact assessment of public policies (M120) should be: a) valued equally with articles published in traditional form, in terms of 'points' and b) considered relevant for academic promotion or pay grade distribution as not being included in 'core M' points). Bearing in mind the troublesome experience with the interpretation of indicators, it is probably best to change the designation from M to S (for state and society oriented research outputs, mainly in social sciences: D in Serbian), and from M to C (for culturally relevant research predominantly in humanities: K in Serbian). M indicators should be replaced by D and K indicators for SSH policy-oriented research assessments.

SSH scholars should not be treated as researchers, writers, translators and proofreaders at the same time. A translation and proofreading facility should be established for every major research institution in academic centres and for every region (according to the present/planned number of researchers) if the policy insists on publishing articles in foreign/international journals.

Participants warn that the system is treating them as an underpaid labour force. Many experienced researchers share open disgust about the fact that they must replicate foreign research models or publish case studies in order to feed foreign thinkers with data, as if they are research assistants fit only for data gathering, and not "real" science or scholarship. The current system is perceived as biased in favour of foreign academics not only in terms of the language of publication and topics, theory and methods chosen for research, but on the distinction of competencies presumed of domestic and foreign scholars/peer reviewers in an auto-colonial manner. This problem has been addressed by interviewees in the "interpretive sovereignty" mode of dis-

course that resembles a Postcolonial/Southern theory analytical framework and attributes quality control mechanisms to the neocolonial character of developmental policies. It is of utmost importance for the knowledge-to-policy agenda not to become trapped in this particular variety of academic debate. This is the most important reason why policy-oriented research should be ultimately disassociated from current metric-based assessment.

In addition, it was openly debated during the interviews whether international actors, such as the World Bank, should direct Serbian academic policy in the way that they have been by often requiring austerity measures. It is recommended that the international development instruments' agenda be clearly stated by the ministry, and the reasons for conforming to it explained to the research community. If the introduction of competition in the research sector is the primary goal of prospective regulatory change, competitors must be guaranteed a level playing field, with one quarter (25%) of the budget assigned to SSH and not 19% (2011–2015) or 13% (2016 call). Another option is to assign 20% of the budget to the four major academic fields and leave a further 20% for interdisciplinary research. A currently prevailing indicator for the allocation of funds is "number of researchers in a field", which is considered by participants as unfair and fraudulent, since present numbers are a consequence of the biased reform already carried out over the past decade and a half.

The proclaimed need to introduce competitiveness into governance, if proven to be an irreversible process, should be disassociated from the growing inter-institutional cleavage. Competitiveness should be directed in such a way that the position or even survival of underrepresented disciplines in the body of researchers is not threatened. In that regard, a cautious approach to chairs, departments and publishing series explicitly devoted to cultural and historical heritage, including language and literature, of both majority and minority populations, is highly recommended. Otherwise, the system risks reinforcing both reactive nationalism among majority scholars and serious political and diplomatic damage in the context of the spread of bilateral additional conditionality within the EU accession agenda (Milenkovic and Milenkovic 2013).

If the already suggested administrative separation of 'national sciences' (explicitly identity-related research) proves not to be a preferred option among academic policy options, then the teaching output and outreach in these disciplines should be valued by the rules and regulations in the higher education sector. It should also be noted that academic culture is not completely dissociated from society at large and that the very notion of 'competition' is culturally associated with a 'victory and defeat' type of sport-like (or even warlike) discourse – which should be avoided at all costs. It is widely perceived among participants, and especially by humanities scholars, that academic competition does not lead to an increase of quality but to the eradication of differences, thus triggering the varieties of reactive behaviour explained above.

The organisational form of research should also be adapted to traditional research methods. Short-term projects of individual researchers and small research teams, albeit both popular and necessary (in order to foster innovation and avoid intra-institutional rifts) should, in general, be replaced by long-lasting research programs of strategic relevance.

The level of competence of those in charge of the promotion of researchers is decreasing as our responsibility and mandate increases. Researchers are promoted by committees consisting of members from all of four academic fields, meaning that no more than 25% of the delegates are competent for the promotion of an individual researcher. This is not the case at public universities, as professors are reviewed for promotion and elected by their competent peers (with only full professor appointments confirmed by university senates, consisting of deans, rectors and vice-rectors who also come from various academic fields). In this regard, researchers at research institutes should be reviewed for promotion by their field-specific councils (Serb. *matični naučni odbor*), except for the highest research rank (research professor/principal research fellow) for which a novel, legitimate election body should be introduced, consisting of the directors of research institutes and presidents of field-specific councils. This regulatory change would be an important step toward the

advocated confederalisation, which is expected to bring balance to the distorted relationships among academic fields through harmonising competence with legitimacy.

Pay grades are another 'sore spot' of the existing system, as confirmed by the data obtained. It is precisely the system of incentives that confounds quantitative and qualitative aspects of research outputs that most of the participants feel should be immediately abandoned. A return to the system of financing by title and not by pay grade is recommended, as most researchers share the belief that the omnipresent rush for gathering research output points is the predominant cause of ethical misconduct. As it was introduced in order to motivate tenured/older researchers (full professors at universities and principal investigators at research institutes) "not to get lazy after their final promotion", this pseudo-problem could be tackled by introducing the fixed financing model for teaching/research positions at 75% of monthly salary, with the remaining 25% to be raised from competitive open calls. Another solution to this predicament would be to define a minimal fixed amount of research-output points to be gathered on a yearly average (say 0.5 'core M points' per month, or a book, or five articles/chapters in two years). Whatever the method, this could be easily adddresed. There is a widespread belief among participants that significant change to the regulatory framework should de-quantify quality of research while maintaining pressure on younger and mid-career researchers so that they don't become complacent (except for working mothers, for whom, according to most of the participants, there should be positive discrimination).

Humanities scholars are systematically prevented from having their work categorised in the highest categories (M21a, M21b and M22), as the system of categorisation is based on journal impact factor (and even WoS is reserved toward its own ability to grasp the realistic academic impact of these journals). As scientometricians themselves consider their trade undeveloped and ill-applied, for humanities in general – and for nationally or regionally relevant social sciences in particular – it is recommended that all domestic humanities journals that are listed by WoS, Scimago, ERIH+ and MKS be recategorised as

international (M23).[1] The commencement of a thorough re-categorisation of humanities journals, in order to recognise the parts of AHCI Scimago and ERIH+ listings as leading international journals (M21a, M21b and M22) is also recommended. Finally, it would be prudent to introduce one scientific journal in the M24 category (domestic journals of international stature per definition) for each of the underrepresented disciplines. The Croatian model of journal ranking and categorisation, with its recent assessment policy breakthrough, is widely recognised by participants as a decent, less derogatory solution to the domestic situation, so it would be prudent to institute a similar finely tuned solution.[2]

Regulatory change should concentrate on securing the societal impact of SSH by introducing regular open calls for directed research projects as equivalent to fundamental research. While most of the participants welcome the idea of putting SSH knowledge into practice, they are quite reserved about the evaluative aspects of the prospective system. They would be willing to propose socially relevant research projects if they could both a) keep their jobs and b) keep their research integrity intact. As most of them, as individuals, were formed in times of political turmoil and never-ending economic and political transition, the research shows a willingness for social utilisation only if not blatantly directed by sheer ideological interest. In this regard, the introduction of a project line devoted to directed research should avoid the communist-like command-economy style of commissioning research. Administrators should be reminded of an excellent 2016 solution to this problem, when a PERFORM-instituted body (consisting of representatives of the research community) predefined thematic clusters of special interest to society, culture and the state. This body should be widened to include extra-academic stakeholders.

1 During the writing of this book a series of changes have taken place, some of them suggested by the author himself in the capacity explained in the Acknowledgements.

2 The Croatian model clearly distinguishes SSH from STEM fields: https://www.zakon.hr/z/320/Zakon-o-znanstvenoj-djelatnosti-i-visokom-obrazovanju.

While introducing reforms, we should be mindful that the very notion of research integrity is inextricably interwoven with the notion of the autonomy of individual researchers, research teams and institutions. Research autonomy holds an intrinsic value, as the recent upheaval regarding the Law on Higher Education demonstrates, when even gravely opposed groups of researchers from STEM and SSH fields united in order to bring public pressure against the widening of the ministerial mandate. They are particularly sensitised to hypocrisy and totalitarianism, and while willing to let stakeholders define relevant research topics, they are not willing to give extra-academic stakeholders room for decisive ex-post evaluation of the worth of academic knowledge produced by such directed research projects. It is precisely this apparent paradox – openness to the direction of socially relevant research topics but not to the validation of research outputs by extra-academic stakeholders – that should be reflected upon by the team of policy-oriented scholars. The use of existing comparative experience should be an asset in that regard, with the ENRESSH Agenda (included in the Annexes section) as a solid starting point.

One important aspect of the regulatory process has been neglected in the previous phases of the reform – that of legitimacy. This issue is most relevant to participants either from outside the state capital or from underrepresented disciplines. They underline that regulation has been constantly imposed in a totalitarian manner by bodies (the National Council, field-specific councils, various working groups and committees) that are not balanced in terms of disciplines, regions, gender, and ethnicity. On ethnicity, research conducted in Novi Pazar clearly shows the double exclusion or 'minority within a minority' position of Bosniak intellectuals, with regard to the regulatory process (both in terms of their SSH affiliation and cultural identity). The diversification of participation in academic policymaking is recommended; either by introducing a model based on predefined quotas for women, national minorities and geographical regions, or by introducing regional bodies with delegated duties to culturally and socially contextualise what is considered SSH quality output. The latter is more conducive to obtaining legitimacy in

terms of socially and culturally relevant research results. Participants belonging to underrepresented disciplines, regions, gender and ethnicities all concur that excellence in SSH research should be sought for in its relevance. Therefore, introducing regional research assessment panels for valorising the impact of directed SSH research outputs is recommended.

While it is commendable for extra-academic stakeholders to participate in such panels, they should not be delegated with decision-making power over which projects/research programs will be supported, as the lack of competence of non-academic stakeholders to make judgments about academic issues has been unanimously underlined by the community. The role of non-academic stakeholders should be confined to direction over socially and economically relevant topics for research. Otherwise, the policy-oriented regulatory change would face even more opposition than scientometry has.

Further, the growing tension between scholars working in universities and those working in public research institutes is noted; preventative measures should be taken. Specifically, researchers from institutes complain that their salaries do not reflect equivalence in title ('research fellow' being equivalent to 'assistant professor', 'senior research fellow' to 'associate professor' and 'principal investigator' to 'full professor'), while professors feel irritated that their twofold workload (teaching/research) is constantly been derogated by these complaints. This tension is a potential generator of another conflict that will not only weaken the already marginalised SSH community within the larger academic sector, but will also preclude any serious attempt to direct SSH toward societal engagement. As participants perceive a profound loss of social solidarity and emphasise that the united resistance which the SSH field demonstrated toward STEM-based management is an anomaly that should be cherished, it is even more important to put an end to silent faculty/institute conflict. If the rift within the SSH community alongside universities/institutes becomes too deep, their united struggle for fair governance, unbiased assessment and balanced funding will become obsolete. In that scenario, directing SSH research toward societal use would be very hard to achieve, if not impossible. This could be addressed

by a thorough change in the system of pay grades, which should be abolished in favour of regular and predictable researcher salaries in institutes which should resemble those of civil servants (a status which professors regularly enjoy). It is also important not to treat private research institutions and universities as less qualified per definition if a common struggle for fair and meaningful criteria for SSH research assessment is the primary goal. The impact and outreach of SSH research may also be expected through private research and higher education institutions. Public SSH institutions should be motivated to connect with their private peers and not stay secluded in a public/private institutional rift. Public SSH institutions have made too many concessions in past years to public STEM institutions in order to stay in tune with this public/private conflict. It is recommended that the reaching out to allies should be facilitated in this unexpected way.

Another troublesome aspect of academic life that needs immediate attention, if scholars are to be systematically directed toward societal challenges, is that the public derogation of science and scientists is becoming harder and nastier. Although slating the educated and cultured has time and again been a worldwide phenomenon, in Serbia there is a growing tendency towards the public denunciation of "lazy scholars," "incompetent professors," "fake universities," and "obsolete faculties and institutes" that is not systematically opposed by our regulatory bodies. It is strongly recommended that, except in cases of true laziness or incompetence, the ministry or subsequent regulatory body forms a Standing Committee for the Defense of the Public Reputation of Academia and Academics. Although this is clearly a problem that the STEM and SSH fields share, social and cultural research is especially sensitive in this regard, and SSH scholars are more likely to be denounced as 'surplus'. The level of alienation of SSH scholars from the ministry they are supposed to rely on for regulation, funding and political support is high, and this resembles 'Othering' in sociocultural terms. Academic administrators coming from STEM-fields are considered 'Others' who should be 'prosecuted'. Therefore, introducing an Academic Mediation Office is also suggested, in order to prevent intra-academic rifts appearing in the media.

If the introduction of these mechanisms for the public defense of individual researchers and research institutions proves impossible, it is recommended that a special SSH Public Image Taskforce be facilitated. This taskforce should be mandated to publicly dismantle trashy narratives on SSH within academia as well, as it is noted by participants that they are considered lazy, incompetent or obsolete not only in profane discourse but also by some of their STEM peers. With this in mind, the current trend of the de-legitimisation of expert knowledge in general, and of SSH in particular, coupled with the loss of the authority of academia in society, should be counterweighted by transparency of research output registers that may add to building trust between the society and academia. Such an endeavour should be facilitated, as it might prove indispensible in modifying the public perception of academia and expert knowledge in favour of SSH. Otherwise, putting SSH into practice may prove obsolete, as applying knowledge to a society that is unwilling to accept academic authority will suffer from pre-modern tensions that the current political system is unprepared to overcome.

There is a troublesome tendency among part of the research community to advocate that the existing system not be changed by using explanation in culturally racist terms. A narrative that supports the existing "underdog" position of SSH and feeds on mentality-talk holding the Serbian population, academics included, "unable to change unless treated tough-handedly" and calls for international intervention due to the "laziness and corruption that are culturally rooted in Serbia." This culturally racist narrative is particularly dangerous as it triggers cultural nationalism among SSH scholars, turning them away from otherwise normal international, regional and national developmental processes. Therefore, developmental rhetoric that is based on racist presumptions should be avoided at all costs in regulatory change if R&D resources are to be a) preserved and b) defended from further public and intra-academic slander.

It is widely considered by participants that public issues are usually not addressed publicly by scholars due to: 1) existential fear, 2) laziness or indolence, and 3) the lack of a knowledge-to-policy culture. All three levels of the problem could be

addressed by changing regulatory frameworks: by conforming to stability and predictability principles, by incentives, and by more highly valued policy-oriented outputs in terms of 'points'.

The widespread reluctance regarding the knowledge-to-policy agenda is rationalised by preconceptions about both intra-academic and extra-academic stakeholders. It is recommended that the idiom of critical thinking be rebranded as strategic thinking. As strategic thinking is traditionally reserved for technocrats and international policymakers, if the Serbian SSH community is to be truly invited to change itself, then it should be motivated by incorporating critical thinking into strategic goals. As it would be impossible to harmonise all the critical voices into a single platform, due to the plurality of research topics, theories, methods, historically differentiated social roles and cultural functions of SSH disciplines, and due to the variety of political and ideological commitments by individual researchers, it is recommended that the knowledge-to-policy agenda be facilitated in multi-layer mode: 1) by establishing public policy institutes for the social sciences and humanities, respectively, 2) by establishing applied social science and applied humanities study programs at all university levels, and 3) by establishing more politically and ideologically oriented institutes, even as political party institutes (as in Germany, for instance), in order to substantiate policymaking with academic inputs.

Although the means of addressing these recommendations are manifold, there is one constant trait that continually arises, both in the participants' perceptions and in analyses by scholars interested in regulatory change – the academic sector must not be governed by unacademic means. The introduction of academically founded academic governance would surely stand for social innovation.

This research has shown that SSH scholars rank among vulnerable social groups, although many of them do not perceive their position that way. As with other excluded communities, the probability of the development of fundamentalist or extremist views (nationalistic, antidemocratic, anti-immigrant, antisocial, etc.) is relatively high. Urgent preventive work is needed, as anti-reformist and anti-European sentiment is rising. Both

standard and contextually-sensitive empowerment measures are highly recommended, as already suggested in the sub-section emphasising potential moves by PERFORM.

In relation to the issue of public misconceptions about academia in general and SSH in particular, it should be noted that many disciplines, mainly from the arts and humanities cluster (ethnology with cultural anthropology, archaeology, history of arts etc.) are not present in elementary and high school curricula. Although it is not expected that they be readily introduced into curricula as separate subjects, an introduction of trans-disciplinary subjects, such as the Cultural Heritage of the World, the Cultural Heritage of Serbia and the Cultural Heritage of the Balkans and Mediterranean, should be considered. The same goes for other underrepresented social sciences such as economics, demography or political science. Facilitating a Taskforce for the introduction of underrepresented SSH into curricula is recommended. Such an intervention would certainly enhance efforts toward the social promotion of sociocultural research and its cultural functions, as especially underlined by scholars from minority communities.

Other issues were noted during the research, such as the misclassification of certain disciplines into STEM fields; i.e., social geography or the history and theory of architecture. The complete exclusion of certain disciplines from official classification, such as art theory or communication and cultural studies, is another example of the systematic underrepresentation of SSH in the current system. The fact that whole scientific disciplines are not even mentioned in the existing regulations points to the fact that there is more than bitterness for some SSH scholars, considering the behaviour of STEM-rooted science administrators as "unprofessional," "dishonest," and "shameful." This type of discourse clearly suggests that a rift of such intensity should be dealt with carefully and with the public interest in mind. Therefore, the establishment of a taskforce for the legal harmonisation of research and higher education regulation with the legal framework at national and international level is recommended.

It is also recommended that public policy research institutes be established at state and regional/city levels, both as stand-

alone institutions and within established universities. Many SSH scholars who would normally be ready to engage in applied research are unwilling to move if not guaranteed the same position they currently hold, so this type of formal employment is preferrable to the occasional commissioning of policy research. The lesser standing of applied research to fundamental, more traditional modes of scholarship presents serious obstacles to experienced or mid-career scholars engaging without reservations. Establishing policy research institute(s) would certainly help legitimise policy research as academic in its own right. The development of applied SSH chairs or departments would be an asset to this goal, with sponsored professorships and research positions as a preferable option. In order for these appointments to be more attractive for established researchers, sponsorships should not be confined to the private sector but open to public institutions, foundations, endowments and local governments. A Science for Society Network may be instituted towards that goal, with well-positioned offices, preferably within institutions such as the National Assembly, Chamber of Commerce, Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities and the like.

The intra-academic perception of applied science as "barely scientific", "politically driven", "NGO science", "unobjective" or even "undignified" could be also transformed by establishing a Permanent Seminar in Knowledge-to-Policy, through which to share comparative experiences from societies in which such ways of thinking have been normalised, by accomplished policy scholars, policymakers and policy facilitators working for international organisations in Serbia and throughout the region. PERFORM is strongly encouraged to host this unusual yet much-needed platform.

***

This analysis could be considered a collective voice for SSH scholars, a warning of the grave consequences of mid-2000s administrative innovation (i.e., the application of STEM-derived indicators and concepts to the entire Serbian academic and higher education system). And it should not be ignored. Striking similarities in that regard among interviewees coming

from various disciplines and research institutions, different in age and ethnicity, and in regional background, call for immediate intervention.

The last two years have witnessed some progress, with the ministry opening up, albeit slowly, to the idea of the diversification of criteria for research assessment in STEM and SSH. The regulatory process on criteria for the promotion of researchers and professors, accreditation standards for study programs and for institutions, and other bylaw options, seem to be absorbing some of the recommendations outlined.[3] These recent developments have brought some hope to the community but, bearing in mind the grave and resilient distrust, it is too early to comment on whether there is room for hope. However, it is proposed that this momentum be grasped and regulatory change commenced immediately, either by the complete separation of academic field management in the forthcoming legislative reform or by implementing a fine-tuning of policy options recommended. One or other of these options seems a necessary prerequisite for establishing an assessment environment in which a forthcoming social impact-oriented academy would be seen as possible, legitimate and something to strive for.

We, as a community of SSH scholars, hoped for changes to take place immediately, starting with the establishment of the Serbian Science Fund in 2019. However, their first call opened for all academic fields (called PROMIS, aimed at funding projects proposed by promising young researchers) began with applicants frequently reporting that they were brought on false pretences, with social science and humanities project proposals in particular receiving incompetent and even malicious reviews. The scholar's perception of this newest type of possible academic policy malversation would hopefully form the data pool for the next analysis.

3 All of the Serbian bylaws can be found at: www.propisi.net and www.paragraf.rs.

REFERENCES

Aagaard, Kaare, Carter Bloch and Jesper W. Schneider. 2015. Impacts of performance-based research funding systems: The case of the Norwegian Publication Indicator. *Research Evaluation* 24(1): 106–117

Aksnes, Dag .W and Randi Elisabeth Taxt. 2004. Peer reviews and bibliometric indicators: a comparative study at a Norwegian university. *Research Evaluation* 13(1): 33–41.

Basso, Antonella et al. 2016. The role of books in non-bibliometric areas. ANVUR Working paper 2017/02. Roma: Agenzia Nazionale per la Valutazione del sistema Universitario e della Ricerca. http://www.anvur.org/attachments/article/1195/WPS%20201702-ROBINBA.pdf.

Baćević, Jana. 2006. Od trga do tržnice: antropologija, kritike savremenog obrazovanja, i njihov značaj za Srbiju (From Public Place to Market-Place: Anthropology, Critiques of Contemporary Education, and its Meaning in Serbia). *Etnoantropološki problemi* 1(2): 209–230.

Baćević, Jana. 2010. Masters or servants? Power and discourse in Serbian higher education reform. *Social Anthropology* 18(1): 43–56.

Brujić, Marija. 2016. *Evropeizacija u Srbiji početkom XXI veka: Antropološka analiza sociokulturnih promena u periodu evrointegracija* (The europeanisation of Serbia at the beginning of the 21st century. An anthropological analysis of socio-cultural changes during the process of euro-integration). Etnoantropološki problemi – Monografije, knj. 2. Beograd: Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu i Dosije Studio.

Buela-Casal, Gualberto and Izabela Zych. 2012. What do the scientists think about the Impact Factor? *Scientometrics* 92(2): 281–92.

Burrows, Roger. 2012. Living with the h-index? Metric assemblages in the contemporary academy. *The Sociological Review* 60(2):355–72.

Butler, Linda. 2007. Assessing University Research: A Plea for a Balanced Approach. *Science and Public Policy* 34(8): 565–74.

Chandler, Jon, Jim and Heather Clark. 2002. Stressing Academe: The Wear and Tear of the New Public Management. *Human Relations* 55(9): 1051–1069.

Clegg, Sue. 2008. Academic identities under threat? *British Educational Research Journal* 34 (3): 329–45

Collini, Stefan. 2015. Defending Universities: Argument and Persuasion. *Power and Education* 7(1): 29–33.

Colwell, Rita et al. 2012. *Informing Research Choices: Indicators and Judgment*. The Expert Panel on Science Performance and Research Funding. Ottawa: Council of Canadian Academics. https://cca-reports.ca/reports/informing-research-choices-indicators-and-judgment/.

Craig, Russel, Joel Amernic and Dennis Tourish. 2014. Perverse Audit Culture and Accountability of the Modern Public University. *Financial Accountability and Management* 30(1): 1–24.

Cronin, Blaise and Cassidy R. Sugimoto (eds.). 2014. *Beyond Bibliometrics: Harnessing Multidimensional Indicators of Scholarly Impact*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

de Rijcke, Sarah and Alexander Rushforth. 2015. To Intervene, or Not to Intervene, is that the Question? On the Role of Scientometrics in Research Evaluation. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 66(9):1954–1958.

de Rijcke, Sarah et al. 2016. Evaluation practices and effects of indicators use – a literature review. *Research Evaluation* 25(2): 161–169.

Ejdus, Filip. 2018. Mapping and Analysis of the Social Science Research System in Serbia. https://www.academia.edu/37657575/Mapping_and_Analysis_of_the_Social_Science_Research_System_in_Serbia.

Espeland, Wendy Nelson and Michael Sauder. 2007. Rankings and Reactivity: How Public Measures Recreate Social Worlds. *American Journal of Sociology* 113(1): 1–40.

Gačanović, Ivana. 2009. Antropološke perspektive o/u kulturi revizije (Anthropological perspectives on/in culture of auditing). *Antropologija* 8: 81–97.

Gačanović, Ivana. 2010. Problem globalnog rangiranja univerziteta ili o iskušenjima savremenih visokoobrazovnih sistema (The Question of World University Rankings, Or: On the Challenges Facing Contemporary Higher Education Systems). *Etnoantropološki problemi* 5(2): 185–204.

Gačanović, Ivana. 2019. *Univerzitet i kultura revizije: antropološka analiza* (University and Audit culture: anthropological analysis).

Etnoantropološki problemi – monografije, knj. 14. Beograd: Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu i Dosije studio.

Gavrilović, Ljiljana. 2009. Domaća antropologija na stranim jezicima ili: Dobrovoljna (auto)kolonizacija (Serbian anthropology in foreign languages or: voluntary (self)colonization). *Antropologija* 8: 53–68.

Giminez-Toledo, Elea et al. 2015. "The Evaluation of Scholarly Books as Research Output. Current Developments in Europe". In: A. A. Salah, Y. Tonta, A. A. Akdag Salah, C. Sugimoto, & U. Al (eds.). *Proceedings of the 15th International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics Conference, Istanbul, Turkey, 29th June to 4th July*, pp. 469–476. Istanbul: Bogazici University.

Good practice in the evaluation of researchers and research programmes. Statement by three national academies (Académie des Sciences, Leopoldina and Royal Society)

https://www.leopoldina.org/uploads/tx_leopublication/2017_Statement_3Acad_Evaluation.pdf

Hammarfelt, Björn and Sarah de Rijcke. 2015. Accountability in Context: Effects of Research Evaluation Systems on Publication Practices, Disciplinary Norms and Individual Working Routines in the Faculty of Arts at Uppsala University. *Research Evaluation* 24(1): 63–77.

Hicks, Diana and Jian Wang. 2009. Towards a Bibliometric Database for the Social Sciences and Humanities. "Towards a bibliometric database for the social sciences and humanities – a European scoping project", Annex 1. Sussex: Science and Technology Policy Research Unit. http://works.bepress.com/diana_hicks/18.

Hicks, Diana. 2004. "Four Literatures of Social Sciences". In: Moed, Henk. F et al. (eds.) *Handbook of Quantitative Science and Technology Research,* pp. 473–496. New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hicks, Diana et al. 2015. The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature* 520: 429–431.

Israel, Mark and Ian Hay 2012. *Research Ethics for Social Scientists*. London: Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Knowles, Caroline and Roger Burrows. 2014. The impact of impact. *Ethnográphica* 18(2): 237–254.

Kovačević, Ivan. 2010. *Antropologija između scijentizma i disolucije* (Anthropology between Scientism and Dissolution). Etnološka

biblioteka, knj. 50. Beograd: Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu i Srpski genealoški centar.

Kovačević, Ivan. 2013. Lažne dileme srpskih društveno-humanističkih naučnika (False dilemmas of Serbian social sciences and humanities). *Antropologija* 13(3): 163–175.

Kovačević, Ivan and Miloš Milenković. 2013. Članak važniji od knjige!? (Article valued more than a book!?). *Etnoantropološki problemi* 8(4): 899–925.

Laudel, Grip. 2006. The art of getting funded: How scientists adapt to their funding conditions. *Science and Public Policy* 33(1): 489–504.

Linkova, Marcela. 2014. Unable to Resist: Researchers' Responses to Research Assessment in the Czech Republic. *Human Affairs* 24(1): 78–88.

Löhkivi, Endla, Katrin Velbaum and Jaana Eigi. 2012. Epistemic Injustice in Researh Evaluation: A Cultural Analysis of the Humanities and Physics in Estonia. *Studia Philosophica Estonica* 5(2): 108–132.

Milenković, Marko and Miloš Milenković. 2013. Administrative reform and debate over public agencies' role in Serbia. *Belgrade Law Review* 61(3): 135–150.

Milenković, Marko and Miloš Milenković. 2013. Serbia and the European Union: Is the "culturalization" of accession criteria on the way? In: Laursen, Finn (ed.) *EU enlargement: current challenges and strategic choices* (Multiple Europes vol. 50), pp. 153–172. Brussels: P.I.E. Peter Lang.

Milenković, Miloš. 2009. O brojanju i merenju (drugih) ljudi (za novac) (On counting and measuring (other) people (for money)). *Anthropologija* 8: 33–52.

Milenković, Miloš. 2010. Ka politici srpske antropologije za XXI vek. . Beograd: Filozofski fakultet i SGC.

Milenković, Miloš. 2014. Antropologija multikulturalizma: Od politike identiteta ka očuvanju kulturnog nasleđa(Anthropology of Multiculturalism: From identity politics to cultural heritage safeguarding). Beograd: Filozofski fakultet i SGC.

Milenković, Miloš. 2016. *Povratak nasleđu: Esej iz primenjene humanistike* (Return to Heritage: An Essay in Applied Humanities). Etnoantropološki problemi – Monografije, knj. 3. Beograd: Odeljenje ze etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu i Dosije studio.

Milenković, Miloš. 2019a. Zaštita manjinskog nematerijalnog kulturnog nasleđa u Republici Srbiji – Prilike i prepreke (Opportunities and obstacles to minority intangible cultural heritage protection in Serbia). In Varady, Tibor ed. *Rights of national minorities under the constitutional system of the Republic of Serbia*), 63–69. Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Milenković, Miloš. 2019b. Inclusive Intangible Cultural Heritage Protection as an Instrument for the Prevention of Identity-Based Conflicts: The Case of Serbia. In. Valery Perry ed. E*xtremism and Violent Extremism in Serbia: 21st Century Manifestations of an Historical Challenge*, 319–352. New York: Ibidem Press.

Milenković, Miloš and Ivan Kovačević. 2014 "No authority without competence. Administrative de-centralization as a foundation of the future of the University of Belgrade", 241–260. In: Mirković and Milenković, eds. 2014.

Mirković, Zoran and Miloš Milenković. eds. 2014. *Vek i po Velike škole u Beogradu* 1863–2013 (University of Belgrade, 1863–2013. Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu.

Mulkay, Michael. 1979. *Science and the sociology of knowledge*. Londo: Boston: G. Allen & Unwin.

Ochsner, Michael, Sven Hug and Ioanna Galleron. 2017. The Future of Research Assesment in the Humanities: Bottom Up Assesment Procedures. *Palgrave Communications* 3(17020): 1–12

Pajić, Dejan and Tanja Jevremov. 2014. Globally national – Locally international: Bibliometric analysis of a SEE psychology journal. *Psihologija* 47(2): 263–277.

Pajić, Dejan. 2015. Globalization of the social sciences in Eastern Europe: Genuine breakthrough or a slippery slope of the research evaluation practice? *Scientometrics* 102(3): 2131–2150.

Pavićević, Aleksandra. 2009. Revizionistička ideološka matrica: Spoljnji ili unutrašnji neprijatelj antropološkog promišljanja stvarnosti (Audit ideological matrix: Outside or inside enemy of anthropological comprehension of reality?). *Antropologija* 8: 69–79.

Petersohn, Sabrina. 2014. Bibliometric Services in Research Evaluation: A New Task Area Strengtening the Jurisdiction of Academic Librarians. *Proceeding of the IATULConference,* Paper 1. http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/iatul/2014/performance/1.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey and Gerald L. Salancik. 2003. *The External Control of Organisations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pinheiro, Rómulo, Paul Benneworth and Glen A. Jones (eds.). 2014. *Universities and Regional Development: A Critical Assessment of Tensions and Contradictions*. London and New York: Routledge.

Power, Michael. 1999. *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Radosevic, Slavo and Benedetto Lepori. 2009. Public Research Funding Systems in Central and Eastern Europe: Between Excellence and Relevance. *Science and Public Policy* 36(9): 659–666.

Sá, Creso M., Andrew Kretz, Kristjan Sigurdson. 2013. Accountability, Performance Assessment, and Evaluation: Policy Pressures and Responses from Research Councils. *Research Evaluation* 22(2): 105–17.

Scheffler, Israel. 1967. *Science and Subjectitvity*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

Shore, Chris. 2008. Audit culture and illiberal governance: Universities and the politics of accountability. *Anthropological Theory* 8(3): 278–98.

Shore, Chris. 2010. Beyond the Multiversity: Neoliberalism and the Rise of the Schizophrenic University. *Social Anthropology* 18(1): 15–29.

Shore, Chris and Stephen Roberts. 1995. Higher Education and the Panopticon Paradigm: Quality Assurance as Disciplinary Technology. *Higher Education Review* 27(3): 8–17

Shore, Chris and Susan Wright. 1999. Audit Culture and Anthropology: Neo-Liberalism in British Higher Education. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 5(4): 557–575.

Shore, Chris and Susan Wright. 2015. Governing by numbers: audit culture, rankings and the new world order. *Social Anthropology* 23(1): 22–28.

Strathern, Marilyn. 1996. From Improvement to Enhancement: an Anthropological Comment on the Audit Culture. *Cambridge Anthropology* 19(3): 1–21.

Strathern, Marylin ed. 2000. *Audit cultures: Anthropological studies in accountability, ethics and the academy*. European Association of Social Anthropologists. London and New York: Routledge.

Thompson, Jennifer Wolfe. 2002. The Death of the Scholarly Monograph in the Humanities? *Libri* 52: 121–136.

Urošević, Branko and Dušan Pavlović. 2013. Istraživanja u društvenim naukama u Srbiji posle 1990. godine (Social science research in Serbia after 1990.). *Političke perspektive* 3(2): 103–128.

Van Dalen, Hendrik P. and Kène Henkens. 2012. Intended and Unintended Consequences of a Publish-or-Perish Culture: A Worldwide Survey. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 63(7): 1282–1293.

Van Noorden, Richard. 2010. Metrics: A Profusion of Measures. *Nature* 465: 864–866.

Whitley, Richard and Jochen Gläser (eds.). 2007. *The Changing Governance of the Sciences: The Advent of Research Evaluation Systems* (Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook Vol. 26). Dordrecht: Springer.

Williams, Peter et al. 2009. The role and future of the monograph in arts and the humanities research. *Aslib Proceedings* 61(1): 67–82.

Woelert, Peter. 2013. The "Economy of Memory": Publications, Citations, and the Paradox of Effective Research Governance. *Minerva* 51(3): 341–62.

Wouters, Paul. 2014. "The Citation: From Culture to Infrastructure". In: Blaise Cronin and Cassidy R. Sugimoto (eds.) *Beyond Bibliometrics: Harnessing Multidimensional Indicators of Scholarly Impact*, pp. 47–66. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Wouter, Paul. 2014b. A key challenge: the evaluation gap. https://citationculture.wordpress.com/2014/08/28/a-key-challenge-the-evaluation-gap/.

Žikić, Bojan. 2009. „Druga strana revizorske kulture: Studija primera odnosa obaveza i opterećenja univerzitetskih nastavnika" (The other side of audit culture: Case study of obligations and duties of university professors). *Antropologija* 8: 99–120.

Žikić, Bojan. 2013. *Slike u izlogu: kulturne predstave o Evropskoj uniji kao sredstvo opisivanja paralelne stvarnosti stanju u Srbiji* 1991–2011 (Shop window reflections: cultural notions of EU as a tool for representing the reality comprehended as parallel to the one of Serbia 1991–2011). Etnološka biblioteka, knj. 70. Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar i Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu.

ANNEXES

SAN FRANCISCO DECLARATION ON RESEARCH ASSESSMENT

Putting science into the assessment of research

There is a pressing need to improve the ways in which the output of scientific research is evaluated by funding agencies, academic institutions, and other parties.

To address this issue, a group of editors and publishers of scholarly journals met during the Annual Meeting of The American Society for Cell Biology (ASCB) in San Francisco, CA, on December 16, 2012. The group developed a set of recommendations, referred to as the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment.[4] We invite interested parties across all scientific disciplines to indicate their support by adding their names to this Declaration.

The outputs from scientific research are many and varied, including: research articles reporting new knowledge, data, reagents, and software; intellectual property; and highly trained young scientists. Funding agencies, institutions that employ scientists, and scientists themselves, all have a desire, and need, to assess the quality and impact of scientific outputs. It is thus imperative that scientific output is measured accurately and evaluated wisely.

The Journal Impact Factor is frequently used as the primary parameter with which to compare the scientific output of individuals and institutions. The Journal Impact Factor, as calculated by Thomson Reuters,* was originally created as a tool to help

4 https://sfdora.org/

librarians identify journals to purchase, not as a measure of the scientific quality of research in an article. With that in mind, it is critical to understand that the Journal Impact Factor has a number of well-documented deficiencies as a tool for research assessment. These limitations include: A) citation distributions within journals are highly skewed [1–3]; B) the properties of the Journal Impact Factor are field-specific: it is a composite of multiple, highly diverse article types, including primary research papers and reviews [1, 4]; C) Journal Impact Factors can be manipulated (or "gamed") by editorial policy [5]; and D) data used to calculate the Journal Impact Factors are neither transparent nor openly available to the public [4, 6, 7].

Below we make a number of recommendations for improving the way in which the quality of research output is evaluated. Outputs other than research articles will grow in importance in assessing research effectiveness in the future, but the peer-reviewed research paper will remain a central research output that informs research assessment. Our recommendations therefore focus primarily on practices relating to research articles published in peer-reviewed journals but can and should be extended by recognizing additional products, such as datasets, as important research outputs. These recommendations are aimed at funding agencies, academic institutions, journals, organizations that supply metrics, and individual researchers.

A number of themes run through these recommendations:

– the need to eliminate the use of journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, in funding, appointment, and promotion considerations. the need to assess research on its own merits rather than on the basis of the journal in which the research is published, and the need to capitalize on the opportunities provided by online publication (such as relaxing unnecessary limits on the number of words, figures, and references in articles, and exploring new indicators of significance and impact)

We recognize that many funding agencies, institutions, publishers, and researchers are already encouraging improved

practices in research assessment. Such steps are beginning to increase the momentum toward more sophisticated and meaningful approaches to research evaluation that can now be built upon and adopted by all of the key constituencies involved.

The signatories of the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment support the adoption of the following practices in research assessment.

General Recommendation

1. Do not use journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, as a surrogate measure of the quality of individual research articles, to assess an individual scientist's contributions, or in hiring, promotion, or funding decisions.

For funding agencies

2. Be explicit about the criteria used in evaluating the scientific productivity of grant applicants and clearly highlight, especially for early-stage investigators, that the scientific content of a paper is much more important than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published.

3. For the purposes of research assessment, consider the value and impact of all research outputs (including datasets and software) in addition to research publications, and consider a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice.

For institutions

4. Be explicit about the criteria used to reach hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions, clearly highlighting, especially for early-stage investigators, that the scientific content of a paper is much more important than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published.

5. For the purposes of research assessment, consider the value and impact of all research outputs (including datasets and

software) in addition to research publications, and consider a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice.

For publishers

6. Greatly reduce emphasis on the journal impact factor as a promotional tool, ideally by ceasing to promote the impact factor or by presenting the metric in the context of a variety of journal-based metrics (e.g., 5-year impact factor, EigenFactor [8], SCImago [9], h-index, editorial and publication times, etc.) that provide a richer view of journal performance.

7. Make available a range of article-level metrics to encourage a shift toward assessment based on the scientific content of an article rather than publication metrics of the journal in which it was published.

8. Encourage responsible authorship practices and the provision of information about the specific contributions of each author.

9. Whether a journal is open-access or subscription-based, remove all reuse limitations on reference lists in research articles and make them available under the Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication [10].

10. Remove or reduce the constraints on the number of references in research articles, and, where appropriate, mandate the citation of primary literature in favor of reviews in order to give credit to the group(s) who first reported a finding.

For organizations that supply metrics

11. Be open and transparent by providing data and methods used to calculate all metrics.

12. Provide the data under a licence that allows unrestricted reuse, and provide computational access to data, where possible.

13. Be clear that inappropriate manipulation of metrics will not be tolerated; be explicit about what constitutes inappropriate manipulation and what measures will be taken to combat this.

14. Account for the variation in article types (e.g., reviews versus research articles), and in different subject areas when metrics are used, aggregated, or compared.

For researchers

15. When involved in committees making decisions about funding, hiring, tenure, or promotion, make assessments based on scientific content rather than publication metrics.

16. Wherever appropriate, cite primary literature in which observations are first reported rather than reviews in order to give credit where credit is due.

17. Use a range of article metrics and indicators on personal/supporting statements, as evidence of the impact of individual published articles and other research outputs [11].

18. Challenge research assessment practices that rely inappropriately on Journal Impact Factors and promote and teach best practice that focuses on the value and influence of specific research outputs.

References

1. Adler, R., Ewing, J., and Taylor, P. (2008) Citation statistics. A report from the International Mathematical Union. www.mathunion.org/publications/report/citationstatistics0
2. Seglen, P.O. (1997) Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research. BMJ 314, 498–502.
3. Editorial (2005). Not so deep impact. Nature 435, 1003–1004. 4. Vanclay, J.K. (2012) Impact Factor: Outdated artefact or stepping-stone to journal certification. Scientometric 92, 211–238.
5. The PLoS Medicine Editors (2006). The impact factor game. PLoS Med 3(6): e291 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0030291.
6. Rossner, M., Van Epps, H., Hill, E. (2007). Show me the data. J. Cell Biol. 179, 1091–1092.
7. Rossner M., Van Epps H., and Hill E. (2008). Irreproducible results: A response to Thomson Scientific. J. Cell Biol. 180, 254–255.
8. http://www.eigenfactor.org/

9. http://www.scimagojr.com/
10. http://opencitations.wordpress.com/2013/01/03/open-letter-to-publishers
11. http://altmetrics.org/tools/

* The Journal Impact Factor is now published by Clarivate Analytics.

Original Signers

Euan Adie, Altmetric LLP Sharon Ahmad, Executive Editor, The Journal of Cell Science Bruce Alberts, Editor-in-Chief, Science Parker Antin, Editor-in Chief, Developmental Dynamics Ellen Bergfeld, American Society of Agronomy, Crop Science Society of America, and Soil Science Society of America Stefano Bertuzzi, Executive Director, American Society for Cell Biology Pete Binfield, Co-Founder and Publisher, PeerJ David Botstein, Founding Editor-in-Chief of Molecular Biology of the Cell; Director Lewis-Sigler Institute for Integrative Genomics, Princeton University Michael Caplan, Yale University Paul Courant, Dean of Libraries and Harold Shapiro Professor of Public Policy, University of Michigan Brendan Crabb, President, Association of Australian Medical Research Institutes; Director, The Burnet Institute, Melbourne Ana-Maria Cuervo, co-Editor-in-Chief of Aging Cell; Professor, Albert Einstein College of Medicine Stephen Curry Tracey dePellegrin, Executive Editor, Genetics Mara Dierssen, President, Spanish Society of Neuroscience

David Drubin, Editor-in-Chief, Molecular Biology of the Cell; Professor, University of California, Berkeley Martha Fedor, Editor-in-Chief, Journal of Biological Chemistry Sir Alan Fersht, FRS, Medical Research Council Laboratory of Molecular Biology László Fésüs, Chairman of Publications Committee, Federation of European Biochemical Societies Toni Gabaldón, Centre for Genomic Regulation Christian Gericke, Associate Editor, BMC Health Services Research; CEO, The Wesley Research Institute Paul A. Gleeson, Head, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, The University of Melbourne Robert Graham, Executive Director, Victor Chang Cardiac Research Institute Petra Gross, Reviews Editor, Journal of Cell Science Peter Gunning, President, American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; Editor-In-Chief, BioArchitecture Lisa Hannan, Managing Editor,Traffic Brian Hoal, Society of Economic Geologists Jason Hoyt, Co-Founder and CEO, PeerJ Phil Hurst, Publisher, Royal Society (UK) Paul Hutchinson Reinhard Jahn, Department of Neurobiology, MPI for Bio-

physical Chemistry; EMBO Publications Advisory Committee (chair); EMBL Scientific Advisory Board (vice chair); Dean, Göttingen Graduate School for Neurosciences, Biophysics, and Molecular Biosciences David James, Director Diabetes and Obesity Program, Garvan Institute of Medical Research Mark Johnston, Editor-in-Chief of GENETICS; Professor and Chair, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Genetics, the University of Colorado School of Medicine Kozo Kaibuchi, Editor-in-Chief of Cell Structures and Functions (the official journal of the Japanese Society for Cell Biology) Karl Kuchler, Medical University Vienna, Max F. Perutz Laboratories Pekka Lappalainen, Research Director, Institute of Biotechnology, University of Finland W. Mark Leader, Publications Director, American Society for Cell Biology Daniel Louvard, Director of the Research Centre Institut Curie Vivek Malhotra, Centre for Genomic Regulation, Barcelona, Spain Michael Marks, Co-editor, Traffic; Professor, University of Pennsylvania Mark Marsh, Co-editor, Traffic Thomas Marwick, Director, Menzies Research Institute Tasmania Paul Matsudaira, National University of Singapore Satyajit Mayor, Director, National Centre for Biological Science, Bangalore, India Tom Misteli, Editor-in-Chief, Journal of Cell Biology Lucia Monaco, Italian Telethon Foundation Eric Murphy, Editor-in-Chief, Lipids, a Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society Mark Patterson, Executive Director, eLife Olivier Pourquie, Université de Strasbourg Jason Priem, ImpactStory Bernd Pulverer, Chief Editor of The EMBO Journal; and Head of Scientific Publications, EMBO Jordan Raff, President of the British Society of Cell Biology, Editor-in-Chief of Biology Open Brian Ray, Senior Editor, Science Magazine; Founding Editor, Science Signaling

Francisco X. Real, Spanish National Cancer Research Center and Universitat Pompeu Fabra Alyson Reed, Executive Director, Linguistic Society of America Phillip J. Robinson, Head, Cell Signalling Unit, Children's Medical Research Institute Michael Rossner, Executive Director, The Rockefeller University Press Jean-Louis Salager, Editor-in-Chief, Journal of Surfactants and Detergents Randy Schekman, Editor-in-Chief, eLife Sandra Schmid, former editor, Molecular Biology of the Cell and Traffic Michael Sheetz, Director and Principal Investigator, The Mechanobiology Institute, Singapore Robert Shepherd, Director, Bionics Institute, University of Melbourne Stuart Shieber, Harvard University Michele Solimena, Max Planck Institute, Dresden, Germany Tom Stevens, co-Editor,Traffic; Professor, University of Oregon Jennifer L. Stow, Deputy Director, Research, Institute for Molecular Bioscience, The University of Queensland Robert Tjian, President,

Howard Hughes Medical Institute Gerrit van Meer, Dean of the Faculty of Sciences, Utrecht University Michael Way, Editor-in-Chief, Journal of Cell Science Liz Williams, Executive Editor, The Journal of Cell Biology Mitsuhiro Yanagida, Editor-in-Chief, Genes to Cells Alpha Yap, Head, Division of Molecular Cell Biology, Institute for Molecular Bioscience Marino Zerial, Max Planck Director, Max Planck Institute of Molecular Cell Biology and Genetics, Dresden Ya-ping Zhang, Vice-President of the Chinese Academy of Sciences

THE LEIDEN MANIFESTO FOR RESEARCH METRICS

Data are increasingly used to govern science. Research evaluations that were once bespoke and performed by peers are now routine and reliant on metrics[1]. The problem is that evaluation is now led by the data rather than by judgement. Metrics have proliferated: usually well intentioned, not always well informed, often ill applied. We risk damaging the system with the very tools designed to improve it, as evaluation is increasingly implemented by organizations without knowledge of, or advice on, good practice and interpretation.

Before 2000, there was the Science Citation Index on CD-ROM from the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), used by experts for specialist analyses. In 2002, Thomson Reuters launched an integrated web platform, making the Web of Science database widely accessible. Competing citation indices were created: Elsevier's Scopus (released in 2004) and Google Scholar (beta version released in 2004). Web-based tools to easily compare institutional research productivity and impact were introduced, such as InCites (using the Web of Science) and SciVal (using Scopus), as well as software to analyse individual citation profiles using Google Scholar (Publish or Perish, released in 2007).

In 2005, Jorge Hirsch, a physicist at the University of California, San Diego, proposed the *h*-index, popularizing citation counting for individual researchers. Interest in the journal impact factor grew steadily after 1995 (see 'Impact-factor obsession').

Lately, metrics related to social usage and online comment have gained momentum — F1000Prime was established in 2002, Mendeley in 2008, and Altmetric.com (supported by Macmillan

Science and Education, which owns Nature Publishing Group) in 2011.

As scientometricians, social scientists and research administrators, we have watched with increasing alarm the pervasive misapplication of indicators to the evaluation of scientific performance. The following are just a few of numerous examples. Across the world, universities have become obsessed with their position in global rankings (such as the Shanghai Ranking and *Times Higher Education*'s list), even when such lists are based on what are, in our view, inaccurate data and arbitrary indicators.

Some recruiters request *h*-index values for candidates. Several universities base promotion decisions on threshold *h*-index values and on the number of articles in 'high-impact' journals. Researchers' CVs have become opportunities to boast about these scores, notably in biomedicine. Everywhere, supervisors ask PhD students to publish in high-impact journals and acquire external funding before they are ready.

In Scandinavia and China, some universities allocate research funding or bonuses on the basis of a number: for example, by calculating individual impact scores to allocate 'performance resources' or by giving researchers a bonus for a publication in a journal with an impact factor higher than 15 (ref. 2).

In many cases, researchers and evaluators still exert balanced judgement. Yet the abuse of research metrics has become too widespread to ignore.

We therefore present the Leiden Manifesto, named after the conference at which it crystallized (see http://sti2014.cwts.nl). Its ten principles are not news to scientometricians, although none of us would be able to recite them in their entirety because codification has been lacking until now. Luminaries in the field, such as Eugene Garfield (founder of the ISI), are on record stating some of these principles[3, 4]. But they are not in the room when evaluators report back to university administrators who are not expert in the relevant methodology. Scientists searching for literature with which to contest an evaluation find the material scattered in what are, to them, obscure journals to which they lack access.

We offer this distillation of best practice in metrics-based research assessment so that researchers can hold evaluators to account, and evaluators can hold their indicators to account.

Ten principles

1) Quantitative evaluation should support qualitative, expert assessment. Quantitative metrics can challenge bias tendencies in peer review and facilitate deliberation. This should strengthen peer review, because making judgements about colleagues is difficult without a range of relevant information. However, assessors must not be tempted to cede decision-making to the numbers. Indicators must not substitute for informed judgement. Everyone retains responsibility for their assessments.

2) Measure performance against the research missions of the institution, group or researcher. Programme goals should be stated at the start, and the indicators used to evaluate performance should relate clearly to those goals. The choice of indicators, and the ways in which they are used, should take into account the wider socio-economic and cultural contexts. Scientists have diverse research missions. Research that advances the frontiers of academic knowledge differs from research that is focused on delivering solutions to societal problems. Review may be based on merits relevant to policy, industry or the public rather than on academic ideas of excellence. No single evaluation model applies to all contexts.

3) Protect excellence in locally relevant research. In many parts of the world, research excellence is equated with English-language publication. Spanish law, for example, states the desirability of Spanish scholars publishing in high-impact journals. The impact factor is calculated for journals indexed in the US-based and still mostly English-language Web of Science. These biases are particularly problematic in the social sciences and humanities, in which research is more regionally and nationally engaged. Many other fields have a national or regional dimension — for instance, HIV epidemiology in sub-Saharan Africa.

This pluralism and societal relevance tends to be suppressed to create papers of interest to the gatekeepers of high impact: English-language journals. The Spanish sociologists that are highly cited in the Web of Science have worked on abstract models or study US data. Lost is the specificity of sociologists in high-impact Spanish-language papers: topics such as local labour law, family health care for the elderly or immigrant employment[5]. Metrics built on high-quality non-English literature would serve to identify and reward excellence in locally relevant research.

4) Keep data collection and analytical processes open, transparent and simple. The construction of the databases required for evaluation should follow clearly stated rules, set before the research has been completed. This was common practice among the academic and commercial groups that built bibliometric evaluation methodology over several decades. Those groups referenced protocols published in the peer-reviewed literature. This transparency enabled scrutiny. For example, in 2010, public debate on the technical properties of an important indicator used by one of our groups (the Centre for Science and Technology Studies at Leiden University in the Netherlands) led to a revision in the calculation of this indicator[6]. Recent commercial entrants should be held to the same standards; no one should accept a black-box evaluation machine.

Simplicity is a virtue in an indicator because it enhances transparency. But simplistic metrics can distort the record (see principle 7). Evaluators must strive for balance — simple indicators true to the complexity of the research process.

5) Allow those evaluated to verify data and analysis. To ensure data quality, all researchers included in bibliometric studies should be able to check that their outputs have been correctly identified. Everyone directing and managing evaluation processes should assure data accuracy, through self-verification or third-party audit. Universities could implement this in their research information systems and it should be a guiding principle in the selection of providers of these systems. Accurate, high-quality data take time and money to collate and process. Budget for it.

6) Account for variation by field in publication and citation practices. Best practice is to select a suite of possible indicators and allow fields to choose among them. A few years ago, a European group of historians received a relatively low rating in a national peer-review assessment because they wrote books rather than articles in journals indexed by the Web of Science. The historians had the misfortune to be part of a psychology department. Historians and social scientists require books and national-language literature to be included in their publication counts; computer scientists require conference papers be counted.

Citation rates vary by field: top-ranked journals in mathematics have impact factors of around 3; top-ranked journals in cell biology have impact factors of about 30. Normalized indicators are required, and the most robust normalization method is based on percentiles: each paper is weighted on the basis of the percentile to which it belongs in the citation distribution of its field (the top 1%, 10% or 20%, for example). A single highly cited publication slightly improves the position of a university in a ranking that is based on percentile indicators, but may propel the university from the middle to the top of a ranking built on citation averages[7].

7) Base assessment of individual researchers on a qualitative judgement of their portfolio. The older you are, the higher your *h*-index, even in the absence of new papers. The *h*-index varies by field: life scientists top out at 200; physicists at 100 and social scientists at 20–30 (ref. 8). It is database dependent: there are researchers in computer science who have an *h*-index of around 10 in the Web of Science but of 20–30 in Google Scholar[9]. Reading and judging a researcher's work is much more appropriate than relying on one number. Even when comparing large numbers of researchers, an approach that considers more information about an individual's expertise, experience, activities and influence is best.

8) Avoid misplaced concreteness and false precision. Science and technology indicators are prone to conceptual ambiguity and uncertainty and require strong assumptions that are not universally accepted. The meaning of citation counts, for example, has long been debated. Thus, best practice uses multi-

ple indicators to provide a more robust and pluralistic picture. If uncertainty and error can be quantified, for instance using error bars, this information should accompany published indicator values. If this is not possible, indicator producers should at least avoid false precision. For example, the journal impact factor is published to three decimal places to avoid ties. However, given the conceptual ambiguity and random variability of citation counts, it makes no sense to distinguish between journals on the basis of very small impact factor differences. Avoid false precision: only one decimal is warranted.

9) Recognize the systemic effects of assessment and indicators. Indicators change the system through the incentives they establish. These effects should be anticipated. This means that a suite of indicators is always preferable — a single one will invite gaming and goal displacement (in which the measurement becomes the goal). For example, in the 1990s, Australia funded university research using a formula based largely on the number of papers published by an institute. Universities could calculate the 'value' of a paper in a refereed journal; in 2000, it was Aus$800 (around US$480 in 2000) in research funding. Predictably, the number of papers published by Australian researchers went up, but they were in less-cited journals, suggesting that article quality fell[10].

10) Scrutinize indicators regularly and update them. Research missions and the goals of assessment shift and the research system itself co-evolves. Once-useful metrics become inadequate; new ones emerge. Indicator systems have to be reviewed and perhaps modified. Realizing the effects of its simplistic formula, Australia in 2010 introduced its more complex Excellence in Research for Australia initiative, which emphasizes quality.

Next steps

Abiding by these ten principles, research evaluation can play an important part in the development of science and its interactions with society. Research metrics can provide crucial

information that would be difficult to gather or understand by means of individual expertise. But this quantitative information must not be allowed to morph from an instrument into the goal.

The best decisions are taken by combining robust statistics with sensitivity to the aim and nature of the research that is evaluated. Both quantitative and qualitative evidence are needed; each is objective in its own way. Decision-making about science must be based on high-quality processes that are informed by the highest quality data.

1) Wouters, P. in *Beyond Bibliometrics: Harnessing Multidimensional Indicators of Scholarly Impact* (eds Cronin, B. & Sugimoto, C.) 47–66 (MIT Press, 2014).
2) Shao, J. & Shen, H. *Learned Publ.* 24, 95–97 (2011).
3) Seglen, P. O. *Br. Med. J.* 314, 498–502 (1997).
4) Garfield, E. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 295, 90–93 (2006).
5) López Piñeiro, C. & Hicks, D. *Res. Eval.* 24, 78–89 (2015).
6) van Raan, A. F. J., van Leeuwen, T. N., Visser, M. S., van Eck, N. J. & Waltman, L. *J. Informetrics* 4, 431–435 (2010).
7) Waltman, L. *et al. J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* 63, 2419–2432 (2012).
8) Hirsch, J. E. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* 102, 16569–16572 (2005).
9) Bar-Ilan, J. *Scientometrics* 74, 257–271 (2008).
10) Butler, L. *Res. Policy* 32, 143–155 (2003).

CHALLENGES OF THE EVALUATION OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH (SSH)

ENRESSH – European Network for Research Evaluation in the SSH

Preamble

ENRESSH gathers leading research evaluation scholars from 35 countries, with the aim to develop appropriate and transparent methods of evaluation for the SSH. This document seeks to establish principles and approaches towards improving research evaluation for the Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH). It lists a number of challenges that are faced in evaluating SSH research. It is based on expert discussions within the COST Action 15137 (ENRESSH), on the stakeholders' meeting organised in Prague in January 2017 and on previous reports and manifestos around research evaluation (Leiden manifesto, HERA report on SSH research evaluation, etc.).

General considerations

We assert that, commensurate with its academic, societal and cultural value, SSH research deserves increased policy attention as well as an evaluation protocol capable of reflecting its potential and value. The Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) are crucial in any society where knowledge and culture are valued. SSH research underpins democracy and deserves to be recognised for its own merits in teaching critical thought, as well as its contribution to the understanding of many modern issues such as economic crisis, migration or conflicts arising from religious, cultural and socio-economic differences. The pre-condi-

tion for any evaluation exercise is to build trust and confidence between the evaluators and the evaluated. At present, scepticism towards evaluation is found among SSH scholars, due to procedures that are ill-adapted or even inappropriate to SSH research paradigms. Many SSH research topics have strong significant societal impacts on the local level, and others need to use vernacular language. For the entire SSH research community, the development of relevant and meaningful benchmarks and indicators is possible, and essential to build confidence, trust and compliance with research evaluation. Where mistrust is found among SSH scholars towards evaluation, it is often related to inappropriate or incomplete communication. We recommend bottom-up discussions providing a large voice for SSH scholars, as well as to relevant societal stakeholders, in order to link evaluation to knowledge production in the evaluated disciplines. We recommend that quality and relevance should not be automatically related to a particular type of publication (i.e. monographs or articles). Instead, all types of outputs in the SSH should be rewarded, according to their scholarly relevance and/or societal impact. This reflects the scholarly consensus that quality comes in many shapes and forms.

The evaluation process should be transparent. This means clearly stating the goals, criteria, quantitative thresholds, consequences and benchmarks for evaluation of both academic quality and societal relevance. A commitment to transparency also requires that outcomes are made publicly available, while respecting individual-level privacy. Finally, more data about SSH research is needed. ENRESSH experts have observed that SSH evaluation is significantly impended by the lack of robust and valid data. Although data is currently being collected (through project evaluation, programme evaluation, institution evaluation, etc.), it is neither harmonised nor complete at the European level.

Improving SSH research evaluation

To address the above challenges, the following principles and recommendations must be considered: 1. SSH diversity must be taken into account in evaluation exercises. SSH research does not follow a single paradigm and is interdisciplinary. • Relate evalu-

ation procedures to the research practices in the respective SSH field. • Design and execute multidimensional/mixed method evaluation paradigms and procedures that admit that no single indicator can capture the value of both scholarly contributions and society-oriented work. • Gain systematic evidence about production, dissemination and impact in the SSH. 2. The quality of peer-review processes for evaluating SSH research must be monitored, and new forms of peer-review that recognise the societal value of SSH research, as well as other important aspects, need to be developed. • Invest in extended forms of review, where different types of expertise are included. • Organise training of professionals in evaluation, involving any necessary knowledge users in the evaluation of social impacts. • Allow for meta-evaluation of assessments where SSH research is involved. 3. Develop databases reflecting all types of SSH research output, interoperable at the European level and useful for researchers as means of dissemination and information retrieval. • Reflect upon the role of national and international authoritative lists of publication channels, and the definition of minimal standards for scholarly publications. • Identify the SSH fields where (alt-)metrics are relevant and appropriate evaluation tools, linked to the research practices in the field. • Where relevant, develop methods for attributing (alt)-metrics to individual publications, and not to the dissemination channel in which they are published.

Next steps

Building new models to judge performance, quality and relevance of SSH research requires further cooperation at national, European and international levels. As a network of experts in SSH research evaluation, ENRESSH is ideally placed to provide further on going expertise and advice to the relevant stakeholders about the implementation of the above recommendations.

STATEMENT BY THREE NATIONAL ACADEMIES (ACADÉMIE DES SCIENCES, LEOPOLDINA AND ROYAL SOCIETY) ON GOOD PRACTICE IN THE EVALUATION OF RESEARCHERS AND RESEARCH PROGRAMMES

1. Introduction

The large increase in the size of the international scientific community, coupled with the desire to ensure the appropriate and efficient use of the substantial funding devoted to supporting scientific research, have understandably led to an increased emphasis on accountability and on the evaluation of both researchers, research activities and research projects (including recruitment, as well as the evaluation of grants and prizes). Given that there is a large diversity of procedures currently used in evaluations which have accumulated over time, it is now necessary to provide some guidelines for best practice in the evaluation of scientific research. Peer review, adhering to strict standards, is widely accepted as by far the best method for research evaluation. In this context, the present statement focuses on the evaluation of individual researchers.

Such an assessment by competent experts should be based on both written (journal articles, reviews, books, book chapters, patents, etc.) and other contributions and indicators of esteem (conference presentations, awards, public engagement activity, peer review activity, datasets shared, seminars, etc.). As a careful evaluation of scientific content and quality by experts is time consuming and costly, the number of evaluations should be limited and only undertaken when necessary, in particular for

decisions on competitive academic appointments or funding large projects.

With the increase in the number of evaluations and the emergence of easily accessible electronic databases, the use of bibliometric measures has become an additional tool. However, there has been too much reliance on bibliometric indices and indicator-based tools as measures of performance by many evaluation committees and exercises, leading to the danger of superficial, over-simplified and unreliable methods of evaluation. This bad practice involving the misuse of metrics has become a cause for serious concern.

Of particular concern are the widely used journal impact factors (IF) which are an estimate of the impact of the journal itself rather than the intrinsic scientific quality of a given article published within it – a point that has been made on several occasions and notably in the San Francisco Declaration(1). Outstanding and original work can be found published in journals of low impact factor and the converse is also true. Nevertheless, the use of impact factors as a proxy for the quality of a publication is now common in many disciplines. There is growing concern that such "IF pressure" on authors has increased the incidence of bad practice in research and the 'gaming' of metrics over the past two decades, in particular in those disciplines that have over-emphasized impact factors. Also, the so–called 'altmetrics' – a new form of impact measure – while adding an important and hitherto overlooked dimension to the measurement of impact, suffers from some of the same weaknesses as the existing citation-based metrics.

There is a serious danger that undue emphasis on bibliometric indicators will not only fail to reflect correctly the quality of research, but may also hinder the appreciation of the work of excellent scientists outside the mainstream; it will also tend to promote those who follow current or fashionable research trends, rather than those whose work is highly novel and which might produce completely new directions of scientific research. Moreover, overreliance on citations as a measure of quality may encourage the formation of aggregates of researchers (or "citation clubs") who boost each others citation metrics by mutual

citation. It thus becomes important to concentrate on better methods of evaluation, which promote good and innovative scientific research.

2. Principles of good practice in the evaluation of researchers and research activities

Essential elements for the evaluation of researchers can be summarized as follows:

2.1. Selection of evaluation procedures and evaluators

Evaluators Since the evaluation of research by peers is the essential process by which its quality and originality can be estimated, it is crucial to ensure that the evaluators themselves adhere to the highest standards and are leaders in their field. The selection of evaluators should be based on their scientific excellence and integrity. Their scientific achievements should be widely recognised and their curriculum vitae and research achievements should be easily accessible. Such an open process will ensure the credibility and transparency of the evaluations.

Evaluation processes Since the number of excellent evaluators is limited, the number of evaluation processes should be reduced in order to avoid over-use of first-class evaluators. There is a concern that different agencies and institutions have carried out an excessive number of routine evaluations over the last decades, putting too much pressure on the best evaluators. First-rate evaluators are increasingly reluctant to commit to time-consuming and unproductive evaluation exercises. It is of great importance to reduce the number of evaluations and to confine them to the core issues of research that only peers are able to judge. Evaluators provide a "free resource" as part of their academic duty and this resource is over-exploited. Evaluating bodies must recognise that good evaluation is a limited and precious resource. A page limit for submissions to all evaluation processes is needed. Excessively long submissions are coun-

ter-productive: evaluators need to be able to concentrate on the essentials, which is problematic with very lengthy submissions. Rotation of evaluators is essential to avoid excessive or repeated influence from the same opinion leaders. The panel of experts should be adapted to reflect the diversity of disciplines or scientific domains. Although gender and geographical distribution will be factors in the selection of evaluating groups, excellence must remain the primary criterion.

2.2. Ethical guidelines and duties of evaluators

Evaluators should clearly declare possible conflicts of interest before the evaluation process. The confidentiality of expert reviews and of the discussions in the evaluation panel must be strictly respected to protect both the evaluators and the evaluated persons.

While reviewers have often learned the practice of evaluation by experience and selfteaching, this competence cannot be taken as given. Methods and approaches to evaluating and reviewing should become part of all researchers' competence as should the ethical principles involved. Evaluators should be made aware of the dangers of "unconscious bias". There should, as far as possible, be equivalent standards and procedures for all research disciplines.

The evaluation procedures must also include mechanisms to identify the cases of biased or otherwise inappropriate reviews and exclude them from consideration.

2.3. Evaluation criteria

Evaluations must be based under all circumstances on expert assessment of scientific content, quality and excellence. Publications that are identified by the authors as their most important work, including major articles and books, should receive particular attention in the evaluation. The simple number of publications should not be a dominant criterion.

Impact factors of journals should not be considered in evaluating research outputs. Bibliometric indicators such as the widely used H index or numbers of citations (per article or per

year) should only be interpreted by scientific experts able to put these values within the context of each scientific discipline. The source of these bibliometric indicators must be given and checks should be made to ensure their accuracy by comparison to rival sources of bibliometric information. The use of bibliometric indicators should only be considered as auxiliary information to supplement peer review, not a substitute for it. The use of bibliometric indicators for early career scientists must in particular be avoided. Such use will tend to push scientists who are building their career into well established/fashionable research fields, rather than encouraging them to tackle new scientific challenges.

For patents a clear distinction should be made between the stages of application, delivery and licensing.

Success in raising research grant funding should, where relevant, be only one and not the dominant factor in assessing research performance. The main criteria must be the quality, originality and importance of the scientific research.

3. Short summary of the main recommendations

Evaluation requires peer review by acknowledged experts working to the highest ethical standards and focusing on intellectual merits and scientific achievements. Bibliometric data cannot be used as a proxy for expert assessment. Well-founded judgment is essential. Overemphasis on such metrics may seriously damage scientific creativity and originality. Expert peer review should be treated as a valuable resource.

HELSINKI INITIATIVE ON MULTILINGUALISM IN SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

Research is international. That's the way we like it!

Multilingualism keeps locally relevant research alive. Protect it!

Disseminating research results in your own language creates impact.

Endorse it! It is vital to interact with society and share knowledge beyond academia. Promote it!

Infrastructure of scholarly communication in national languages is fragile. Don't lose it!

The signatories of the Helsinki Initiative on Multilingualism in Scholarly Communication support the following recommendations to be adopted by policy-makers, leaders, universities, research institutions, research funders, libraries, and researchers:

1. **Support dissemination of research results for the full benefit of the society.**
    - Make sure researchers are merited for disseminating research results beyond academia and for interacting with heritage, culture, and society.
    - Make sure equal access to researched knowledge is provided in a variety of languages.

2. **Protect national infrastructures for publishing locally relevant research.**
    - Make sure not-for-profit journals and book publishers have both sufficient resources and the support needed to maintain high standards of quality control and research integrity.

- Make sure national journals and book publishers are safeguarded in their transition to open access.

3. Promote language diversity in research assessment, evaluation, and funding systems.

- Make sure that in the process of expert-based evaluation, high quality research is valued regardless of the publishing language or publication channel.
- Make sure that when metrics-based systems are utilized, journal and book publications in all languages are adequately taken into account.

Helsinki Initiative on Multilingualism in Scholarly Communication has been prepared by the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV), the Committee for Public Information (TJNK), the Finnish Association for Scholarly Publishing, Universities Norway (UHR) and the COST Action "European Network for Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and the Humanities" (ENRESSH).

РЕЗИМЕ „У ИМЕ“ ЕВРОПЕ

Контраиндикације критеријума вредновања друштвено-хуманистичких наука (у Србији)

Основни циљ овог антрополошког квалитативног истраживања, недавно спроведеног међу српским друштвено-хуманистичким (ДХ) научницима, био је да се установи (само)перцепција њихове друштвене улоге и утицаја у односу на важеће критеријуме и поступке вредновања истраживања. Налази показују да они постојећи систем вредновања, развијен за потребе и у складу с интересима других научних поља, доживљавају као осујећујући, увредљив, друштвено штетан, антиевропски, псеудокосмополитски, антинаучан, антинационалан, па и примитиван.

Међу њима преовлађују изразито негативни ставови према форми и садржају реформи предузетих у овом веку у сектору науке и високог образовања, под различитим владама. Истраживање је потврдило основну хипотезу – да ДХ научници и институције матичне за њихове области неће одиграти улогу какву им стратешка документа и закони предодређују (унапређење доношења државних одлука, подршка реформским процесима у друштву, очување културно-историјског наслеђа, развој међукултурне толеранције, постконфликтна стабилизација, развој демократског друштва заснованог на владавини права и сл.), а ратификоване међународне конвенције и Устав гарантују, док год не поврате изгубљени углед и унутар и изван саме академске заједнице. Они сматрају да се у таквој позицији налазе услед системског, стратешког дерогирања од стране колега из других научних поља који чине већину у телима која доносе одлуке у области научне и високообразовне политике.

У популацији ДХ научника приметни су не само незадовољство и жеља да колеге из других научних поља едукују о прикладним алатима за вредновање истраживања, него и разочараност, бес па и спремност да се остатак академске заједнице некако „казни“ за начињену штету. Овај налаз не иде у прилог оптимизму с којим се настављају реформе у сектору високог образовања, науке и истраживања, као и иновација и развоја. Напротив, делује да ће наставак инсистирања на, у међународним научним круговима напуштеним сцијентометријским критеријума поимања и вредновања науке, довести до још штетнијих последица од оних до данас изазваних реформом. Давање предности технолошком концепту развоја занемарило је културне функције науке, а друштвено-хуманистичких наука посебно, креирајући друштвено, политички и економски штетне последице.

Имајући у виду да се у Републици Србији примењују углавном напуштени стандардни вредновања истраживања, засновани на сцијентометрији, резултати овог истраживања могу бити употребљени за потребе унапређивања домаћег система вредновања истраживања, ради његовог приближавања европским стандардима.

***

Основне карактеристике истраживања. Аутор је комбиновао а) историјско-теоријско, б) квалитативно теренско истраживање, в) анализу докумената и г) учествовање у административним праксама у области управљања науком. Емпиријски део истраживања био је „мултитеренски“ – истраживање које „прати“ дефинисани проблем на више локација, међу многим актерима, у различитим контекстима и током дужег временског периода. Током њега су изведени индивидуални и фокус-групни интервјуи са преко 100 испитаника, професора и истраживача из бројних области ДХН, у 5 академских центара (Београду, Новом Саду, Нишу, Крагујевцу и Новом Пазару). Испитаници су били окупљени по 4 различита критеријума: 1) истраживачи-доносиоци одлука (тренутно или раније на функцијама); 2) млади

истраживачи (до 35 година или до 8 година од одбране докторске дисертације); 3) истраживачи активни у дебатама о научној политици и вредновању науке; 4) истраживачи који нису (били) ни доносиоци одлука ни активни у дебатама о ови темама. Идентитет испитаника је апсолутно скривен, као што им је на почетку интервјуа и гарантовано, имајући у виду веома висок ризик који учествовање у јавној дебати носи у Србији.

Основне теме интервјуа. Са колегама је разговарано о четири групе тема: 1) Статусу ДХН у академским оквирима; 2) Критеријумима вредновања одн. индикаторима квалитета ДХН; 3) Друштвеном статусу и улози ДХН; 4) Погледима на недавне/најављене промене у научном систему.

Поглед испитаника на статус ДХ поља. Колегинице и колеге махом доживљавају поглед на себе од стране других академских поља као на „децу са посебним потребама" или као на „неразвијене рођаке". У одговорима на ово питање преовлађују резигнираност па и згађеност над „злоупотребом академске аутономије". Испитаници истичу неопходност административне реформе, неопходност поделе надлежности по академским пољима, као и потребу за препознавањем дисциплинарних, регионалних али и мањинских специфичности. Као посебна тема у одговорима се појављује (у међувремену решен) системски проблем неразликовања друштвених наука и хуманистике. Неразликовање и нераздвајање академских и примењених истраживања изазива посебан одијум.

Критеријуми вредновања/индикатори квалитета. Испитаници сматрају да је дуготрајан спор око критеријума вредновања штетан за научну заједницу у целини а посебно за њен углед изван академије. Они истичу да и на плану методологије и на плану друштвене улоге и на плану традиционалних облика комуникације/типова резултата, научна поља не могу имати обједињену регулативу. Посебан нагласак стављају на различите културне функције различитих научних поља. Као најпроблематичније место спора препознају лабораторијско наметање чланка у међународном часопису са високим импакт фактором као „вреднијег" од

хуманистичке књиге за домаћу научну и културну јавност. Они квантитативне критеријуме вредновања научноистраживачког рада тумаче као привидну објективикацију одн. као политичко, интересно мотивисано решење у складу са тренутном расподелом моћи. Осим концепције, и технике вредновања доживљавају као неуке и нефер. Алате за вредновање посматрају као дубоко необјективне, с обзиром на то да врше значајну интрузију у оно што наводно треба „објеткивно“ да процене док значајно мењају саму концепцију науке и научника какву о себи имају истраживачи у ДХН пољу.

Међу испитаницима су присутне реактивне интерпретације – реактивни национализам (интерпретативни суверенитет, контрола над саморепрезентацијом) и реактивни елитизам (повратак у „кулу од слоноваче“, „вреднују нас неписмени“). Они који су заинтересовани за историју и филозофију науке сукоб који пламти на српској научнополитичкој сцени виде као повратак у период од пре једног века (нем. *Methodenstreit*). Саму квантификацију виде не као алатку него као оружје. Испољавајући изразито антипозитивистичке и антисцијентистичке ставове, колеге доминантан образац у научној политици доживљавају као квантофренију. Као што је и очекивано у тако хетерогеном пољу, испитаници дају веома различите предлоге у вези са тим које индикаторе квалитета треба фаворизовати – социјалне иновације, очување културног наслеђа, интернационализацију, ерудицију, подизање општег цивилизацијског нивоа сопственог друштва и др.

Друштвени статус и улога ДХН. Испитаници истичу корелацију унутаракадемског и изванакадемског понижавања ДХ поља. Пад репутације ДХН виде као последицу опште друштвене климе – пада поверења у експертско знање – али и као последицу медијског извештавања пристрасног у корист природнонаучно дефинисаних појмова о науци. Низак углед и лош финансијски статус виде као заједничке проблеме свих научних поља, истичући да је нејасно зашто научни администратори из других научних поља инсистирају на политици која разједињује и слаби, уместо да ује-

дињује и јача. Саговорници су сагласни да насилна унификација научних поља, на погрешним основама, не делује као решење економских проблема српске науке. Испитаници се међусобно слажу да је у најмању руку чудно то што се од њих очекује – да се с циљем друштвеног утицаја баве оним што друштво од њих не очекује, објашњавајући да друштву могу да буду кориснији не као они који изводе задатке него као они који усмеравају друштво. Испитаници су, међутим, подељени поводом идеје да се националне науке издвоје у посебно поље (неки из идеолошких/моралних а неки из тактичких разлога). Саговорници су, такође, подељени поводом идеје да ДХН треба заштити и као конститутивни елемент, а не само проучавање културног наслеђа.

Поїледи на недавне/најављене ӣромене у научном сисӣему. Већина испитаника дели тумачење да ће редукција целокупне науке на њену примену довести до гашења универзитета, ако не у целини, онда свакако ДХН на нивоу докторских студија. Многи испитаници сматрају да је конкурс за научне пројекте који је надлежно министарство објавило 2016. године садржао добро решење – задате државно и културно корисне теме (што виде као „праву меру“ мешања државе у академска посла).

Идеја Отворене науке је и даље углавном апстрактна па и непозната – већина колега сматра да је у основи добра, под условом да се неакадемским актерима не препусти њено вредновање (што виде као „горе чак и од сцијентометрије“). Транспарентност резултата, непристраност рецензија и корисност истраживања не доводе се у питање, у овом контексту. Саговорници позивају надлежне на дијалог о економским, друштвеним, политичким, културним и другим корисним аспектима ДХ истраживања уместо новог наметања неприкладних критеријума. Колеге изражавају генерално антиауторитарни сентимент и јак осећај индивидуалне и институционалне аутономије.

Доминанӣне инӣерӣреӣације исӣиӣаника о досадашњим реформама научноӣ сисӣема. Саговорници нуде више различитих, међусобно преклопљених тумачења: некомпетентност, несналажење, аматеризам; уобичајена непро-

мишљена бирократска стандардизација путем униформизације; незнање, непознавање промена у самој евалуативној струци – необавештеност о европским и светским стандардима; примитивизам, некритички модернизам, самоукидање компаративних предности; неолиберална ауторитарност – аутоколонијализам, аутошовинизам, квазикосмополитизам; технократски модел друштва; физикалистички модел науке (непознавање историје и филозофије науке); криминал, корупција, злоупотреба аутономије, партократска демократија; псеудоморализација, злоупотреба етике научноистраживачког рада...

Сумирана гледишта истраживача. Упркос значајним идеолошким разликама, типичним за ДХН, проучена заједница је готово јединствена у ставу да су критеријуми вредновања истраживања и истраживача у пољу друштвено-хуманистичких наука, наслеђени из 2000-их: а) ненаучни – у нескладу са стварном научном праксом и наслеђеним смислом и функцијама ДХН у друштву и култури; б) необјективни – врше дисторзију онога што наводно незаинтересовано процењују; в) аматерски – заснивају се на давно превазиђеном сцијентизму и физикализму; г) неевропски – супротни европским трендовима развоја вредновања као професије, али и супротни политици ЕУ и СЕ које чувају научне-као-кулурне потенцијале свих својих држава и народа; д) антинационални – супротни национални интересима, очувању интерпретативног суверенитета и културне баштине; подстичу најгоре у нашој култури, изазивају реактивни изолационизам и деструктивни национализам; антиразвојни – производе инверзне последице; удаљавају ДХН од примене и развоја.

Вредновање као инхерентно ограничење. Реформе у сектору науке и високог образвања током 2000-их година и касније нису биле засноване на елементарним чињеницама познатим из историје, филозофије, социологије и антропологије науке. Игноришући фундаменталне разлике друштвених наука и хуманистике у односу на друга научна поља и технологију, оне су их ограничиле, уместо да допринесу њиховом развоју. У том смислу, резултати овог истра-

живања могу представљати полазну основу за једну такву неограничавајућу реформу. Ограничавајући и уназађујући карактер реформи најпогубније се испољава на плану вредновања резултата истраживања, и то је домен у којем треба спровести хитно поништавање штетних аката, уколико се тежи искреној и продуктивној сарадњи са ДХ пољем.

Диверсификација индикатора као фундаментални услов помирења у заједници. Резултати истраживања показују да је заједница дубоко подељена, до мере да део ДХ научника оне колеге из других научних поља које су дефинисале критеријуме вредновања у своју корист сматра – криминалцима. Такво стање је штетно по више основа, а може се изменити хитном диверсификацијом критеријума, таквом да резултати истраживања у сваком научном пољу буду вредновани по европским и светским стандардима; прикладним, а не унисоним критеиријумима и алатима. Није вероватно да ће друштвене науке и хуманистика дати ни пожељан ни релавантан друштвени допринос док се не ослободе потчињеног положаја када је о управљању, финансирању, вредновању, представљању и типу очекиваних резултата реч. Развој, заснован на знању а посебно на утицају науке на друштво, није могуће остварити без фер, легитимног и подстицајног оквира. За разлику од научних поља која захтевају изразито високе финансијске подстицаје, ДХ наукама би за почетак било довољно да се прекине са њиховим омаловажавањем, понижавањем или и отвореним ниподаштавањем.

Ово усмерено истраживање открило је начелни отпор према усмереним истраживањима под постојећим условима. Партнер Министарства просвете, науке и технолошког развоја SDC Helvetas, кроз свој програм PERFORM, наручило је аутору ово истраживање. Оно је, упркос предрасудама о нарученим истраживањима, дало резултате који не иду сасвим у прилог наручиоцу и откривају да ће остваривање његових резултата захтевати многа прилагођавања постојеће научне политике. Наиме, наручилац је био заинтересован за јачање друштвене релевантности друштвених наука, оснаживање заједнице друштвених научника у настојању да

се они повежу с доменом јавних политика, као и за креирање стабилне климе за даљи развој овог научног поља. Истраживање је показало да ДХ научници немају ни воље ни времена, а ни објективних могућности, да се у атмосфери креираној постојећим критеријумима вредновања, окрену ка примени науке за добробит друштва у форми креирања јавних политика.

Управљање науком превенира њену примену. Потврђивањем хипотезе овог специфичног истраживања даље је установљено да основном циљу PERFORM платформе – промени начина управљања науком, како би се ДХ заједници омогућило да буде јака, самопоуздана и позиционирана у јавности, способна да допринесе социоекономским и политичким реформама у земљи – треба да претходи помирење исте те заједнице са онима који науком управљају. Након тог открића се са традиционалног модела објективног истраживања прешло на акционо истраживање – покушај изазивања промене током самог научноистраживачког рада. Разумевање негативног утицаја који постојећи систем вредновања има на односе у заједници, а посебно откриће чињенице да ДХ научници одбијају сарадњу с актерима које доживљавају као тлачитеље, водило је активностима на поновном успостављању поверења међу неким од кључних актера у спору. Засновавши препоруке за ревизију система управљања науком, а посебно вредновања резултатима научноистраживачког рада у ДХ пољу, аутор је утицао на делимичне измене низа подзаконских аката, у чијим новим верзијама се ДХ поље у мањој мери него раније третира као „рођак са посебним потребама“, како су то сами испитаници сликовито описали, наведене у закључку резимеа. Иако њихове најновије верзије нису идеалне, у њих су уграђени предлози засновани на овом емпиријском истраживању. Науком се коначно почиње управљати на научним основама. Такво управљање има шансе да престане да превенира њену примену, барем када је о ДХ пољу реч.

Закључци теренског дела истраживања. Постојећи систем вредновања обесхрабрује друштвено-хуманистичке научнике да се посвете стратешки дефинисаним циљевима и

уместо тога их окреће далеко од њих (ка хиперпродукцији друштвено излишних резултата у часописима за уске специјалистичке кругове, ка изолационистичком национализму, ка социјалном конзервативизму и сл.). Српска реформа сектора науке и високог образовања 2000-их година, када је о вредновању истраживања реч, типичан је пример контраиндиковане реформе и за њу је типичан парадокс уназађивања путем развоја. Уместо подстицајно, вредновање засновано на сцијентометрији деловало је као антагонист. Оно се испоставило као необјективно, пристрасно и контрапродуктивно у академском, а опасно и штетно и у научном и у политичком смислу (како на међународном тако и на плану националне културне политике). Изузетак представљају експерименталне однсно лабораторијски оријентисане друштвене науке, за које је могуће креирати „резерват прописа".

***

Резултати теренског квалитативног истраживања потом су протумачени и у другим контекстима: у контексту промене у самој евалуативној професији; у контексту јасне антисцијентометријске поруке какву последњих година шаљу водеће европске академије наука; у контексту циљева самог наручиоца истраживања; у контексту ауторовог ангажмана у Европској мрежи за вредовање истраживања у друштвено-хуманситичким наукама, Светском савету антрополошких друштава, Матичном научном одбору за историју, етнологију и археологију (историју уметности, музикологију и етномузикологију); у контексту истраживања европеизације српског друштва у оквиру пројеката самог Министарства просвете, науке и технолошког развоја и Европске извршне агенције за образовање, аудиовизуалне садржаје и културу, којима руководи.

Промене у самој евалуативној професији. Евалуативна професија се последњих година одмиче, па и „пере руке" од штете коју је употреба сцијентометрије нанела како науци, тако и њој самој, препознајући да се пуко преношење појмова, правила, кртеријума и поступака из једног научног поља у друго показало као грешка. Евалуатори увиђају, ши-

ром света а у Европи посебно, да научници пружају отпор и бојкотују евалуацију коју сматрају ненаучном, неправедном или на други начин штетном, и схватају нелегитимност униформне евалуације разноликих научних поља. Даље, они увиђају да адекватно вредновање, какво сада замењује оно засновано на сцијентометрији, не служи само исправљању неправди према ДХН већ и добром управљању – оно помаже креаторима и онима који примењују јавне политике, али и широј јавности, да разумеју како ДХН доприносе стварању одговора на највеће изазове данашњице попут, на пример оних дефинисаних Миленијумским приоритетима УН. Евалуативна професија препознаје са су ДХН традиционално интерпретативне, рефлексивне, често индивидуалне, као и да традиционално на други начин доживљавају „ефикасност“ и „продуктивност“ у односу на друга научна поља. Што је најважније, расте свест да су ДХН често окренуте сопственом друштву и у сталној су интеракцији с његовим културним наслеђем (оне не само да проучавају наслеђе већ су и његов интегративни део).

Окретање ка онима који су евалуирани. Концепција истраживача као пуког објекта евалуације је напуштена, осим у земљама које каскају за трендовима, попут Србије. Исто важи и за евалуацију институција. Након што је истраживањима широм света, а посебно у Европи, откривено да и појединци и групе реагују на евалуацију прилагођавајући јој се (или јој пружајући отпор), доведена је у питање сама објективност евалуације, а она схваћена као пуки инструмент политичког притиска на академску сферу. Дакле, управо оно на шта су социолози и антрополози науке и образовања указивали током последњих деценија. Промућурнији међу професионалцима из области евалуације освестили су и да је претварање професије у инструмент политике посебно ризично, посебно у културама заснованим на поносу и части (дакле и на освети), што је посебно релевантно за домаћи контекст. Даље, литература у овој области учестало освешћује да неприкладан систем производи неприкладна понашања – неетичко понашање је последица реформи иако су оне (наводно) покренуте управо како би се оно

превенирало. У оба типа реактивног понашања оних који су жртве евалуације (конформизација/отпор), систем не успева да испуни своје основне сврхе – усмерава истраживаче ка друштвено бескорисним типовима објављивања и мења њихове друштвене и културне функције уместо да их ојача. Управо ова негативна последица обележила је „српски случај научне евалуације" и мора се хитно отклонити.

Интрузивни, ауторитарни/недемократски карактер евалуације. Компаративна истраживања показују да је прихватање наопаких критеријума вредновања постало циљ по себи. Широм света истраживачи и институције окрећу се ка задовољавању критеријума, што постаје основно својство њиховог рада. Директни корисници њихових резултата нису више студенти, друштво, компаније или институције, већ – евалуатори. У питању је темељна интервенција у историју науке од стране актера који претендују на објективност. . Директно повезивање износа финансирања и прописаних резултата фаворизује квантитет у односу на квалитет, апологетику насупрот критици, сегментацију и спектакуларизацију резултата уместо њихово целовито и дубоко промишљање. Парадоксално, све то је учињено у име успостављања демократског система, заснованог на владавини права, уз инсистирање на повећању квалитета научноистраживачког рада.

Европска мрежа за вредновање истраживања у друштвено-хуманистичких наукама (ENRESSH). Аутор има част и задовољство да је део највећег удруживања истраживача специфично заинтересованих за проблематику евалуације ДХН у Европи, с циљем да се установи како да се евалуација ДХН упристоји (не и одбаци). Компаративна европска перспектива показује да су српски ДХ научници типични/стандардни ДХ научници из Европског истраживачког простора – дуго и организовано пружају отпор редукцији њиховог рада на моделе других научних поља. Поређење показује да критика, бојкот, медијски и политички отпор сцијентометрији у Србији нису ни необични ни неочекивани. Истраживање, спроведено у скоро свим земљама Европе, показује четири заједничке карактеристике отпора квантитативно заснова-

ној евалуацији ДХН: 1) појмови и методи евалуације истраживања у ДХН некритички су пренети из лабораторијских наука – не могу да обухвате разноликост теорија и метода, сложеност жанрова и публика, вишеструкост језика, нелинеарност закључивања, плурализам вредности и дуго трајање знања (импакт им „не застарева“ у 2 или 5 година); 2) квантификација није у стању да ухвати све оно по чему су ДХН специфичне и друштвено корисне – она чини да изгледају застарело и бескорисно; у питању је промашен/злонамеран метод вредновања; 3) контраефекти – смањење разноврсности и истраживање „на сигурно“ (умањење шансе за открића и иновације), системско изазивање кршења етичких норми (дописивање на радове, фабриковање резултата, плагијаризам), губитак профила појединачних истраживача али и целих институција („објави било шта, само да носи пуно поена“)...; 4) ДХН нису целина и за њих је немогуће развити јединствене критеријуме; историјски су, културно па и програмски де-стандардизоване, често тематски, методолошки и институционално варијабилне до мере да их је немогуће самерити у две суседне државе; не постоји јединствена класификација научних области и ужих научних области која није аргументовано оспорена.

Потцењивање књиге. Иако делује као специфично српски феномен, с обзиром на екстремно потцењивање монографских дела у домаћој пракси вредновања научноистраживачких резултата, компаративна ситуација је веома слична. Тек недавно је евалуативна професија препознала да је књига стандардни модел научне комуникације у хуманистици и делу друштвених наука. Књига је и индикатор специјализације и разлог за унапређење. Фундаментални научни допринос даје се темељним, дуготрајним и целовитим сагледавањем проблема управо у форми књиге. Она није само тип комуникације него и платформа за дебату, за важне парадигматске промене, кључна ознака престижа и гаранција квалитета.

Колизија између импакт-фактора и друштвеног доприноса истраживања. Вероватно најважнији налаз овог истраживања јесте то, да се сви испитаници, не само у Србији

него и учесници и аутори истраживања широм Европе, слажу да се, као најпожељнији резултат, ДХ наукама прописује оно што једино и сигурно не може да понуди њихов допринос друштву. Наиме, друштвена корист и чланак у часопису с највишим импакт фактором су обрнуто пропорционални. Да ли је у питању ненамеравана, контраиндикована последица „објави или нестани" културе промовисане у извесним интересним круговима, или намера, остаје да се установи... Ипак, судећи по раширености ове праксе, вероватније је да је у питању комбинација помодности и необразованости, пре него криминалног удруживања. Како било, сцијентометријска идеологија је довела до тектонског поремећаја у академској култури. Читаве институције усмеравају се системом казни и подстицаја („штапа и шаргарепе", како је то промовисано у Србији), да њихови истраживачи објављују у часописима са високим импакт-фактором, иако то води ка хиперпродукцији друштвено ирелевантних резултата и изазивању политички погубних последица. „Рангирање" на „листама" постаје циљ по себи и ствара нездраву атмосферу, налик на спортску (па и ратну), што не погодује стратешки прописаној/очекиваној корисности ДХН за друштво.

Антиауторитарна традиција српских друштвено-хуманистичких наука. Истраживање показује још једну важну сличност српских ДХ научница и научника са својим европским парњацима. Наиме, наука се у Србији углавном не поима као апологетика. Ова јака антиауторитарна традиција представља изазов за преусмеравање ДХН ка примени, имајући у виду да се примена код доброг дела испитаника изједначава са извођењем наручених истраживања (која се по дефиницији доживљавају као ненаучна). Реч је о феномену који представља последицу успостављања поменутог нездравог вида управљања академском сфером. Њиме се производе озбиљне последице по друштво. Наиме, квантитативни индикатори се легитимишу не на основу њихове смислености или прецизности, већ на основу њихове инструменталности у такмичењу за ресурсе – плате, донације за пројекте али и „углед". Управо тај бизарни појам угледа, институције и појединци сад стичу прилагођавајући се па-

раметрима које министарства, агенције, фондови и друге институције које финансирају истраживање, и јавне и приватне, постављају пред њих. Те институције саме често нису академске по свом карактеру и по правилу су повезане било са владама било са великим компанијама. Управо преко притиска на институције у којима раде, истраживачи постају све више зависни од туђег погледа на себе. Последица те зависности је убрзано смањене њиховог потенцијала за друштвену и политичку критику, па и отворена апологетика актуелних политичких и економских решења. Јасно је да је тај тренд, који се промовише у Србији, у колизији са стратешки промовисаним циљем – трагањем за најбољим решењима у јавним политикама, заснованим на истраживању. И на овај парадокс је антропологија науке и антропологија јавних политика упозоравала још од 1990-их година.

Опште и посебне штетне последице квантитативног вредновања резултата научноистраживачког рада. Осим посебних директних штетних последица по академске ДХН, које су истовремено и посредно штетне по друштво, постоје и оне последице које моментално изазивају општедруштвену штету. Наиме, дискурс налик ревизорском, који ДХ научнике подвргава надзору и контроли, код њих изазива индивидуалнопсихолошке последице али и нусефекте по њихов јавни рад. И док су индивидуалнопсихолошке и моралне последице већ добро проучене – осећај подређености, срамоте, губљења аутономије и интегритета, стрес, анксиозност па и беспомоћност – постоје и оне последице које чекају да буду проучене. Ово истраживање и истраживања сарадника показују да систематско дерогирање јединог научног поља професионално посвећеног културноисторијским и друштвено-политичким питањима наноси штету не само научницима него и самим тим пољима (по аналогији, на пример, штете која је нанета јавном здрављу или судству када је исти тај принцип примењен на лекаре и судије). Тако квантитативно вредновање налик на затворски надзор не само да смањује квалитет истраживања и високог образовања у ДХН, већ путем укидања угледа умањује значај њихове експертизе у јавном дискурсу. Прелиминар-

на истраживања указују на значајну корелацију наношења штете академским ДХН и пораста социокултурног конзервативизма, који за последицу има одбијање да се учествује у реформској агенди оријентисаној ка развојним циљевима.

Привидни парадокс – наизглед контрадикторни налази. Подаци показују да се српски ДХ научници готово јединствено противе евалуацији академских резултата од стране неакадемских актера (дозвољавају сугерисање тема на основу државних или привредних потреба, али не и допуштање да их евалуирају и на њихов рад, изборе, финансирање и сл. утичу мање образоване особе, које одлуке не доносе на основу академског знања). Ефективност метричке евалуације обрнуто је пропорционална доприносу ДХН јавним политикама – бркање друштвене релевантности са академском „изврсношћу" (која је још и некритички пренета из наука у којима је ИФ релевантан индикатор квалитета) испоставља се као контраиндикована, такође. Овај налаз указује како на потребу за раздвајањем Отворене науке од Отворене евалуације, тако и за раздвајањем оба наведена тренда од настојања да се ДХН научници оријентишу ка друштвеном доприносу како га креатори реформи виде.

Истраживање је, затим, усмерено на сагледавање резултата добијених проучавањем међународних конвенција, препорука, објава и других текстова водећих међународних политичких и научних институција и организација. Политика Унеска, Савета Европе и ОЕБС значајно је различита од политике ОЕРС (OECD), ММФ и Светске банке, када је о ДХН реч. Ове организације разумеју пресудни значај научног познавања идентитетских питања за успостављање мира и стабилности (дакле и одрживог развоја). Сумарно, може се закључити да домаћа научна политика, када је вредновање у питању, значајно заостаје за међународним стандардима, о чему свакако вреди објавити и засебну студију. Таква студија узеће у обзир ставове глобалне антрополошке заједнице према односу статуса ДХН и њиховог потенцијала за учешће у развојним политикама. Досадашња искуства рада у Светском савету антрополошких друштава показују да се колегинице и колеге чуде, али подржавају

српску ДХН заједницу да опстанемо у борби против нечег толико друштвено штетног. Они указују на пример развојних политика које у њиховим традицијама не служе самопонижавању. Посебно висок степен поноса изражавају колеге са јужне Земљине хемисфере, код којих је изражен антиколонијални сентимент. Указују и на замке „отпора“ у које су сами упадали, посебно стављање пред „узми или остави“ ситуацију типа „свршеног чина“, када су принуђени да хитно направе избор да ли ће наставити да служе сопственом друштву, или глобалним корпорацијама и локалним кабадахијама. Овај тип компаративне перспективе, такође, потврђује примат природних наука и технологије у друштву и у њиховим државама, али не и у академским и културним круговима (хуманистика се и даље у многим државама доживљава као интегрални елемент високе културе, док се државна управа ослања на друштвене науке.

Коначно, у енглеској верзији понуђен је и допринос јавним политикама – конкретна решења која се могу применити, у случају да се одустане од недавно поново заузетог оштрог курса.

***

Да ли се ствари полако поправљају? Последњих година приметан је напредак у поштовању равноправности специфичних и веома различитих научних поља. Постепена диверсификација критеријума и алата вредновања резултат је како унутрашњег притиска (отпора ДХН научника) тако и препознавања светских трендова. У последње време приметан је и привидни парадокс – европеизација и интернационализација, којима је примена сцијентометрије наводно требало да служи, довеле су до њеног укидања. Може се закључити да је српска научна политика релативно упристојена – не заснива се више на самопорицању па и самоистребљењу, препознаје значај очувања научне и технолошке баштине, почиње да показује разумевање за друштвене и културне функције ДХН и – што је у овом контекту најважније – има наговештаја да ће престати да намеће критеријуме вредновања лабораторијских истраживања свим осталим типовима бављења нау-

ком (од чега штете имају и бројне друге природне, медицинске и техничке дисциплине).

Правилник о рангирању и категоризацији научних часописа, Првилник о минималним условима за избор наставника у пољу друштвено-хуманистичких наука Универзитета у Београду, Стандарди за акредитацију студијских програма докторских студија и друга акта донета у претходном периоду сугеришу да се постепено окрећемо истински европском тренду – укидању сцијентометријске евалуације за хуманистику и националне друштене науке.

Кључне речи: вредновање истраживања, вредновање – друштвене науке, вредновање – хуманистика, научни часописи – импакт-фактор, квалитет истраживања, финансирање истраживања, универзитетска унапређења, научна политика, квалитативно истраживање, консеквенцијална анализа, Србија, европске интеграције, наука у друштву, јавне политике засноване на истраживањима, регулаторне реформе, административне реформе, друштвени утицај науке, антропологија науке, антропологија образовања, антропологија Европске уније, методологија друштвених наука, историја и филозофија науке, културно наслеђе, културно памћење, Министарство просвете, науке и технолошког развоја Републике Србије, WCAA, ERASMUS+ Jean Monnet, PERFORM, ENRESSH.

Милош Миленковић
„У ИМЕ“ ЕВРОПЕ
Контраиндикације критеријума вредновања
друштвено-хуманистиких наука (у Србији)

Издавачи

Универзитет у Београду – Филозофски факултет
Одељење за етнологију и антропологију
Центар за антропологију науке и образовања
Центар за антропологију јавних и практичних политика

Досије студио, Београд

За издаваче

Иван Ковачевић
Мирко Милићевић

Лектура

Џереми Робин Фокс

Дизајн корица

Владимира Илић

Фотографија

Валентина Марковић

Припрема и штампа

Досије студио, Београд

ISBN 978-86-6427-143-1 (ФФ)
ISBN 978-86-6047-330-3 (ДС)

Тираж

100 примерака

CIP – Каталогизација у публикацији
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

001.891:3(497.11)

MILENKOVIĆ, Miloš, 1975–
"In the name of" Europe : on the counterindications of social science and humanities research assessment criteria (in Serbia) / Miloš Milenković. – Београд : Faculty of Philosophy,University, Department of Ethnology and Anthropology, Centre for Anthropology of Science and Education, Centre for Anthropology of Policy, 2020 (Београд : Досије студио). – 145 str. ; 21 cm. – (Issues in Ethnology and Anthropology. Monographs series ; no. 17)

"This book is based on research conducted within the following projects: PERFORM – Performative and Responsive Social Sciences ..., 'Identity Policies of the European Union: Adaptation and Application in Serbia' (177017) ..., ERASMUS+ Jean Monnet Module 'Anthropology of European Union' at the University of Belgrade (2017–2020) ... [and] ENRESSH– European Network for Research Evaluation in Social Sciences and Humanities, COST 15137 (enressh.eu)" —> poleđina nasl. lista. – Tiraž 100. – Bibliografija: str. 93–99. – Резиме: „У име" Европе. – Sadrži i: San Francisco declaration on research assessment. The Leiden manifesto for research metrics. Challenges of the evaluation of social sciences and humanities research (SSH) : ENRESSH – European Network for Research Evaluation in the SSH. Statement by three national academies (Académie des Sciences, Leopoldina and Royal Society) on good practice in the evaluation of researchers and research programmes. Helsinki initiative on multilingualism in scholarly communication.

ISBN 978-86-6427-143-1 (FF)
ISBN 978-86-6047-330-3 (DS)

а) Научноистраживачки рад – Друштвене науке – Србија
б) Научноистраживачки рад – Вредновање – Србија

COBISS.SR-ID 13761801

ISBN 978-86-6427-143-1 (FF)
ISBN 978-86-6047-330-3 (DS)

Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju baštini tradiciju nastave etnologije na Filozofskom fakultetu Velike škole u Beogradu (osn. 1863) i njenog Etnološkog seminara (osn. 1906). Odeljenje je 1990. dopunilo svoj naziv u Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju, administrativno obeleživ̌si značajne teorijsko-metodološke promene koje su disciplinu iz tradicionalno orijentisanog proučavanja isključivo nacionalne kulture transformisale u savremenu sociokulturnu analizu društvene stvarnosti i kulturne raznovrsnosti na nacionalnom, regionalnom i globalnom nivou.

Odeljenje izdaje časopis „Etnoantropološki problemi“ (www.eap-iea.org) i suizdavač je „Etnološke biblioteke“ (www.etnoloskabiblioteka.co.rs).

МОНОГРАФИЈЕ ЕАП