



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Bibliometric mapping as a science policy and research management tool

Noyons, E.C.M.

Citation

Noyons, E. C. M. (1999, December 9). *Bibliometric mapping as a science policy and research management tool*. DSWO Press, Leiden. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/38308>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/38308>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/38308> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Noyons, Ed C.M.

Title: Bibliometric mapping as a science policy and research management tool

Issue Date: 1999-12-09

Bibliometric Mapping as a Science Policy and Research Management Tool

Ed C.M. Noyons

Bibliometric Mapping as a Science Policy and Research Management Tool

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad van
Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus Dr. W.A. Wagenaar,
hoogleraar in de Faculteit der Sociale Wetenschappen,
volgens besluit van de College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op donderdag
9 december 1999 te klokke 14:15 uur

door

Everard Christiaan Marie Noyons

geboren te Drunen in 1963

PROMOTIECOMMISSIE

Promotor: Prof. Dr. A.F.J. van Raan
Referent: Dr. H.E. Roosendaal (Universiteit Twente)

Overige Leden: Prof. Dr. G.A.M. Kempen
Prof. Dr. M.H. van IJzendoorn
Prof. Dr. J. C. Stoof (Universiteit Utrecht)

*Voor Susanne, Guus en Joep
In herinnering aan Betty Noyons-Luszczek*

Preface

Bibliometric maps of science are landscapes of scientific research fields created by quantitative analysis of bibliographic data. In such maps the 'cities' are, for instance, research topics. Topics with a strong cognitive relation are in each other's vicinity and topics with a weak relation are distant from each other. These maps have several domains of application. As a policy supportive tool they can be applied to overview the structure of a research field and to monitor its evolution. This book contributes to the development of this application of bibliometric maps.

There has been much discussion about the trustworthiness and utility of these landscapes ("What does the map show?") since their birth in the 1960s. In this book, a methodology and procedure is proposed to allow both expert (trustworthiness) and user (utility) to evaluate and validate the maps. Furthermore, a procedure is designed to extract field-specific keywords from publication data, used to create the maps. Thus, the method becomes independent from database-specific classification schemes and thesauri. As a result, a research field may be delineated and mapped on the basis of more than one publication database.

The proposed method opens new doors for 'evaluative bibliometrics' and is prepared for the advent of electronic publishing in science.

Most of the case studies presented in this book were performed in the framework of contract research and of other externally financed research programs. The 'umbrella' of our work was mainly funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) and by Elsevier Science.

I wish to thank the co-authors of the articles in this book, Anthony van Raan, Henk Moed, Marc Luwel, Ulrich Schmoch, and Hariolf Grupp. Their contributions were of great value. Furthermore, I wish to acknowledge my colleagues at CWTS: Thed van Leeuwen, who has been a great roommate, colleague and friend in the past ten years, and Renald Buter, Peter Negenborn, Erik van Wijk, Robert Tijssen, Ton Nederhof, Martijn Visser, Bert van der Wurff, and Olga van Driel, for their comments and support, as well as my former colleagues, Joke Korevaar, Harrie Peters, Robert Braam, and Renger de Bruin. Suze van der Luijt and Christine Ibler are acknowledged for their effort in preparing the articles and the final manuscript. I also would like to thank my colleagues from all over the world for the fruitful discussions we had during conferences in Chicago, Antwerp, Jerusalem, Cambridge and Colima.

Special thanks goes to Susanne, Guus and Joep, for their support and for allowing me to take my work home every 'once in a while'.

Table of Contents

Preface

Part I	Evolution of Science Maps	1
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Introduction to bibliometrics	3
1.2	Introduction to science maps	6
1.3	Introduction to science maps as policy-supportive tool	9
2	Principles of Science Maps	15
2.1	What do maps show?	15
2.2	Co-word analysis as a bibliometric tool	21
2.3	Mapping as a bibliometric tool	22
2.4	Science mapping as a policy supportive tool	23
2.5	From scientific output to science maps	25
3	Validation of science maps	29
3.1	Validation of science maps by field experts	29
3.2	Kinds of validation	31
Part II	Published Articles	39
4	Exploring the Science and Technology Interface: Inventor-Author Relations in Laser Medicine Research	41
4.1	Introduction	42
4.2	Method and Techniques	44
4.2.1	Main lines	44
4.2.2	Data collection	45
4.2.3	Details of the four different approaches	46

4.3	Results and Discussion	48
4.3.1	First approach: general bibliometric characteristics	48
4.3.2	Second approach: scientific counterparts of patents	53
4.3.3	Third approach: expert opinions	56
4.3.4	Fourth approach: time trends in inventor-author relations	59
4.3.4.1	Two basic indicators	59
4.3.4.2	Patent application vs. publishing	64
4.4	Conclusions	64
5	Bibliometric Cartography of Scientific and Technological Developments of an R&D field: The Case of Optomechatronics	69
5.1	Introduction	70
5.1.1	Science base of technology	70
5.1.2	Basic principles of bibliometric cartography	71
5.2	Maps of optomechatronics based on expert field definitions	73
5.2.1	Method and data	74
5.2.2	Results	76
5.2.2.1	Two maps based on one definition	76
5.2.2.2	The role of actors	80
5.3	General conclusions and discussion: overview of possibilities and limitations	83
6	Monitoring Scientific Developments from a Dynamic Perspective: Self-Organized Structuring to Map Neural Network Research	89
6.1	Introduction: analysis of the structure of science and technology	90
6.2	Shaping a methodology of self-organized cognitive structuring	92
6.3	Methodological principles	94
6.4	Putting a time reference into the mapping procedure	96
6.5	Results and discussion	97
6.5.1	Observations with the overview map: the ‘coarse structure’ of the field	97
6.5.2	Observations with the detailed subfield-maps: the fine structure of the field	105
6.6	Concluding Remarks	110
7	Actor Analysis in Neural Network Research: The Position of Germany	113
7.1	Introduction	114

7.2	Method	115
7.3	Results	119
7.4	Concluding remarks and discussion	128
8	Assessment of Flemish R&D in the field of Information Technology	131
8.1	Introduction	132
8.2	Data and methods	133
8.2.1	Bibliographic databases and the delineation of the field	133
8.2.2	Combining publication and patent data	134
8.2.3	Bibliometric indicators	135
8.3	Results	137
8.3.1	Exploration of the developments in IT	137
8.3.2	Flemish activity in IT	139
8.3.3	Productivity of Flemish IT	146
8.3.4	Impact of Flemish IT publication output	148
8.4	Concluding remarks	151
9	Combining Mapping and Citation Analysis for Evaluative Bibliometric Purposes	155
9.1	Introduction	156
9.1.1	IMEC's organizational structure	158
9.2	Data, method and results	159
9.2.1	Publication data	159
9.2.2	Citation data	159
9.2.3	Selection of benchmark institutes	159
9.2.4	Analyses	161
9.2.4.1	General trends in micro-electronics and actor analysis	161
9.2.4.2	Fine-structure analysis	167
9.2.4.3	Performance analysis of the IMEC as compared to benchmark institutes	168
9.2.4.4	Performance analysis of IMEC compared to world average	174
9.2.4.5	Research performance of IMEC's divisions	175
9.3	Comments of experts and additional analysis	178
9.3.1	Introduction	178
9.3.2	Comments of experts	178
9.3.3	Relocatability	179
9.3.4	Publication strategy	180
9.4	Concluding remarks	183

Part III	New Developments in Science Mapping	187
10	'State of the Art': A Case Study of Scientometrics, Informetrics and Bibliometrics	189
10.1	Field delineation, data collection, and methodology	189
10.2	Main results	191
10.3	Expert input	194
	Appendix A	197
	Appendix B	198
11	Towards automated field keyword identification	199
11.1	Introduction	199
11.2	From CDE to field keyword (FKW)	200
11.3	Linguistic characteristics	202
11.4	Semantic scope	207
11.5	Bibliometric distribution	211
11.6	Combining the three aspects	211
12	Conclusions and future perspectives	219
	Samenvatting	221
	Curriculum Vitae	225

