



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Quantitative research assessment and its unintended consequences

Dagiene, E.

Citation

Dagiene, E. (2025, October 30). *Quantitative research assessment and its unintended consequences*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4281943>

Version: 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/1887/4281943>

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

Propositions

accompanying the dissertation

Quantitative research assessment and its unintended consequences

Propositions relating to the subject

1. In transitioning science systems, adopting international research assessment models with hard-to-fulfil expectations leads to unintended consequences and hinders the development of a diverse research ecosystem focused on fulfilling local needs (Chapters 2–4).
2. Small science systems can encounter elite-driven research assessments that put individual interests ahead of national goals and limit community inclusion (Chapters 2–4).
3. Research assessments using journal, database, and publisher lists embed bias, encourage gaming, and hinder diverse research (Chapters 2–4).
4. To boost international visibility of local research, book assessments should shift from publisher prestige to open access, digital discovery, and long-term preservation (Chapters 4–6).

Scientific propositions relating to the field

5. National research assessment policies should be regularly evaluated for their effectiveness and impact on research behaviour, with consideration to disciplinary differences and unintended consequences (Chapters 2–5).
6. Future research assessment frameworks should incorporate open science principles and give more priority to research contributing to society and public knowledge (Chapters 4–6).
7. Scientometricians should explore diverse data sources to develop nuanced research assessment metrics that support open science and include outputs produced by “widening” countries (Chapters 4–6).
8. Open and transparent metrics, drawing on data beyond traditional citation databases, enable richer and better informed research evaluations (Chapters 4–6).

Propositions on societal subjects

9. Researchers and institutions have a fundamental responsibility to ensure societal understanding of, and benefit from, publicly funded research; this includes transparently communicating research outputs in local languages and justifying resource allocation.
10. Inclusive science policymaking that engages diverse stakeholders fosters transparency and accountability in research assessment, promoting public trust in science.