

Title, abstract and keywords in English

Title of dissertation:

Social aspects of judging. The case of reviews in habilitation proceedings

Author: Łukasz Remisiewicz

Supervisor: dr. hab. Dorota Rancew-Sikora, prof. UG

Keywords: sociology of science, academic assessment, evaluation, peer review, habilitation reviews, bibliometrics, sociological theory

Abstract: The dissertation documents and analyzes the evaluation practices of peer reviewers in habilitation proceedings in the discipline of sociology from 2013-2019. The structure of the dissertation includes nine chapters, an introduction, and a conclusion. Chapters 1-5 present the current state of research on review processes, as well as the theory used in the work. The first chapter analyzes the transformation of the imaginaries of science, distinguishing science as a pursuit of truth, science as a game of the community of scholars, and science as an evaluation game. Imaginaries that outline purposes of scientific activity are being transformed nowadays, particularly due to metrics trends (the spread of measurement of scientific achievements) and economic trends (increased competitiveness, pressure for transparency of public spending), and this could potentially affect the ways in which habilitation achievements are evaluated.

The second chapter critically reviews the most important sociological knowledge concerning scientific evaluation processes, including Michele Lamont's concept of evaluation cultures, Pierre Bourdieu's concept of *homo academicus*, and more broadly, Randall Collins' theory of scientific community.

Referring to the previous findings, Chapter Three introduces the theoretical concept of three logics of assessment. Logics of assessment are patterns within which individual judgement is construed. These logics are isomorphic to the imaginaries of science, hence there are the logic of truth, the logic of the scholarly community game (game-S) and the logic of the evaluation game (game-E). Each of these logics is characterized by a different way of producing evaluation criteria, sources of motives for inference, main reference points for evaluation, as well as

objects of trust and heuristics using by reviewers. As assumed, evaluations of habilitation achievements conducted under different logics may result in different outcomes.

The fourth chapter outlines the social context of habilitation reviews, presenting habilitation reviews in the context of other types of reviews existing in science. The history of habilitation in Poland, the legal status during the period under review, and the role of habilitation in scientific biography in the Polish context are briefly outlined.

The fifth chapter is devoted to the agreement of the various social roles played by reviewers. Distinguished were the role of the gatekeeper, who selects people and ideas in habilitation proceedings, the role of the peer, the role of the judges (in the context of research on the reliability and accuracy of reviews and the internal and external compatibility of reviews), and the role of the author of the review text.

Chapter 6 outlines a description of the study's design, the study's objectives and the ethical dilemmas involved in conducting the study. The aim of the study was to test the sociological viability of the logics of assessment theory, in relation to habilitation proceedings in the discipline of sociology. For this purpose, a study conducted in a two-phase sequential mixed methods approach, was created.

The first phase of the study, described in Chapter 7, assumed a quantitative analysis of all proceedings and reviews in postdoctoral proceedings in the discipline of sociology from 2013-2019. The research material consists of data on 195 proceedings and 474 reviews. The analysis was intended to provide information on selected descriptive statistics on these proceedings, diagnose the impact of specific variables (gender, degree) on the reviews' results, and identify proceedings which outcome was particularly difficult to predict.

The next two chapters present the second, qualitative phase of the analysis. The Chapter 8 analyzed 70 negative reviews in the proceedings included in the dataset. The goal was to identify gatekeeping practices, and to distinguish patterns of reviewers' use of specific logics of assessment. The ways in which reviewers construct symbolic boundaries between science and non-science, as well as between sociology and other disciplines, were analyzed in detail. A catalog of the charges made under the distinguished logics is indicated, as well as the practices that sought to determine evaluation in relation to key concepts such as "significant contribution to the discipline," "significant activity" or "scientific independence."

Chapter 9, on the other hand, provides a comparative analysis of reviews from six proceedings which results were particularly difficult to predict. The chapter identifies a number of patterns that emerged during the analysis of obtaining concurrence or inconsistency of reviewers with regard to the same subjects of evaluation.

The dissertation concludes with a summary of the results achieved, metatheoretical reflections and research self-reflections, as well as dispositions for further research.