

<<同行评议、研究诚信与科学治理>>

图书基本信息

书名：<<同行评议、研究诚信与科学治理>>

13位ISBN编号：9787010108704

10位ISBN编号：7010108706

出版时间：2012-5

出版时间：人民出版社

作者：（美）弗洛德曼，（美）霍尔布鲁克，（美）米切姆，洪晓楠 编，夏国军，朱勤 译

页数：678

字数：653000

版权说明：本站所提供下载的PDF图书仅提供预览和简介，请支持正版图书。

更多资源请访问：<http://www.tushu007.com>

<<同行评议、研究诚信与科学治理>>

内容概要

《同行评议、研究诚信与科学治理：实践、理论与当代议题》对“同行评议”的发展进行了历史性描述，尤其是它对于科学诚信以及科学治理的重要性。

本书对当前同行评议实践中产生的问题将开展系统性分析。

在此基础上，本书介绍有关这类问题以及同行评议的其他相关方面的最新研究成果。

本书分为两大部分：第一部分，首先总结了同行评议在两大主要实践语境（科学成果发表与科学研究资助）下的一些基本模式。

其次，回顾了在过去二十多年来，同行评议所面临的一些具体挑战，特别是由科学公共责任日益增长的压力以及科学全球化而带来的挑战。

并提出一些处理这类挑战的具体建议。

本稿的第二部分，为读者提供一条进入同行评议研究领域的最优路径。

从这些学术成果也可以看出，除了讨论一些基本问题之外，同行评议也将对科学实践、科学政策以及科学管理起到很大作用。

<<同行评议、研究诚信与科学治理>>

书籍目录

丛书总序

同行评议：中国的理论、实践与展望（代序）

导言与致谢

第一部分 界定同行评议

1.同行评议

1.1 同行评议概念

1.2 出版前的同行评议

1.3 基金申请同行评议

1.4 同行评议的其他用途

1.5 对同行评议的批评与取代

2.同行评议与研究诚信

2.1 诚信研究的历史起源

2.2 一般意义上的诚信

2.3 促进专业科学诚信水平的同行评议

2.4 同行评议中的诚信实践

3.同行评议及科学治理

3.1 自治与责任的辩证关系

3.2 同行评议的跨学科研究

3.3 结论：跨学科性及转向更强的社会责任感

附录：同行评议的政策实践

第二部分 当代学术成果

1.同行评议的历史与原则

1.1 从书籍审查到学术同行评议

1.2 科学中的评价模式：评议系统的制度化、结构与功能

1.3 同行评议的原则与实践

1.4 无偏见，无价值：反对盲态投稿的案例

2.出版前的、基金的与制定规则的同行评议

2.1 有问题的传统

2.2 同行评议的去学科化

2.3 重新评价科学-社会关系：以美国国家科学基金会广泛影响的价值评议标准（1997-2011）为例

2.4 同行评议过程在美国作用的日益扩展

2.5 受规章限制的科学中的质量控制

2.6 超越盲目的信仰：克服交叉学科评价的障碍

3.政策制定、同行评议与科学治理

3.1 科学与科学政策中的同行评议

3.2 英国卓越研究框架计划书中的"影响因素"：学术自治边界的变化

3.3 同行评议：寻求最优实践的一种理论？

3.4 同行评议的政策挑战：管理偏见、利益冲突与跨学科评估

3.5 评价研究：从基于可靠信息的同行评议到文献计量学

3.6 文献计量学对于科学体系的影响：无意的后果？

3.7 社会科学的计算化：政治科学计量的政治学

3.8 无伤大雅：民主政治中飞速发展技术的评估与治理

附录 同行评议的对比性评估

参考文献
后记

章节摘录

版权页：插图： But while there was a substantial overlap between members of royal academies, state censors, book review writers and editors of state-sponsored literary journals, such an overlap does not imply an identity between peer review and book censorship. The crucial difference between the two systems was a spatial one: it was the provenance of the texts and their positioning vis-à-vis the state that informed what review protocols were applied to them. My hypothesis is that texts produced within the state apparatus were peer-reviewed while texts that were not produced within that framework were processed by the censorship and licensing system. Peer review was for 'domestic products' (texts produced within state academies or by authors pre-disciplined by direct ties to the state). Censorship was for 'foreign imports' (foreign books, or domestic manuscripts produced by authors who were not directly connected to and corporatively supervised by the state). News was also treated as a 'foreign import'. Actually, because news happened completely outside the control of the state, it could be seen as the epitome of this 'foreign imports' category. Not surprisingly, state-controlled journals did treat news like books: both had to be selected, reviewed, and censored before publication. Distance from the state meant reduced control and higher risk, and it was the relative risk a text posed to the state that differentiated the jurisdictions of peer review and state censorship. The domestic / foreign distinction helps reframe the notion of 'peer'. What differentiated texts that became peer-reviewed from texts that continued to undergo censorship was not primarily the discipline they belonged to, nor their authorial status (because even factual reports like news could be censored). It is not that certain kinds of texts began to be peer-reviewed (as opposed to being censored) because they belonged to a professionally mature discipline—a discipline that could provide competent peers for self-reviewing.

编辑推荐

《同行评议、研究诚信与科学治理:实践、理论与当代议题》由人民出版社出版。

版权说明

本站所提供下载的PDF图书仅提供预览和简介，请支持正版图书。

更多资源请访问:<http://www.tushu007.com>