

Pano Loulanski, Professor, Dr. Ec. Scs.

## **POSSIBILITIES TO IMPROVE THE COMPLEX ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH**

There are identified and analyzed some major aspects of the quality of economic research. An attempt is made at outlining the possible directions for improvement of its complex assessment. The achievement of that objective involves the performing of the following tasks: summarizing the main points in the nature and the mechanism of assessment; assessment of the content-related aspect of the research; assessment of the relation "analysis-results" of the research process; analysis of the formed traditional negative features of research work.

JEL: Z00; A31

The assessment of the quality of research work, including economic research, is a task of strategic nature. The process of assessment has its intrinsic elements and reaches a state of completion in the review. The generalizations in it are an expression of the assessment of two aspects of the study: content-related aspect and the relation "analysis performed-results obtained". The first comprises an audit of the contents, description of the analysis and the form of expression. The second is connected with the innovation in the scientific product (the generated contribution): new ideas, theories, methodologies, etc.

Essential features of the process of assessment are also the mechanisms of identification of contributions and the degree the researcher has overcome a number of traditional negative characteristics of research.

The complex assessment of the quality of research work is an issue that is complicated and difficult to solve. The calculated grade is an expression of both the characteristics of the submitted study and the used measurement-assessment system of indicators, criteria and procedures. In recent years we have increasingly witnessed the circulation of works that are rudimentary in terms of ideas, cognition and application on the recommendation of reviewers, who are unaware of the inflation induced in the scientific area by way of their participation. On account of that it is not surprising that we ascertain both the successful development of economic knowledge and failures in the utilization of the former in the economy.

It is natural to pose the question where does the reason lie: in the low quality of the submitted research and the inadequately high grade given by auditors, in the incompetence of reviewers, in the low rate and range of application of research ideas or in something else? It would be naive to think that the answers to the above questions can be simple. What is more, it is impossible to have a situation in which the "chain breaks" repeatedly and that be taken as normal. Obviously there is room for uneasiness and one of the decisive factors for its elimination is the strictness in the conduct of the reviewer. That is why the selection, morality, the fee

for reviewing, the control are issues which, unless solved adequately, will not have positive consequences in the applied field of economic cognition.

### **Formulation of the issue**

*The assessment* of every piece of research is a process of careful and precise comparison of the factual and referential values of the scientific product and summing up of the final grade - unreservedly positive, positive with suggestions for constructive amendments or negative. Failures in research are a reality, which should not be made too dramatic. There are many factor determinants of that phenomenon and every author should out of respect for himself humbly and with dignity accept the verdict of the reviewer. This can be done only if it is fair, persuasive enough and with an emphasis on the possibilities of correcting the failures with future research. At the same time it is not only the contents of the review, but also its tone that have a rectifying influence. The tone may "hurt" the researcher a lot more if there has not been chosen the necessary balanced tonality, if in the work there is sought only the negative, while the positive is left out, if the tone is deconstructive, deliberate and therefore destructive.

The other extreme - stressing out non-existent positive aspects in disguise and thus promoting mediocrity - is also useless. This helps neither the research worker, nor science itself, still less the practice. Just the opposite, there is more damage done than if there are applied the criteria of serious assessment and are circulated studies which enrich modern knowledge and foster the economic and social development.

The review is the active institutionalized form of performing the assessment. It is a kind of creative work - representative written assessment of the contents and qualities of the research work.<sup>1</sup> In terms of composition it comprises the following elements:

- bibliographical data on the submitted work;
- brief information about the subject and the contents of the research;
- reporting and interpretation of some major principles of the work (significance of the subject of the research, the objectives, the methodology, the structure and the logical sequence, style of exposition, ideas, theses, assertions, recommendations, etc.);
- comment and assessment of the scientific contributions;
- summing up and systematization of assessment assertions: positive and negative aspects of the submitted research;
- a definitive conclusion with a recommendation on the future of the manuscript.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Кършакова, Р. Научна комуникация. РУ "А. Кънчев", Ruse, 2004, p. 48.

In general terms, the suitability of every research work is proved by assessing its content-related aspect and the complex relation "performed analysis - attained results".

### **Assessment of the content-related aspect of the research**

Every piece of research is composed of intrinsic requisites - contents, analysis and style. On that basis there are formulated the individual aspects of its assessment - *text elements of the research, the nature of the analysis and form of expression*. These are the aspects which are the subject of expert assessment by reviewers (Table 1).

*Table 1*

#### Aspects of Assessment

Subject	Assessment Criteria
I. Text Elements of the Research	
1. Title	1. Narrow and rich in content. 2. Containing a summary of the subject of research or elements of the approach, method and the main result.
2. Introduction	1. Reasons for organizing the research. 2. Urgency and importance of the problem under study. 3. Precision in the defined: objective, subject, object and hypothesis/hypotheses of the research. Adopted methods of research, corresponding to the set objective. 4. The presence of specifying parameters of the research – scientific reservations, adopted angle, the used conceptual system, sources of information, etc.
3. Body	1. The performed survey of similar studies carried out by other authors - the state of the problem. 2. A description of the conducted experiment. 3. A presentation and discussion of the results of the experiment, of the induced problems and verification of the hypothesis/hypotheses.
4. Conclusion	1. The manner of summarizing the principal results. 2. The presence of major recommendations for solving the generated problems. 3. Possibilities for continuation of the research.

5. Additional requisites	1. Acknowledgements 2. Bibliography – a minimum number of publications (only those cited in the research work !)
<b>II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ANALYSIS</b>	
1. Identifying of the problem and creating a methodological experiment	1. Ways of formulating, identifying, specifying and systematizing the problem. 2. The achieved adequacy between the formulation of the subject, objectives, tasks, methods and hypotheses of the research on the one hand, and the defined for solving the problem, on the other.
2. Bibliographical sources and practice	1. The degree of familiarity with the scientific area of the problem. 2. The degree of familiarity with the practical aspect of the problem. 3. Thoroughness in the classification and description of the main theses and adoption of a well-founded position, elimination of errors and discrepancies from previous research.
3. Independently conducted research	1. Generated new knowledge. 2. Generated new confirmatory facts. 3. Creating a methodology/methodologies. 4. Creating models, concepts, generalized recommendations, etc.
4. Interpretation of obtained results	1. Completeness of range and precision of formulation. 2. Significance of results. 3. Applicability of results - user coverage.
<b>III. FORM OF EXPRESSION</b>	
1. Expression	1. Imagery of the used means of expression. 2. Vividness and persuasiveness of scientific expression. 3. Brevity and thoroughness of the exposition.
2. Description	1. Degree of efficiency, critical attitude and strictness in the descriptions of phenomena and processes. 2. Continuity of the presentation. 3. Degree of adherence to the initial formulations.

In connection with the expert assessment we need to seek answers to a number of principal questions.

*The first* refers to<sup>2</sup> the convergency and divergency in the creative work of the researcher.

*The convergency* characterizes the possibility to study simultaneously and consecutively objects in several directions, sections, aspects, etc. The wider the page of analysis is open, the more information can be used, respectively the more comprehensively the process is studied, the more precise and broad is the information on it. The sections of the analysis are varied:

- *Organizational-typological* aspect - analysis of the kind and type of the phenomenon, of the group, the category of similar phenomena and of the forms of its organization. For instance, the skills as an element of the abilities of the workforce are classified as professional, personal, leaders' and contextual (being able to act successfully in different surroundings). The forms of organization of the accumulation of the respective skills are varied: learning, apprenticeship, practice, improving one's qualification, requalification, etc.

- *Structural-morphological* aspect - analysis of the form of the object and its composite parts. For instance multiple intelligence as the bio-psychological potential of the workforce takes a linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, spatial, interpersonal and intrapersonal form. Each one of these forms is built by its respective elements: for example the linguistic - by the ability to study a foreign language, to use the language, the susceptibility to the spoken and written language, etc.

- *Functional aspect* - analysis of the behaviour of the object - its internal and external interactions.

- *Essential aspect* - analysis of the essential and the phenomenal-memorable from the object (its specific features), the single in the group and the individual in the phenomenon. For example the designated aspect of the services market is characterized by a number of phenomenal characteristics - lack of warehouse, indefiniteness of the result, a high level of differentiation of the service, etc.; the single for the healthcare market is nonexclusion and nonrivalry in the public health services, while the individual with the service of street cleaning or ensuring the defense of the country is the indivisibility of the effect.

- *Genetic aspect* - analysis of the onto- and philogenic aspects: origin, development, transformation, adaptation, etc. For instance the virtual enterprise is born in "the organizations at the crossroads" after the mid XXth century and finds an expression in the use of Internet-based technologies in order to present itself and its production. The first wave of development of the process ("renunciation of

---

<sup>2</sup> See Майданов, А. Процесс научного творчества. Наука, Moscow, 1983, p. 14-15, 20-31, 58-59, 99.

the rules") is the emerging of e-commerce, the second ("transformation of the organization") - performing of electronic administration of the business and the third (the proper virtual organization) - virtual work by means of electronic administration 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

- *Internal and external aspects* - study of the phenomenon covering its internal and external properties.

*Divergency* has to do with research, connected with the forms of difference, with the available deviations, with the working out of the ideographic in the phenomenon and the way of its examination - imperfect decisions, the various approaches used, the different working hypotheses, the dissimilar supertheoretical grounds, etc. Divergency is connected above all with the variation in research approaches and the features of a given phenomenon.

The establishment of the contributions of each research work is a typical example of divergency.

*The second point* refers to the rates of generation, cumulation, elimination and neogenesis.

The creative process as a means of searching for the truth is simultaneously a fight between it and untruth, between the less true and more true ratiocination. In it there are carried out a number of *interrelated processes*:

- new knowledge is created - a process of generation.
- the created knowledge is accumulated - it is amassed, regardless of whether it has a positive (true), or negative (untrue) value.
- knowledge is constantly eliminated, regardless of whether it has a positive (true), or negative (untrue) value.

Neogenesis encompasses all given aspects in their integrity and guarantees disproof and elimination of knowledge, cancellation of their cumulation (provided the issue has been solved), rejection of solutions which lack heuristic value, etc. In this way there arise new directions for the formulation of ideas and solutions.

The creative process, featuring a constructive aspect, is at the same time *deconstructive* - society is freed from incorrect knowledge, from knowledge, steeped in ideological fragments, there are eliminated solutions without heuristic value, there is cumulated knowledge, which is the engine of progress.

That is the proper cycle of scientific knowledge, which should not escape the range of vision of the reviewer.

*The third point* is connected with assessing the author's solutions at the different levels of the research process.

Its heuristic level is built up from the following elements-requisites:

- the accurate setting of the goal of the research;
- the correct definition of the problem and formulation of the theme;
- the collection of sufficient amount of starting data for the rationalization of the problem;

- the choice of appropriate means and methods of analysis;
- the successful definition of the analysis' hypotheses.

That level is connected with the laboratory for the conducting of the research, with its methodical and functional orientation. The heuristic level is the starting point of every creative process.

*The cumulative level* is connected with the creation of specific knowledge. It can be assessed in three consecutive stages:

- *the stage of the preparation* of the starting material: inquiry into theories (cognitional information), objects, problem-raising situations, relevant situations (classifications, hypotheses, systematizations, etc.). That stage is connected with the creation of the operative material of the research - a solution of the important and starting question for the state of the problem;
- *the stage of the creation of supplementary tools* for analysis - methodologies, methods, conceptions, programs, etc.;
- *the stage of the creation of the product* of analysis: initial - collection of existing or summing up of new facts; intermediate - formulation of hypotheses and provision of the conditions for their demonstration, and final - verification of hypotheses - creation of new theories, new methods, confirmatory facts, recommendations for the improvement of processes, etc.

Through those stages (and through the scientific-creative process in general) knowledge develops in the following general order:

- discovery of new, unexplained up till now facts and cumulation of knowledge about them characterized by breadth and depth;
- systematization and summarizing of facts;
- formulation of a theory of the area of the facts in question;
- transfer of that theory over other facts, conclusions, etc. and testing of the former;
- conducting empirical studies of the created theory;
- conclusive formulation of the nature and the contents of the new theory, etc.

*The fourth point* is connected with assessing the correlation among the servicing requisites of every research - on the one hand theme, goal, tasks and subject and on the other, the formulated hypotheses. In scientific research there is mutual penetration and complementation among those required elements - any controversy is undoubtedly a mistake and unbalances the research process.

The working hypothesis gets the main focus of the research. It is the main idea, the "rain-cloud" of the research process. In this line of thoughts the hypothesis (hypotheses) needs to be correlative with the theme of the research. The goal, tasks and adopted methods of research show the way of organization of

the creative process, that is, the technology of demonstration or rejection of hypotheses. On the whole the chain "object-theme-subject-hypothesis-goal-tasks-methods" in terms of their compatibility is the Achillean lever for searching on the part of the reviewer of inconsistency in the logic of the researcher, of lack of argumentation of the working hypotheses presented by the latter.

### **Assessment of the relation "analysis-results"**

As the doctoral defense is the most representative assessment field (a simultaneous assessment by reviewers and members of the scientific council) of the quality of the research, we give the *major requirements* of the Scientific Committee on Economic Sciences with the HAC to the reviewers of research work:<sup>3</sup>

1. Identification by the opponent of a clearly formulated theme (problem), goal, tasks and hypotheses in the dissertation.
2. Evidence of familiarity with literature and the achievements in the particular scientific area, including clearly outlined unsolved or partly solved issues.
3. Systematization and critical rationalization of existing scientific theses and taking by the doctoral student a well-grounded position.
4. Independently conducted research.
5. Correct interpretation of the obtained results, presented in a comprehensible, logical and precise form.

In addition to the assessment of the scientific value of the dissertation the opponent proves the eventual existence of the following types of contributions:<sup>4</sup>

- A) An addition to an existing theory and methodology, increasing its validity or broadening the field of its application.
- B) Development of a new method or improvement of known methods of solving the particular problem.
- C) Application of existing theory and methodology for solving, explanation and analysis of specific issues or processes along with the formulation of conclusions and recommendations.
- D) Application of existing methods of solving a specific economic issue along with the formulation of conclusions and recommendations to management practice.
- E) Enrichment, confirmation, challenge or specification of certain aspects of economic theory, including those achieved by means of experimental research.

In a more spatial form the expanded and enriched system of the requirements, as the comprehensive assessment platform, is given in Table 2.

---

<sup>3</sup> Препоръчителни научни и иконометрични показатели. ВАК. Научна комисия по икономически науки, Sofia, 2001, p. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

Possibilities to Improve the Complex Assessment of the Quality of Economic Research

**Table 2**  
Assessment Grid of the Research Product

No	Type of the Innovated Product	Established Rise (divergency) in the Parameters of the Innovated Product after the Research									The Effect of the Generated Results			
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1.	Idea													
2.	Issue													
3.	Fact													
4.	Argument													
5.	Category													
6.	Concept													
7.	Theory													
8.	Axiom													
9.	Phenomenon													
10.	Process													
11.	Regularity													
12.	Principle													
13.	Law													
14.	Invention													
15.	Property													
16.	Approach													
17.	Method													
18.	Methodology													
19.	Standard													
20.	Technology /scheme/													
21.	Model													
22.	Conception													
23.	Programme (recommendations)													
24.	Other													

Key: A) Enrichment (expansion); B) Confirmation (argumentation); C) Contestation (scientific explanation); D) Specification (improvement); E) Creation of a new product; F) Adaptation (transfer); G) Identification; H) Categorization (unification, structuralization); I) Definition; J) Scientific significance of the contribution; K) Applied significance and forms of implementation; L) Social and economic effect of the implementation; M) Prospects for future research.

The suggested assessment grid lets us introduce in the review the following points:

- determining innovated product (rather than a creative medium, as is the article, the study, the report, etc.) of the research (the researcher) - shown as 24 model phenomena;
- priorities in the creative contributions - indicators A to I;
- a determining requisite of the applied significance of the research - indicators J to M;
- relations among those three groups of indicators in the following sense: the creative product as a function of creative operations; the identified significance of the contribution as a function of the creative products; type of applied significance as a function of creative operations, etc.

In order to avoid possible errors when defining the contributions, it is recommended that the reviewers answer a priori some questions (Table 3).

*Table 3*  
Identification of Contributions in the Doctoral Work

No	What are the Past Solutions in the Literature and Practice to the Issue under Study?	What are the Solutions of the Researcher	What is New?	What is the Type (product) of the New Aspect - A Theory, Confirmation of Facts, Methodology, etc.?
1.				
2.				
N.				

The above identification can be supplemented by the search for correspondence<sup>5</sup> between the tasks set, the conclusions made and the formulated contributions (Table 4).

*Table 4*  
Correspondence between Tasks, Conclusions and Contributions  
in the Research Work

No	Tasks of the Research	Generated Conclusions on the Solution of the Individual Task	Composed Contributions
1.			
2.			
N.			

<sup>5</sup> Angel Smrikarov comes up with an interesting and very useful system of identification of the contributions, achieving simultaneously compatibility between those and the conclusions and tasks. See Тасев, Г. и др. Законова база и структура на дисертационния труд. РУ "Ангел Кънчев", Ruse, 2002, p. 31.

Such an approach is productive - through it we identify not only what has been achieved, but it also has educational-generalizing importance for the quality of the offered review. It portrays the author's work in the field of concrete contributions.

### **Negative aspects of the research process**

Reviewing is a tool for eliminating the negative in research and blocking the gray inflow. Since the most regular form of identifying omissions are the reviews of doctoral research, we put forward some general evaluations of that process.<sup>6</sup>

#### *Unsuccessful formulation of the theme*

*The object of the research cannot be the theme of the dissertation.* Its title should contain the specific problem and the main thesis of the author should be built in implicitly.

The real capabilities of the doctoral student can be demonstrated only if the theme is well-formulated.

It should be kept in mind that it must be: *first*, a function of the subject and the thesis, *second*, it must also emphasize on the consequences, *third*, it must specify the spatial and temporal borders of the analysis (where, when?).

#### *Insufficient familiarity with previous research on the theme*

Sometimes in the dissertation *there is no critical analysis of the rate at which the issue has been worked out in literature* as well as a listing, *first*, of the unsolved, partly solved and incorrectly solved issues and *second*, of solutions, which are unsatisfactory due to a change in the external environment.

That omission can be eliminated if the doctoral student generates answers to the questions given in Table 5 in advance.

*Table 5*

Critical Grid of the Problem-raising Field

Issue	How long, when, where, how ?					
	Solved	Unsolved	Partly solved	Incorrectly solved	Controversial	Modified by conditions

<sup>6</sup> During the development of this part there were used a number of ideas from: 3a дисертациите и авторефератите (становище на научната комисия). BAK, Sofia, 2003, p. 1-11; Плагиатството (становище на научната комисия). BAK, Sofia, 2001, p. 1-11; reviews of doctoral dissertations and some of the author's practical observations.

The critical analysis of solutions made so far (the organization of the unknown) is a required element of every research. On the basis of it we need to deduce the need for new solutions. At the same time this analysis allows for a better definition of the theme and its significance. It is of enormous importance for determining the objectives and tasks of the research.

It should not be forgotten that critical analysis also allows us to:

- draw the borderline between the familiar and the unknown;
- make a portrayal of the problem-raising field of analysis;
- define (specify) the theme, objectives and tasks;
- choose a suitable methodology and methods of the research and the exposition;
- formulate correctly the adopted restrictions for the analysis;
- note down the steps forward in the analysis;
- achieve succession between what has been done and what is needed in the analysis and development of the subject matter area of the dissertation.

#### *Underestimation of the scientific-methodological formulation of the issue*

What's common in that category of shortcomings refers to: *first*, the paradigmatic orientation of the author and the conceptualization of the problems; *second*, the choice and maintenance of the methodological framework of the analysis.

It is not uncommon for a dissertation to lack a conception that is clearly formulated and fully defended. The position of the author is usually lost, the manner of exposition is descriptive, without a clear-cut emphasis on the research stand, which shows that the depth of the insight in the research area is insufficient.

At the same time the framework of methodological choice (cognitive-normative, logical-empirical, disciplinary-interdisciplinary, micro/macroeconomic, historical and suprahistorical and other possible adopted approaches of analysis) is not delineated precisely enough. That should be defined in the introduction of the research and be observed in the analysis and the exposition.

#### *Insufficient novelty*

The dissertation should contain contributions, novelties for the theory and practice. They will be a sign of the knowledgeability of the doctoral student, the degree of familiarity with the subject of the dissertation, the quality of the performed analysis, etc. The possible contributions that are required, can be formulated in various ways (part of them were the subject of analysis of the requirements towards the reviews). Generally, they refer to: new arguments in support of a known thesis; new interpretation of well-known facts; new treatment of familiar issues; new opinion on an old issue, etc.

It is necessary that the doctoral student establish the progressiveness of his solutions on his own using the following criteria:<sup>7</sup>

- completeness of the proposed solutions - completely or partially solves the issue;
- formulation, specification, concretization, systematization of the issue;
- elimination of errors and contradictions in previous solutions;
- discovery of new, unaccounted essential facts, accumulation of new knowledge of them characterized by depth and width;
- generation of knowledge, which can be included in the solving of future issues, and on their basis there can be built new hypotheses;
- creation of solutions beneficial to a greater range of consumers, including those from other systems.

These are also a part of the criteria on which the research will be assessed, and the author should be aware of that.

#### *Undefined and Incorrectly presented hypotheses*

In some dissertations the main hypothesis (or group of hypotheses) is undefined or incorrectly presented. That is an essential omission, since the hypothesis is the basic suggestion, the supporting framework of the research, the defended assertion. The lack of a hypothesis (respectively a thesis) automatically puts a sign of equality between the dissertation and a classical diploma project.

It is totally unacceptable for the hypothesis to be defined as a task: "I am going to clarify", "to analyze", "to prove the need", etc. The hypothesis is something totally different and it, along with the other requisites, characterizes *the cognitional grid* of the research project. How then will the dissertation be defended if in it there isn't a defined and substantiated thesis, that is, at the time of writing there was no preliminary unifying idea in the field of vision of the doctoral student?

#### *Weaknesses in the composition of the research*

A major weakness can be the composition of the work. There is little emphasis as a suggestion and as an imperative on the outline of the three elements of every piece of work: *the commencement* - deduction of the problem; *the culmination* - the developed presentation of the problem and *the conclusion* - formulation of multifaceted solutions and a generalized thesis with an outcome towards theory and practice.

In the research there shouldn't dominate the establishing-analytical, but mostly the estimative approach, by which there will be created prerequisites for touching upon new facts, new solutions, new generalizations, new recommendations, etc.

The analysis in the work is not always based on the principal requirements:

- to be logically consistent;
- to contain no repetitions, and the text should gradually build up;

---

<sup>7</sup> Майданов, А. Op. cit., p. 38-41.

- the individual elements of the research should relate as a whole to a part: theme-chapter, chapter-paragraph, etc.;
- the title of the dissertation should not be at the same time a heading of a chapter, and the latter also of a paragraph.

#### *Style and other lapses*

There are significant weaknesses of a more specific nature.<sup>8</sup>

- a) concepts which are not precise enough - borrowed from different schools, those are frequently used, for example production forces (a category of the Marxist school) and production factors (a category of the neoclassical school);
- b) improper and incorrect quotation;
- c) in the bibliography used there are included works which have nothing to do with the theme, no matter what the viewing angle is;
- d) there is no evidence of the methodology and the methods of research, of the performed empirical experiments, the organized sociological studies, surveys, expert reports, etc. Those moments, however, are essential and give the dissertation a sense of completeness and practical orientation;
- e) insufficient attention is paid to the introduction, the conclusion and the editing of the material. Those otherwise interesting and very useful theses, which are presented in an unsatisfactory linguistic form, give an unpleasant impression and are a sign of the culture of the doctoral student.

The opponents "check" the dissertation also with respect to its style characteristics:

- accuracy, clarity, conciseness and brevity of the wording;
- businesslike efficiency and strictness in the description of the phenomena and processes;
- imagery and expressiveness of the vehicles, vividness and persuasiveness of scientific speech;
- strict continuity of the exposition, permanency of the starting theoretical positions, etc.

That necessitates an inevitable scientific and style editing of the research;

f) an essential weakness are the sometimes present traces of *plagiarism* in the submitted work.

*Plagiarism is theft* of intellectual property, a violation of Copyright Law and related rights. In the meaning of Law on Academic Degrees and Academic Titles it is an instance of *professional fraud*.

The identification of that phenomenon is connected with the borrowing of ideas, thoughts, texts, graphs, diagrams, tables, formulas by other authors, without specifically mentioning it.

---

<sup>8</sup> With respect to the requirements on style, layout of illustrations and tables, formulas, appendices, etc. see *Taceas, Г. et al.* Op. cit., p. 119-137.

## Possibilities to Improve the Complex Assessment of the Quality of Economic Research

The map<sup>9</sup> of possible antiplagiarism (of good practice according to the Higher Attestation Committee) is shown in Table 6.

*Table 6*  
Correct Quotation Guidelines

Type of Knowledge	Correct Use
Knowledge well-known to the academic circles	Source is not cited
Knowledge which is not well-known	If it is in a manual or a methodological handbook – source does not have to be cited. If it is in another scientific work - source must be cited.
Use of ideas, thoughts, research technology, results, etc.	Source must be cited.
Use of excerpts, thoughts, ideas, graphs from a specific source.	Source is cited.

Plagiarism is a harmful phenomenon and we should engage it in a constant and open fight. In this line of thoughts doctoral students should observe the moral requirements to every research process.

\*

The above analysis of the assessment of a research project of an economic subject-matter is an attempt at rationalizing the theoretical solutions to this issue from literature and the practical work on the defense of dissertations the author is familiar with.

The temptation to make a parallel analysis of the behaviour of the reviewer and the researcher stems out of the responsibility of the specialist-assessor to science and to himself. Through his behaviour he proves:

1. His potential of accumulated knowledge of the theory and methodology of scientific creative work and the opportunities for their application in respect of the assessment of somebody else's work which, however, is close to his research field.
2. His analytical abilities, which have reached a degree of generating comparative generalizations and recommendations - mastery of the methods of research in the particular area and the particular issue.
3. The possibilities to respect somebody else's opinion, to generate well-grounded assessments and recommendations.

His assertions would be more reliable if researchers were required to submit additional information concerning their contributions - for instance filling in Tables 3, 4 and 5.

Only in this way will the activities of auditing research be typologized and there will constantly be sought real ways to raise their quality.

21.XII.2004

---

<sup>9</sup> See Плагиатството..., p. 5.