

Science News

from research organizations

How success breeds success in the sciences

New research finds that in the sciences, early career success yields large and lasting advantages -- a phenomenon known as the 'Matthew effect'

Date: April 27, 2018

Source: University of California - Berkeley Haas School of Business

Summary: A small number of scientists stand at the top of their fields, commanding the lion's share of research funding, awards, citations, and prestigious academic appointments. New research shows it's not necessarily because they are better and smarter than their peers, but rather, the result of the 'Matthew effect.'

Share:      

FULL STORY

A small number of scientists stand at the top of their fields, commanding the lion's share of research funding, awards, citations, and prestigious academic appointments. But are they better and smarter than their peers? Or is this a classic example of success breeding success -- a phenomenon known as the "Matthew effect"?

Mathijs De Vaan, an assistant professor in the Haas Management of Organizations Group, believes it's clearly the latter. In a paper published this week in *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, "The Matthew Effect in Science Funding," De Vaan presents the results of a study of Dutch research grants that shows precisely how much of an advantage early achievement confers, and identifies the reasons behind the boost. De Vaan, who came to Haas in 2015 after earning a PhD in sociology from Columbia University, co-authored the paper with Thijs Bol of the University of Amsterdam and Arnout van de Rijt of Utrecht University.

"To those who have, more will be given"

The term "Matthew effect" was coined by sociologist Robert Merton in the 1960s to describe how eminent scientists get more recognition for their work than less-well-known researchers -- the reference is to the New Testament parable that, to those who have, more will be given. Previous attempts to study this phenomenon have yielded inconclusive results, in part because it is hard to prove that differences in achievement don't reflect differences in work quality.

To get around the quality question, De Vaan and his co-authors took advantage of special features of the main science funding organization in the Netherlands, IRIS, which awards grants based on a point system. Everyone whose application scores above the point threshold gets money, while everyone below is left out. The authors zeroed in on researchers who came in just above and just below the funding threshold, assuming that, for practical purposes, their applications were equal in quality.

First off, they found the benefits of winning an early-career grant were enormous. Recent PhDs who scored just above the funding threshold later received more than twice as much research money as their counterparts who scored immediately below the threshold. The winners also had a 47 percent greater chance of eventually landing a full professorship. "Even though the differences between individuals were virtually zero, over time a giant gap in success became evident," De Vaan notes.

Status and participation

De Vaan says that two main mechanisms may explain the Matthew effect in science funding. First, winners achieve status that can tilt the playing field in their direction when it comes to funding, awards, and job opportunities. The second is participation, meaning that successful applicants continue seeking grant money, while unsuccessful applicants often give up, withdrawing from future competition.

De Vaan and his coauthors argue that the Matthew effect erodes the quality of scientific research because projects tend to get funded based on an applicant's status, not merit. Groundbreaking work may not get done because the researchers are unknown or too discouraged to compete for funds. They recommend several reforms to the funding process, including limiting information grant application reviewers have about previous awards. They also suggest that rejected applicants learn their scores, which might encourage those just below the threshold to try again.

These findings may apply in many areas beyond science. For example, the Matthew effect may also widen a gulf between winning and losing entrepreneurs in the race for venture capital. Even the Academy Awards may favor big movie industry names over lesser-known talent. "There are a lot of social settings with large amounts of inequality, which could be ripe for the study of the Matthew effect," De Vaan stresses.

Story Source:

Materials provided by **University of California - Berkeley Haas School of Business**. *Note: Content may be edited for style and length.*

Journal Reference:

1. Thijs Bol, Mathijs de Vaan, Arnout van de Rijt. **The Matthew effect in science funding**. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2018; 201719557 DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1719557115

Cite This Page:

[MLA](#)[APA](#)[Chicago](#)

University of California - Berkeley Haas School of Business. "How success breeds success in the sciences: New research finds that in the sciences, early career success yields large and lasting advantages -- a phenomenon known as the 'Matthew effect'." ScienceDaily. ScienceDaily, 27 April 2018. <www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/04/180427100301.htm>.

RELATED STORIES



Negative Citations Important to Scientific Progress Should Be Tracked, Says New Study

Feb. 23, 2016 — Negative citations are not necessarily a bad thing, says a new article. Tracking those citations can reveal where there is particular 'vitality' in a research area, especially when there is ... **read more »**

Assessing the Role of Negative Citations in Science

Oct. 26, 2015 — Not all academic citations are positive ones, and a new paper finds that as many as one in 50 citations in a top immunology journal were critical in ... [read more](#) »

Social Ties Influence Who Wins Certain Hollywood Movie Awards

Mar. 13, 2014 — When it comes to Oscars and some other Hollywood movie awards, who your friends are affects whether you win, according to a new study. Film awards generally fall into two categories: those, such as ... [read more](#) »

Research Funding Has Become Prone to Bubble Formation

Nov. 22, 2013 — Fashions in research funding, reward structures in universities and streamlining of scientific agendas undermine traditional academic norms and may result in science bubbles. New research shows how ... [read more](#) »

FROM AROUND THE WEB

Below are relevant articles that may interest you. ScienceDaily shares links and proceeds with scholarly publications in the TrendMD network.

[Retrain the Brain](#)

Telemedicine Magazine

[Better sleep can literally make us feel like a million bucks](#)

Ana Sandoiu, Medical News Today

[Why Clinical Trials Shouldn't Be Stopped Early for Benefit](#)

EPMonthly

[free slots best online casino review on stargames.me](#)

Telemedicine Magazine

[A brash idea to reinvent pharma and \(maybe\) make a mint](#)

STAT

[Diagnostics Projects Among Winners of £26M in Funding](#)

360Dx

[Sexism in the ED: How pervasive is gender bias?](#)

EPMonthly

[A Market In Search of a King](#)

Telemedicine Magazine

Powered by

Free Subscriptions

Get the latest science news with ScienceDaily's free email newsletters, updated daily and weekly. Or view hourly updated newsfeeds in your RSS reader:

 [Email Newsletters](#)

 [RSS Feeds](#)

Follow Us

Keep up to date with the latest news from ScienceDaily via social networks:

 [Facebook](#)

 [Twitter](#)

 [Google+](#)

 [LinkedIn](#)

Have Feedback?

Tell us what you think of ScienceDaily -- we welcome both positive and negative comments. Have any problems using the site? Questions?

 [Leave Feedback](#)

 [Contact Us](#)

[About This Site](#) | [Editorial Staff](#) | [Awards & Reviews](#) | [Contribute](#) | [Advertise](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms of Use](#)

Copyright 2018 ScienceDaily or by other parties, where indicated. All rights controlled by their respective owners. Content on this website is for information only. It is not intended to provide medical or other professional advice. Views expressed here do not necessarily reflect those of ScienceDaily, its staff, its contributors, or its partners.

Financial support for ScienceDaily comes from advertisements and referral programs, where indicated.