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INTRODUCTION TO THE SPECIAL ISSUE

Understanding the Social Sciences and Humanities in Europe

Johan Heilbron, Thibaud Boncourt, Rob Timans
johan.heilbron@planet.nl

For a long time European integration could be perceived as a unidirectional process. Although it was never uncontested and developments across various domains were markedly uneven, the process as a whole appeared to many as one of steady and almost irreversible progress. Since the early treatises, which created the European Coal and Steel Community (1952) and the European Economic Community (1958), economic modernization and establishing an internal market were the primary objectives. After decades of relatively slow growth, the Fall of the Berlin wall in 1989 and the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe accelerated economic integration and provoked a wave of unprecedented political expansion. The single market design was completed in 1993, the euro introduced in 1999, and the European Union was enlarged from 12 to 28 member states in little over a decade. Well before the Brexit vote of 2016, however, the French and Dutch votes against a European constitution in 2005 had already manifested increasing suspicion toward the European bureaucratic and political elites. The financial crisis of 2007–09, the Greek depression, and the economic downturn that followed not only sharpened attention to monetary and other economic problems, they also deepened awareness of the difficulties that Europe faces.

As compared to the older, more confident literature about European integration, recent scholarship has rightly insisted on the peculiarities and problems of the European Union. The most general, long-standing and lasting issue has been the disjunction of market liberalization and political institution building. How can markets function under conditions of “limited statehood” (Risse 2011)? Taking up these questions from the perspective of field theory, the European Union is probably best understood as constituting a “weak field,” that is a social space, comparable to other social spaces, but one defined by its limited degree of autonomy. As a transnational field, the universe of European agents and institutions is structurally dependent on more strongly integrated and institutionalized national fields (Georgakakis 2009, 2011; Vauchez 2011; Sapiro 2013; see also Fligstein 2008). One of the key questions of Europeanization is thus how the European areas of political, economic or cultural action are intertwined with, and dependent on, the various national systems on which they have been built.
One of the more salient aspects of the European political field, for example, is the much discussed “democratic deficit” (Moravcsik 2003, Follesdal and Hix 2006). The European Union has an elected parliament since 1979, but its position is relatively weak, its debates in Brussels and Strasbourg are largely inaudible to citizens of the member states, and voter turnout for its elections has seen a downward trend. While there is no lack of European policymaking, it is not properly rooted in a democratic process of political deliberation. Without a public sphere on a European scale, Europe is confined to a process of “policymaking without politics” (De Swaan 2003). Since there are hardly any European newspapers, magazines and television channels, European citizens and their organizations have few ways of expressing themselves and engaging in a regular exchange of views (on these issues see Fossum and Schlesinger 2007; Frank et al. 2010). This lack of a European public sphere is often attributed to language barriers, but it is also caused by the near absence of the kind of cultural and intellectual institutions that could provide an infrastructure for opinion formation and debate on a European level. This “cultural void” (De Swaan 2007) is all the more troublesome, because it is not recognized as a major problem in the public spheres of the individual nation states. European integration thus seems trapped in a vicious circle. The EU cannot function democratically without a public sphere, but the lack of such a public sphere is not considered a major issue in the nation states that form the European Union.

The deep crisis that the European Union is currently going through not only requires analysis of the political, economic, and social issues. There is also a need for a better understanding of the intellectual tools to study these issues—in other words of how knowledge is produced in and about the European Union, how this knowledge circulates across national and other boundaries, and how it is appropriated and mobilized by various groups and institutions.

Scholars, especially in the social sciences and humanities (SSH), played a prominent role in the production and legitimization of European integration, most strikingly in the case of law and the creation of European institutions (Cohen and Vauchez 2010; Georgakakis and Rowell 2013), and in the case of economics and the setting up of the single market (Hay and Rosamond 2002, Mudge and Vauchez 2012). By striving to build a “European Research Area” and developing their own science funding schemes, European institutions have, in return, also shaped the development of SSH disciplines in Europe. This special issue of *Serendipities* argues that an analysis of the interactions between European institutions and the social sciences and humanities is essential both to understand the current crisis of European integration and its legitimization, and to identify and improve patterns of international collaboration and exchange in the SSH.

**Studying the Production and Circulation of SSH Knowledge in Europe**

Assessing the production and circulation of knowledge within and about Europe implies studying a large and complex set of issues. It requires an account of the functioning of the “European Research Area,” and its consequences for the SSH disciplines themselves, and more broadly for the workings of the intellectual field and the public sphere at the European level.

Few studies have addressed such issues. Inquiries about the European SSH have been concerned with rather ill-defined questions about European “identity” (Nedelmann and Sztompka 1993), with the juxtaposition of national cases while ignoring the transnational level (Coats 2000), or with research capacity and policy matters (Kuhn and Remoe 2005; Kovács and Kutsar 2010; Kastrinos 2010). Rarely have such studies dealt with the complex relations between the European and the
national level in SSH research, with the circulation and uses of SSH knowledge, or with the position of European SSH disciplines in the more global context.

Debates about the internationalization of the SSH, for example, have focused on “globalization,” on the spread of the social sciences worldwide, the hegemony of Anglo-American or Western social science, or, alternatively, on “Southern” or “subaltern” perspectives on knowledge production (Alatas 2006; Alatas and Sinha-Kerkhoff 2010; Chakrabarty 2000; Connell 2007; Keim et al. 2014; Kuhn and Weidemann 2010; UNESCO 2010). What has been obscured in many of these studies, however, is that internationalization has not only taken the form globalization, but also of transnational regionalization (Heilbron 2014). Within the worldwide growth of transnational scholarly exchange, various transnational regional fields have emerged (for illustrations see UNESCO 2010; Gingras 2002, Gingras and Heilbron 2009). Located between national systems of higher learning and global arrangements, these transnational regional structures include research councils like the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLASCO, founded in 1967), the Association of Asian Social Science Research Councils (AASSREC, 1973), the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA, 1973), and the Arab Council for the Social Sciences (ACSS, founded in 2008). Unfortunately the documentation about these regional initiatives is sparse and uneven, and no historical or comparative analyses are readily available (see however Beigel 2013; for a regional perspective see also Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014).

While transnational regional initiatives have developed in most parts of the world—North America is the main exception—Europe may be considered to be its most advanced case. This process was generally driven by academic entrepreneurs who mobilized their network to profit from growing funding opportunities. During the 1960s and 1970s funding for European SSH projects came mainly from American philanthropic foundations (Gemelli 1998; Boncourt 2015, 2016). Since the 1980s, their role has been gradually taken over by European research policy in the context of a deepening European integration. Against the background of a deep economic recession and in the face of mounting international competition, European research and development funding became concentrated in multi-annual, collaborative “Framework Programmes”. The first was launched in 1984, the seventh Framework Programme ran during the years 2007–2013 after which they were replaced by the Horizon 2020 Programme. With the so-called Lisbon Agenda (2000) research officially became a European priority. Europe, as was famously declared by the government leaders assembled in Lisbon, was to be transformed into the “most competitive knowledge economy” in the world. The route mapped out for scientific research was parallel to that laid down for education. Just as the Bologna Process of 1999 aimed at creating a single European Higher Education Area (EHEA), research policy now set out to establish a European Research Area (ERA). One of the most tangible consequences of this process was the establishment of the European Research Council (2007). As the equivalent of the American National Science Foundation, it funds research in all disciplines, independent of policy objectives, with “scientific excellence” as the only criterion. As such, it represents a significant complement to the policy-oriented research of the Framework Programmes.

These European funding schemes contributed to a strong growth of European research projects, networks, exchange programs, journals and scholarly associations. Together with the establishment of European databases like the European Social Survey (ESS) or the Consortium of European Social Science Data Archives (CESSDA), these initiatives have acquired a pivotal role in the functioning of the “European Research Area.” However, at the same time, the position of the SSH in the EU bureaucratic field has remained not only relatively weak, but fundamentally contested. The SSH have proved to be vulnerable to shifting ideological winds and political attacks. Although the SSH are
arguably more important now than ever given the problems Europe is facing today (migration, inequality, threats to democracy etc.), the allocation of EU funding to SSH research has been put under strain. For example, in the original propositions for Horizon 2020, no specific “societal challenge”—that is, issues defined as priority research topics by European institutions—fell specifically within the realm of the SSH. Although a mobilization of European SSH researchers resulted in a revised design and an improved place for these disciplines, subsequent policy implementation measures did not consistently follow this revision. The place of SSH in EU funding schemes still appears to be under threat, at a time when it has become crucial for the financial backing of these disciplines.

This special issue of *Serendipities* provides a historical and sociological perspective on the processes that shaped, and are shaping, the European Research Area in the social sciences and humanities. In line with prior studies of the European intellectual field (Charle 1996; Sapiro 2009) and its interactions with European institutions and integration (Adler-Nissen and Kropp 2015), it puts the emphasis on the study of circulations between the national and transnational levels, and between the scientific and political fields. As it analyzes the complexities of the formation and functioning of a transnational field of the social sciences and humanities, it studies processes that are not specific to the European case. Transnational regional scientific fields exist around the globe, and a better understanding of the European case may contribute to addressing the challenges that the SSH face all over the world.

**Outline of the Special Issue**

The articles gathered in this special issue study the interactions between European integration and the development of European SSH from different angles. The first four papers are case-studies of the “Europeanization” of the SSH. They respectively focus on European SSH associations, journals, and databases, as well as the only academic European institution in the SSH: the European University Institute (EUI). After these case studies two more general articles analyze the two most important European funding schemes and their consequences. The first studies the functioning of the European Research Council (2007), the second examines the other main instrument of European support for the SSH: the so-called Framework Programmes.

Thibaud Boncourt studies the development of European SSH associations. He shows that the creation and development of these professional organizations has been driven by interactions between academic entrepreneurs and political actors, such as philanthropic foundations and, later, European institutions. By comparing the membership of these associations, he also argues that they foster different forms of “Europeanization”, structured around different geographical areas. This process of “Europeanization” is shown to be, in any case, strongly structured by the weight of the United States.

Johan Heilbron, Madeline Bedecarré, and Rob Timans focus on “European” SSH journals. They show that the number of such journals has been growing since the 1960s, and at a particularly fast rate since the late 1980s—a time frame that corresponds to the process of European integration and policy making on the European level. They also argue that this growth has been concentrated in the most established disciplines (most European SSH journals are of a disciplinary or subdisciplinary nature), and that it has been dominated in particular by actors from the UK (these journals are published primarily by Anglo-American publishers and are run by editors from these countries).
Comparing two European social science surveys—the European Values Study and the European Social Survey, respectively launched in 1981 and 2001—Kristoffer Kropp shows that, in spite of what they have in common (both were closely connected to national and European social scientific institutions, and had ties to the EU), they enjoyed different fates. The European Social Survey was granted more symbolic and monetary resources than its counterpart, in part because it was more firmly embedded in academic networks with well-established epistemological and methodological goals.

Thibaud Boncourt and Oriane Calligaro focus on the only European transnational and academic institute devoted to research in the SSH. Founded in 1976, the European University Institute (EUI) was created by European community member states with the explicit objective to promote European integration. The article studies the extent to which European institutions succeeded in orientating EUI scholars’ scientific agenda, in a direction favorable to European integration. The article argues that this attempt only enjoyed limited success, as scientific disciplines proved autonomous enough to bend external influences to their own logics.

Other papers approach the topic of this special issue by focusing primarily on the emergence of European research policies and showing how they shape the field of European SSH. Barbara Hoenig studies funding allocated by the European Research Council (ERC) which is focused on “excellence” and independent of issues of policy relevance. She argues that European SSH have been relatively underperforming in their attempts to secure ERC grants, with national funding retaining key importance in these domains. She also shows that proportionally more ERC funding has been allocated to SSH in some countries (United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands) than others.

Rafael Schögler and Thomas König analyze the policy-related European Framework Programmes. They address the mode of operation of these research projects and their ambitions with regard to the social sciences. Although the Framework Programmes provided the largest amount of European funding and significantly enhanced transnational collaboration, the “SSH” labelled programme has been a residual category within the overall structures of the Framework Programmes.

Collectively, these studies point to the key role played by political actors and funding schemes for the development of a SSH research infrastructure in Europe: associations, journals, databases, and the EUI all benefited from such support and have become established institutions in the field of European SSH. The articles also show that some of these funding opportunities were conditional upon researchers addressing specific topics (for example, European institutions sponsored the EUI in order to promote research on European integration) or developing specific approaches (for example, American philanthropic foundations aimed to promote the diffusion in Europe of behavioralism, a paradigm originally developed in the United States). These intellectual objectives, however, were only partially achieved. By funding the development of an SSH infrastructure, political actors created the conditions for the increasing autonomy of disciplinary fields which, in turn, became able to bend political injunctions in a direction compatible with their specific scientific debates. The extent to which the SSH provide tools to legitimize political processes is, thus, a product of a negotiation between the political and scientific fields.

The articles also draw converging conclusions on the weight of Anglo-Saxon countries on the history and structure of European SSH. Historically, the United States played a key role in the shaping of European SSH at both the institutional and intellectual level. Philanthropic foundations provided significant funding for the creation of European associations and research centers in several disciplines, while the US has retained considerable importance as a point of reference for the
intellectual positioning of all nascent European endeavors—the US being, in most cases, conceived either as a “model” to emulate or as a hegemonic threat to the diversity of European thought. The articles also show that the UK assumes a key position in the emerging field of European SSH, acting as a host for many SSH structures (most prominently journals) and obtaining large shares of EU funding. It seems likely, however, that Brexit will have significant consequences for this state of affairs although, at the time of publication, the scale and nature of these consequences is difficult to predict.

The special issue closes with a document that proposes a series of relevant indicators for studying the internationalization of the social sciences and humanities. It complements a similar document on indicators of institutionalization published in a previous issue of *Serendipities*.¹

This thematic issue is the outcome of a workshop about the social and human sciences in the European Research Area, organized at Erasmus University Rotterdam on 25–26 February 2016 in the framework of the European INTERCO-SSH project. The aim of the workshop was to gain insight into the functioning of the European field of the social sciences and humanities, in particular in order to identify obstacles to European exchange and collaboration, and to stimulate new avenues for collaboration in the social and human sciences. INTERCO-SSH’s disciplinary scope included classical social science disciplines (economics, political science, sociology, anthropology, psychology) as well as some of the humanities (philosophy, literature).²


² This project, including the Rotterdam workshop, received funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 319974 (Interco-SSH).
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ARTICLE

The Struggles for European Science. A Comparative Perspective on the History of European Social Science Associations

Thibauld Boncourt
t.boncourt@gmail.com

Abstract

How and in what way are the social sciences becoming European? This paper answers this question by comparing the creation and development of eight European associations rooted in five disciplines (sociology, economics, anthropology, political science, psychology). It shows that the Europeanisation of the social sciences is linked to different types of competitions: rivalries between scientific paradigms, competitions between academic institutions, as well as geopolitical tensions. Europeanisation works as a resource that can be used on these different stages, in the framework of pre-existing institutional, intellectual and political conflicts. However, the use of this resource tends to only partially achieve intended objectives. As associations grow, their objectives, practices and agendas become increasingly autonomous from what their founders intended. They are also shown to be relatively confined to certain geographical areas, rather than encompassing the whole of Europe. European associations thus appear to only foster limited transnational convergence.
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Introduction

Internationalisation is a relatively late phenomenon in the history of scholarly associations. While national scientific academies were created as early as the 17th century, international forms of scientific gatherings were not organised before the 19th century. They first took the shape of a few punctual congresses, mostly around the discipline of physics. After 1850, the number of such congresses began to grow at an exponential pace and became more diversified at the disciplinary level, with both natural (e.g. physicists, biologists) and social scientists (e.g. demographers, geographers) organising such events. Several disciplines, such as statistics, set out to hold congresses on a regular basis, thereby paving the way for the creation of proper international scholarly associations (Rasmussen 1995; Brian 1999; Feuerhahn and Rabault-Feuerhahn 2010; Jeangepierre and Boncourt 2015). More than 350 such associations were then created between the mid-19th and the late 20th century, with over 70 percent of them being founded after 1945 (Schofer 1999). These organisations differ in terms of their geographical scope: some seek to have a global reach (internationalisation), while others have continental or regional ambitions (regionalisation). European associations are prominent examples of the latter (Europeanisation).

Most international social science associations were created after 1945 (Tables 1 and 2). International and European associations, however, were founded at different stages. International ones were mostly created in the late 1940s or early 1950s. They had common political roots as they were founded under the auspices of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), which aimed at stimulating the expansion of the social sciences worldwide as part of its general mission of strengthening world peace through cultural ties. They also had similar structures (they were all federations of national associations) and organised comparable activities (world congresses, journals, bibliographical inventories, etc.) (Platt 1998; Boncourt 2009). In contrast to these strong similarities between disciplines, European associations were founded from the second half of the 1960s onwards, with important fluctuations across disciplines: organisations were set up in different contexts (e.g. during and after the Cold War) and initiated in different countries; they relied on funds from diverse sources (philanthropic foundations, national governments, the European Union, etc.); and they structured themselves around different types of membership, organisational set-ups, and intellectual orientations (Table 3).

Thus, in contrast to prior developments, the Europeanisation of the social sciences appears to be the product of multiple processes. This leads to two questions: (1) Under what conditions do continental forms of internationalisation emerge? (2) What are the effects of this Europeanisation on the international structure of disciplines?
### Table 1: Creation of main international and European social science organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940–1949</td>
<td>IPSA (49)</td>
<td>ISA (49)</td>
<td>IUAES (48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950–1959</td>
<td></td>
<td>IEA (50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>IUPsyS (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960–1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EAESP (66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970–1979</td>
<td>ECPR (70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980–1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>EEA (84)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EASA (89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–1999</td>
<td>ECSR (91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–2009</td>
<td>EpsNet (96)</td>
<td>ESA (92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–...</td>
<td>EPSA (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>WEA (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- ECPR (70) European organisation
- IPSA (49) International organisation

### Table 2: Names and acronyms of international and European organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EASA</td>
<td>European Association of Social Anthropologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAEESP</td>
<td>European Association of Experimental Social Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECPR</td>
<td>European Consortium for Political Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECSR</td>
<td>European Consortium for Sociological Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>European Economic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSA</td>
<td>European Political Science Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EpsNet</td>
<td>European Political Science Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>European Sociological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEA</td>
<td>International Economics Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSA</td>
<td>International Political Science Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
<td>International Sociological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUAES</td>
<td>International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUPsyS</td>
<td>International Union of Psychological Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEA</td>
<td>World Economics Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Characteristics of main European social science organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>First president</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECPR</td>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>• Ford Foundation • University of Essex</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EpsNet</td>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>• European Union • Sciences Po</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSA</td>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>• Founders’ own funds</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECSR</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>• European Union</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>• Austrian government</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEESP</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>• Central banks • Belgian ministry of economy • European Cultural Foundation</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAESP</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>• Royaumont, Volkswagen and Ford Foundations • Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASA</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>• Wenner-Gren Foundation</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Literature Review and Research Approach

While international scientific associations—and, especially, European social science associations—have not been much studied in the literature, some authors have looked at the causes and effects of the internationalisation of the social sciences.

Authors interested in the causes of internationalisation have provided two types of answers. For part of the literature, the origins of internationalisation lie in the properties of national fields. The internationalisation of the social sciences has to be understood as the combined consequence of the national development of disciplines, the diversity of national scientific “traditions”, the unequal international distribution of “research capacities” (Unesco 2010), and the linguistic properties of different countries. Correlatively, the transnational circulation of ideas is seen as an import-export phenomenon: concepts, methods, and paradigms are produced in an “exporting” national field before being transferred to an “importing” national field (Bourdieu 2002). Internationalisation is conceptualised as a “stage” in the development of disciplines that comes after national developments. In other words, “the international is made exclusively of national stuff” (Guilhot 2014: 64). By contrast, another part of the literature highlights the transnational dynamics that shape sciences from a very early stage (Adcock et al. 2007; Heilbron et al. 2009). Disciplinary fields are analysed as transnational from the outset, and ideas are presented as produced in and by these “interstitial” spaces (Gemelli 1998: 249; Guilhot 2014: 79). The emergence of a transnational scientific infrastructure is a mere consequence of the pre-existing circulation of knowledge and researchers.

The study of the effects of internationalisation has revolved around that of the convergence mechanisms that are commonly associated with them. These mechanisms have been interpreted in two different ways. For part of the literature, internationalisation is linked to an incremental homogenisation of scientific knowledge and practices. The process is seen as an aggregate of local interactions that produce different effects in different contexts: local appropriations of scientific ideas developed elsewhere lead to heterogeneous hybridisations (Bourdieu 2002; Rodriguez Medina 2014). By contrast, another approach analyses internationalisation as a hegemonic process. It is seen as linked to domination relationships between scientific “centres” and “peripheries”: harmonisation is the process by which centres impose dominant scientific orientations to peripheries (Alatas 2003; Keim 2010 and 2011; Keim et al. 2014; Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014), and internationalisation is often taken as a synonym of “Americanisation”.

This article engages in a debate with these different approaches as it follows a relational approach to internationalisation. In line with studies of the transnational history of the social sciences (Guilhot 2005 and 2014; Fourcade 2006; L’Estoile 2007; Heilbron et al. 2009), it studies scientific internationalisation in connection with the evolution of several social fields (scientific, academic, philanthropic, political) at different levels (national, international, European). Following the “new sociology of ideas” (Camic and Gross 2001; Camic et al. 2011) and related approaches of the history of the social sciences (e.g. studies of “Cold War social science”—see Solovey and Cravens 2012), it pays special attention to the interactions between dynamics internal and external to the scientific field. It especially emphasises the conflicted character of these interactions, who bring together actors with different (and not always compatible) interests and strategies.

This article also follows a different perspective. While the research strands described above share a structural approach of the international—the latter being described as a space made up either of national or transnational elements, relatively egalitarian or dominated by the United States (US)—this article sees internationalisation as a resource that may be used by different actors, to serve
different purposes. It emphasises the social uses of internationalisation rather than the international structure of science. Thus, the article contributes to a literature that analyses internationalisation as a means for actors to stand out in competitive environments (Dezalay and Garth 2002; Michel 2002).

These theoretical choices lead to two hypotheses that focus, respectively, on the causes and effects of internationalisation. First, this theoretical framework suggests that internationalisation is best conceptualised as a product of the actions of multiple actors pursuing different strategies, rather than a consequence of a single process (be it national or transnational). Thus, the article hypothesises that the resource of internationalisation is mobilised in different ways according to the specific contexts in which it unfolds and the configurations of actors involved. Second, the relational approach also suggests that internationalisation cannot be a priori defined as an Americanisation or creolisation process: the resource of internationalisation may be used to serve different intellectual agendas, with more or less success. Thus, the article hypothesises that internationalisation has different shapes in different contexts and that, correlatively, it alters the structure of disciplines in different ways.

In order to test these hypotheses, this article compares the history of eight social science associations (EAESP, ECPR, EpsNet, EPSA, EASA, EEA, ECSR, ESA) that belong to five disciplines: anthropology, economics, political science, psychology, and sociology. These disciplines are empirically connected. For several actors that played a part in their development (notably philanthropic foundations and the European Union), they are all seen as part of the “social sciences”. Their development was also influenced by the same paradigms (e.g. behaviouralism) and methods (e.g. the increasing sophistication of quantitative and qualitative techniques)—even though the extent of this influence varies across cases. They all claim the label “European”, rest on similar structures (organised around members and an executive committee, for example), and organise comparable scientific activities (as opposed to associations that are more concerned with lobbying).

Table 4: List of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Assoc.</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>ECPR</td>
<td>Jean Blondel</td>
<td>Founding member, first director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serge Hurtig</td>
<td>Founding member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ian Budge</td>
<td>Second director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David McKay</td>
<td>Third director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EpsNet</td>
<td>Gérard Grunberg</td>
<td>Founding member, first president</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>André-Paul Frognier</td>
<td>Founding member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSA</td>
<td>Ken Benoit</td>
<td>Current secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Hix</td>
<td>Founding member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>Jacques Drèze</td>
<td>First president</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Atkinson</td>
<td>First second vice-president</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>EASA</td>
<td>Jean-Claude Galey</td>
<td>Journal editor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Kuper</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>ECSR</td>
<td>Serge Paugam</td>
<td>EC member 2001-07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Goldthorpe</td>
<td>Founding member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>David Lane</td>
<td>First president</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The argument rests on qualitative and quantitative data gathered in the course of the INTERCO-SSH research project. As Table 4 shows, interviews were conducted with founding members and past officers of European social science organisations. Material was also collected from the records of these associations as well as from the Ford Foundation’s archives, the Foundation having contributed to the funding of many European social science organisations. The article also draws on accounts of the history of these organisations written by their founders and past officers (e.g. Kuper 2004; Moscovici and Markova 2006).

2. The Creation of European Scientific Associations: A Resource in Power Struggles

The comparison of the fluctuations of the variables listed in Table 3 indicates that the creation of European associations is a product of the actions of different groups of actors in different cases. It invites more precise studies of the sociological dynamics behind the creation of associations. A closer look at the history of European social science organisations shows that their founders pursued different kinds of scientific, academic and political strategies.

2.1. In the Shadow of the United States: Europeanisation and Scientific Debates

At the scientific level, most of the founders of associations aimed at changing the paradigmatic structure of their discipline on the European stage by either promoting or resisting “American” approaches. In the case of the majority of organisations (ECPR, ECSR, EPSA, EEA, EAESP), their founders strived to imitate American social sciences—or rather a specific part of them, as these actors mostly assimilated “American social sciences” with their most positivist, deductive, and statistically sophisticated factions, thus artificially reducing the internal diversity of the US field. They criticized European approaches to social issues and claimed that it was necessary to “catch up” to their American counterparts by importing “modern” approaches into Europe and subverting dominant paradigmatic power relations in the continent. This stance has to be understood in relation to these scholars’ trajectories. In contrast to many of their contemporaries, their careers were marked by transatlantic circulations. Notably funded by philanthropic foundations, these moves did not follow random logics. Rather, they were oriented towards the establishment of connections between European researchers and specific parts of American social sciences and especially behavioralism, whose domestic development had itself been sponsored by the same philanthropic foundations (see 2.3 below).

This process can be exemplified by the case of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR). Its founders, a group of scholars essentially based in Western and Northern Europe (UK, Germany, Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, France), and whose careers had been marked by research stays in the United States, in universities where behavioralism was growing in importance (e.g. Yale, Berkeley), had been united as a group through a series of transnational meetings held notably in the framework of the international political science and sociology associations. Thus socialised to behavioralism and statistical and comparative methods, they claimed that European political scientists did not know enough about “sophisticated” approaches to be able to interact, let alone
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1 The INTERCO-SSH project (“International Cooperation in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Comparative Perspectives and Future Possibilities”) is coordinated by Gisèle Sapiro and funded by the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under Grant Agreement n°319974 (INTERCO-SSH).
compete with their American colleagues. They therefore set up the ECPR as a means to disseminate these approaches into Europe (Daalder 1997; Budge 2006; Boncourt 2015).

Similar dynamics were at work during the creation of the European Consortium for Sociological Research—which took its name from the ECPR. Created in 1991, ECSR was founded by an international group of scholars from Western and Northern Europe (notably the UK, the Netherlands, Germany, and Sweden). This group, which had up until then been structured by the 28th Research Committee of the International Sociological Association, was united by a common interest in social stratification and mobility and in the application of mathematical techniques to the study of society. First developed in the US and imported into Europe during the 1950s, this quantitative and deductive sociology was seen as threatened by the rise, from the 1960s onwards, of “Marxist and phenomenological perspectives” in Europe. The creation of ECSR was thus a reaction to these evolutions and to what was seen as a political threat to the integrity of a purely scientific sociology:

It all changed at the end of the 1960s. A catalyst in many ways was the événements in Paris, and student rebellion in Germany and around the world. Well, one thing had been starting a little bit before, that kind of reaction in sociology to quantitative work, interest in phenomenological approaches to sociology and ethnomethodology, Garfinkel and co. But perhaps more important then, from the end of the 60s was the revival of Marxist sociology (...). And so these two reactions (...) came together in this so-called reaction against positivism, which I thought was intellectually quite incoherent. (...) And in some ways in this country, sociology became a substitute for religion for a lot of young people of sort of left-wing radical attitudes. And the idea was that it was the discipline that would lead in itself to social transformations. (...) The effect on sociology through the 70s on to the 80s from my point of view was quite disastrous. People were going into sociology for primarily political reasons (...). And I think intellectual standards fell very sharply. So then the whole idea that we had before of this engagement between American and European sociology of a very exciting and constructive kind, that was all lost. And it just became a fight in a way about the nature of sociology within the different countries. And this I think is where you can see the origins of ECSR. (...) Those of thus who believed that sociology had to be founded in serious empirical research which had at least to a large extent to be quantitative in character, and who also believed that theory had to be for use not for decoration (...), we felt that we had to do something to coordinate our activities across Europe.2

The case of political science shows that such pro-American European associations were not typical of the Cold War period, and that several of them may coexist in the same discipline. In 2010, and while ECPR had become a successful organisation (numerous members, multiple activities, etc.), the European Political Science Association was set up with the explicit aim of imitating the American example. Its founders, a group of political scientists predominantly based in Germany and the UK, felt that the growth of ECPR had led to the consortium “losing its soul”: they saw it as having become too open to sociological and historical approaches to politics, and believed that a new organization had to be created to showcase political science studies of a deductive and statistical kind3.

In these cases, as well as in others that will be further detailed below, the same dynamics were at work: Europeanisation was a way for marginalised intellectual factions to try to subvert dominant
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2 Interview with J. Goldthorpe.
3 Interviews with S. Hix and K. Benoit.
European scientific hierarchies by claiming to be promoting a “modern” and alternative approach to social phenomena, inspired by a particular part of American social sciences.

This process can also be observed in the creation of the other associations under study, albeit with opposite consequences. The founders of EASA (anthropology), ESA (sociology), and EpsNet (political science) presented themselves as occupying difficult positions in relation to American social sciences that would, this time, threaten the quality of scientific debates by their hegemonic tendencies. As in the previous case, the American field was seen here as more homogeneous than it actually was, as it was reduced to one of one its parts. The idea, then, was for Europeans to organise themselves in order to resist this “American orthodoxy”.

The case of the European Association of Social Anthropology provides a good example of this process. Created in 1989 by a heterogeneous group of scholars based in a variety of European countries (UK, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Germany, Austria, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece), this organisation sought to provide a counterweight to some of the anthropology that was then developed in the US (Silverman 2014). This approach, centred around the notion of culture and embodied by the work of Clifford Geertz, was criticised by the founders of EASA as “essentialist, idealist and relativist” (Kuper 2004: 154). It was seen as a threat to the scientific character of anthropology, as it brought it closer to the humanities than to the social sciences. The founders of EASA therefore sought to “create an alternative space for theoretical debates, an institutional counterweight to American institutions” (Kuper 2004: 154). In contrast to the “post-modern” tendencies of American anthropology, they presented themselves as the keepers of Claude Lévi-Strauss’s tradition of “social anthropology”. In so doing, they also distinguished themselves from the “folklorist” studies developed in Southern and Eastern Europe and emphasised the need for comparative approaches in anthropology. The process that led to the creation of EASA was thus different from those of ECSR and EPSA, in that the association’s founders openly criticised American social sciences. But it also stemmed from similar aspirations to promote a paradigm presented as superior to the others.

The cases presented in this section show that, in all the periods and disciplines under study, the creation of European social science associations can be presented as an attempt to stand out in scientific competitions and to subvert the dominant intellectual structure. Thus, scientific debates are one of the factors at work behind the creation of these organisations.

### 2.2. Europeanisation and Academic Competitions

The connections between European associations and particular countries (fifth column, Table 3) also calls for an analysis of the links between organisations and the national contexts in which they were created. While their founders saw these associations as means to promote certain ideas on the European and international stage, they were also designed to give them additional weight at the national level. Through Europeanisation and internationalisation, these scholars aimed to gain new symbolic resources—a form of prestige that they could then attempt to convert and use locally.
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4 Interview with A. Kuper.
5 Ibid.
6 The geographical origins of associations could also have been studied through the first location of their official seat. This indicator would, however, have been misleading, as some of these early “seats” and “secretariats” only existed on paper. Table 3 therefore uses the geographical location of European associations’ first directors as a proxy for their geographical origin. The indicator, though imperfect, gives information on the national field that was most active in the setting up of a given association.
(Dezalay and Garth 2002; Michel 2002; Dezalay 2004; Wagner 2007) and in academic competitions: for universities, hosting an international organisation was a way to legitimise themselves in relation to more established institutions. The creation of associations was thus connected to institutional ambitions.

This is tangible in several cases. The creation of ECPR in 1970 has to be understood in relation to the University of Essex’s ambition to rival top social science faculties in the UK, in spite of its relatively recent creation (Boncourt 2015). Founded in 1964, the University was one of the new institutions created in the framework of the rise of mass higher education (Anderson 1995: 16-17; Barry 1999: 434-436). These new universities were quickly faced with the task of attracting enough good students and funding to exist in an academic landscape that had for a long time been dominated by Oxford and Cambridge, as well as the LSE (Grant 2010). In the framework of this competition, Essex and its department of government followed an internationalisation strategy: the department organised a summer school in quantitative methods, recruited researchers with international backgrounds, and developed partnerships with foreign institutions (Blondel 1997; Boncourt 2015). The creation of a European consortium of political science was in line with these choices (Budge 2006). Interestingly though, the process did not go smoothly, as the department’s international partners also made a case to host the new organisation. While these attempts were unsuccessful and Essex became the seat of the consortium, they signal the fact that ECPR was seen as a potential resource for universities.

The foundation of EAESP in 1966 followed a similar logic. It was, like ECSR and ECPR, founded around a clear intellectual ambition: that of importing into Europe an experimental social psychology inspired by the work of Kurt Lewin, that claimed to be close to other social sciences and emphasised the importance of group dynamics rather than that of factors internal to individuals (Schruijer 2012). Elaborated in the framework of transatlantic networks, this approach was represented in Europe by a limited number of recent institutions, such as the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (EPHE), the University of Louvain, and the University of Bristol. The creation of EAESP was a way for these “University lightweights” (Moscovi and Markova 2006: 69) to establish their reputation in their respective national field. For EPHE, internationalisation was a way to gain weight in a field of French social psychology dominated by Sorbonne, where a research centre devoted to the subject had been created in 1951 (Arbisio-Lesourd 2002: 202–205). These local agendas were the reason why the original grant application for the creation of EAESP included funded requests for the association itself (35,000 USD) but also, and more importantly, for the EPHE, Louvain, and Bristol research centres (80,000 USD per laboratory), in order for them to develop their research activity, train young researchers, and “improve or facilitate communication between Americans and Europeans” (Moscovici and Markova 2006: 120–121; Schruijer 2012).

EEA and EpsNet were created along similar objectives, although the idea was for their promoters to enhance their reputation on the international stage, rather than the national one. In the case of economics, the creation of EEA in 1984 was a by-product of the prior activities of the Centre for Operations Research and Econometrics (CORE), which had been founded in 1966. This laboratory’s research priorities focused on game theory, mathematical modelling, and econometrics, explicitly along the lines of the American example. Its policy was to invite European and American scholars as fellows, in order to progressively gain weight at the international level. The creation of EEA was part of this effort7. In political science, Sciences Po pursued a similar agenda when it pushed for the creation of the European Political Science Network (EpsNet) in 1996, as a rival organization to the
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7 Interview with J. Drèze. See also Drèze 2008.
well-established ECPR. In contrast to the consortium, which put a strong emphasis on transatlantic connections and American paradigms, and whose members were mostly from Northern Europe, EpsNet presented itself as European in outlook, and more open to Southern and Eastern Europe. The creation of the new network was also part of Sciences Po Paris’s bid to become more internationalised and to find its place on the international scientific map, along with French political science as a whole.8

The study of intellectual and academic rivalries, however, does not tell the whole story, as factors external to the scientific field also played a role in the creation of European social science associations.

2.3. INTERNATIONALISATION AND THE POLITICISATION OF SCIENCES

The fourth column of Table 3 shows that the founders of social science associations often relied on external grants. As they sought to gather support and funding for their projects, they were led to collaborate with political actors such as national governments and, more frequently, philanthropic foundations.

The influence of philanthropic foundations on the development of the social sciences is well documented. In the context of the Cold War, these foundations sought to influence European cultural developments, with a view of contributing to the strengthening of transatlantic ties and to the containment of Soviet influence. Studies of the “cultural” or “intellectual Cold War” show the extent to which these actors played a role in the development of literature, arts, sports and sciences (Berghahn 2001; Sirinelli and Soutou 2008; Solovey and Cravens 2012). Social sciences were a key part of this project, as foundations invested money into the development of European economics, political science, social psychology, international relations and public administration, among other areas. By funding these disciplines, they sought to support the development of social knowledge in order to improve human welfare in the long run. Investing in Europe and other continents, such as Latin America, rather than in the US, was a way to help local social scientists catch up to their American counterparts, to deepen transatlantic connections and to strengthen European democracies (Saunier 2003; Moscovici and Markova 2006; Guilhot 2011; Tournès 2011). The Ford Foundation was the main actor in this process in the 1960s. At the time, the Foundation, which had first focused on funding American projects (Hauptmann 2012), changed its policy to encourage the development of non-American social sciences, which were seen as a good vector for promoting American political values and ideas (Magat 1979; Gemelli 1998).

Such logics were mostly at work in the case of associations that sought to imitate the American example, foster transatlantic ties, and promote a conception of science that was in tune with the dominant “Cold War rationality”—a combination of positivist and statistical reasoning (Erickson et al. 2013). Philanthropic support took different shapes across disciplines and associations. In some cases, the Ford Foundation and other philanthropic organisations contributed to the structuring of transatlantic and transnational networks, which would later form the basis of European social science associations. Several European social scientists thus held research fellowships in prestigious American universities and built on their American connections to create European associations some years later. Most of the founders of ECPR, EEA and EAESP had benefited from such fellowships (Daalder 1997; Moscovici and Markova 2006). In other instances, the Ford Foundation provided more direct support by funding the new association itself, the University, or the research centre that

8 Interview with A.-P. Frognier.
was hosting it. In the 1960s, its policy was to send envoys on tours of some of the European universities and encourage the launching of transnational social science endeavours. As they sought to strengthen transatlantic ties, envoys mostly visited institutions with a track record of interconnections with American social sciences (Magat 1979; Gemelli 1998; Drèze 2008). They notably visited the University of Essex, the University of Louvain and the École Pratique des Hautes Études, thus paving the way for providing financial backing to the creation of ECPR, EEA and EAESP (Moscovici and Markova 2006; Drèze 2008; Boncourt 2015). Memorandums internal to the Foundation about EAESP show the extent to which its support was conditional upon the new association adopting specific intellectual orientations:

The memorandum indicates [Ford Foundation Programme officer Robert] Schmid’s hesitation over including ‘observational’ social psychology. He thought that [EAESP founding member] Moscovici ‘might as well include some sociology and some behavioural political science. My personal view is that if we take these centres seriously we should not design them as social psychology centres but as behavioural science centres. The important exclusion… ought to be this: to keep out the descriptive, literary essay types… ones who masquerade in France as social researchers’. (Moscovici and Markova 2006: 126)

Events unfolded in a similar in the case of ECPR, albeit with a specificity. While the Foundation again played a role in the consortium being founded along behavioralist intellectual lines, it also inserted a political clause into ECPR’s statuses: subscription to the consortium was to be restricted to universities based in democratic countries and free from political influences. This principle, which was in line with the Foundation’s Cold War agenda, was also welcome by those of those of the ECPR founding fathers who had directly suffered from the war and were suspicious of communism (Daalder 1997: 227; Kaase and Wildenmann 1997: 40).

Aside of these philanthropic resources, some associations also received support from public authorities such as the European Union. The involvement of the EU comes at a later stage than that of philanthropic foundations and has implications for both “pro-American” (such as ECSR) and “anti-American” organisations (such as EpsNet). From the 1990s onwards, the EU indeed sought to promote the structuring of a “European Research Area” (ERA). Rather than pushing for the development of specific paradigms—be they of European or American origins—UE officials followed a geographical objective as they aimed at building scientific bridges between Eastern, Western, Southern and Northern Europe. The main idea behind the funding of the European Political Science Network was thus to support the development of an organisation that would be more closely connected to Eastern and Southern Europe than the existing ECPR was.

In some other cases, national governments also offered financial support to the new organisations. The fact that these subsidies were provided by relatively ‘small’ countries to associations that held their founding meetings on their soil—ESA in Vienna and EEA in Brussels—could be taken as an indication of the fact that hosting European organisations also constituted a way, however marginal, for these countries to enhance their international profile. Just like philanthropic foundations and the European Union, national governments thus followed their own political agenda when providing funding for the creation of European social science associations.

Table 3 also shows that disciplines are not equally able to obtain other sources of funding and, correlatively, to remain free of the political conditions that come with them. The European
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9 Interview with A.-P. Frognier.
Economics Association is indeed unique in having secured funding from central banks. This shows the extent to which the possibility for scholars to obtain financial support for their undertakings is also linked to the existence of strong connections between their discipline and non-academic professional fields. The very object of economic knowledge may thus have facilitated access to subsidies:

[When we created the EEA], we immediately recruited donor members, that we called honorary members, among which central banks were the most active. (...) We found several honorary members, and that allowed us to start our activities. And with 1800 members providing membership fees during the first year, things were not bad. I don’t recall finances as having been a major problem (...). It was rather easy [with central banks]: Europeans were getting together to collaborate and become more visible. I suppose we also told them that we were willing to compete with the Americans. It wasn’t a problem as central banks all have funds for charity activities. They sometimes gave difficulties finding beneficiaries who would fit all of their criteria, who would not be affiliated with political or religious activities, that sort of things. Us, we were very pure.10

Several factors thus interacted to trigger the creation of European social science organisations. National and international power struggles and competitions came into play at the scientific level (struggles between promoters of different paradigms and methods), the academic level (rivalries between universities) and the political level (competition between countries during and after the Cold War). The importance of these different factors varied according to the intellectual (dominant paradigms and methods) and organisational (existence of other European associations) structure of disciplines. In all cases, scientific internationalisation was a resource for various types of actors. However, the extent to which this resource had significant effects on the structure of disciplines still needs to be assessed.

3. An Efficient Resource? Confinement and Routinisation

While it is relatively easy to evaluate the “success” of associations from a purely organisational point of view (do they have an important membership? Stable sources of funding?), their impact on the general structure of disciplines is more difficult to assess (do they contribute to the circulation of the ideas that they intend to promote? Do they stimulate a form of Europeanisation of social science research?). It is possible, however, to use proxies that provide partial answers to these questions. The article looks, first, at the geographical scope of associations’ membership to show that it is often confined to particular regions, rather than encompassing the whole of Europe. The article then studies changes in associations’ intellectual agendas and ambitions to show that their relationship to scientific debates changes over time. The creation of European associations, originally designed as a resource to alter the structure of disciplines, appears to only partially achieve these objectives.

10 Interview with J. Drèze.
3.1. Scientific and Geographical Territories

The following tables and figures compile basic data on the current membership of eight European social science organizations (EASA, EASP\textsuperscript{11}, ECPR, ECSR, EEA, EPSA and ESA), EpsNet having ceased to exist as an autonomous association after having been absorbed by ECPR in 2007 (see 3.2).

Table 5 lists the four most represented countries in each association and allows us to highlight common points between disciplines and organisations. Some countries are indeed quantitatively dominant in most, if not all cases: Germany and the United Kingdom systematically count among the three most represented countries, and the United States and Italy also display high representation rates. ‘Small’ countries such as the Netherlands, Norway or Switzerland also appear to be more represented than their demographical weight could lead one to expect. By contrast, demographically ‘big’ countries such as France and Spain are underrepresented. Following part of the literature on the history of the social sciences (Klingemann 2008; Gingras and Heilbron 2009), one could take these numbers as linked to the linguistic position and the specific modes of internationalisation of national fields. The strong presence of Germany and the United Kingdom and the relative overrepresentation of small Northern European countries such as Scandinavian nations and the Netherlands could then be taken as a manifestation of their openness to the Anglo-Saxon world. Correlatively, the relative absence of France, Spain and Portugal could be understood as a consequence of the existence of alternative international arenas where French, Spanish or Portuguese are dominant languages. Other explanations could focus on national science policies as some national research evaluation schemes (such as the British Research Assessment Exercise and Research Excellence Framework) provide stronger incentives for internationalisation than comparable schemes in other countries (Camerati 2014).

Table 5: Four most represented countries in each organisation (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EEA (econ.)</th>
<th>ECPR (pol. sci.)</th>
<th>EPSA (pol. sci.)</th>
<th>ECSR (socio.)</th>
<th>ESA (socio.)</th>
<th>EASP (psycho.)</th>
<th>EASA (anthropo.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By revolving around the properties of national fields, these interpretations enable us to make sense of the common points between the memberships of European social science organisations. However, they provide no satisfactory explanation for the important differences that divide these organisations. These differences are tangible at two levels. First, the number of countries represented in the memberships of organisations may vary by a factor of three, from 20 in the case of ECSR to 66 in the case of EEA (Figure 1). Organisations also differ at the level of the geographical repartition of their members. Figure 2 illustrates this by classifying associations according to the share of Western members (that is, Western European and North American members together) that they gather. The case of EPSA, the most Western and American association in the sample (with 96.5 percent of Western members, against only 1.3 percent of Eastern European members), thus contrasts sharply with that of ESA (67.7 percent of Western members against 27.7 percent of Eastern Europeans). In

\textsuperscript{11} As described below, the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology (EAESP) has been renamed European Association of Social Psychology (EASP).
other words Europeanisation, as captured by the membership of European associations, takes different shapes in different disciplines.

**Figure 1: Number of countries represented in each organization.**

These variations may be explained by looking at the specific characteristics of European social science organisations. As they face various constraints linked to the specific organisational, scientific and political contexts they are embedded in, associations indeed follow different strategies to attract members and cumulate financial resources. These differences are tangible at a very early stage of their development and can be observed at three levels. The first is that of the type of members that associations gather, as most organisations work with individual members (EPSA, EEA, EASP, EASA, ESA) while a few are structured as consortiums of academic institutions (ECPR, ECSR). The second level is that of the geographical conditions that organisations set for membership: while some of them have always been potentially open to scholars based in any continent and country, others such as ECPR, ECSR and EASP originally restricted their membership to European or even West-European academics. The third level is that of activities organised by associations: while most of them focus on organising conferences and publishing a journal, some add to these classical activities by developing summer schools (ECPR, ECSR, EASP) and research workshops (ECPR).
This diversity of organisational forms plays a part in explaining variations in the geographical structure of organisations’ memberships. Conditions for membership have an obvious impact, and other parameters have an influence as well. Consortium formats may indeed hamper geographical diversification, as non-Western academic institutions experience difficulties in paying their high membership fees. In the same way, costly activities such as summer schools may also limit geographical diversity. The fact that ECPR, ECSR and EASP gather fewer countries than other organisations therefore appears logical.

However, differences in organisational settings should not be taken as the sole explanation for membership fluctuations. Indeed, as time went on, organisations grew and their structures evolved to become more and more similar, under the influence of mechanisms that will be further detailed below. Therefore, differences in the geographical scope of organisations must also be understood in relation to other factors. More specifically, the intellectual orientation of associations also appears to have an impact on membership, as it may be more or less compatible with dominant national paradigms. A principal component analysis (PCA) of associations’ membership thus locates organisations founded around the ambition of imitating the American example in the same region of the graph as Northern European countries (Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Denmark) and Central European ones (Switzerland, Czech Republic, Hungary). With the notable exception of the EEA, these associations also rely on a relatively restricted membership (Figure 3). By contrast, organisations founded with the objective of resisting American developments are located in the same
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12 The PCA used the proportion of members from a given country in each association as variables, and converted them into two uncorrelated principal components accounting for as much of the variance in the data as possible (respectively 31.66 % and 25.15 %–56.81 % in total). The two graphs are built using these principal components as x and y axes. The first figure projects variables (countries) unto the graph; the second projects associations (units). The comparison between the two graphs allows us to compare associations according to the geographical structure of their membership.

13 The presence of Czech Republic and Hungary could be considered surprising. However, both countries have historically been strongly connected with the American field, as they both acted as host to the American-sponsored Central European University (CEU).

14 This may notably be explained by the fact that EEA promotes a decontextualised conception of economics, as well as by the existence of a well developed professional economics field which facilitates the wide diffusion of the discipline (Fourcade 2006).
region of the graph as Eastern European countries (Rumania, Poland, Russia) and Southern European ones (Italy, Portugal, Greece).

Figure 3. European associations positions according to the structure of their membership (principal component analysis)
This data suggests that a given association’s ability to “penetrate” a given national field depends on the compatibility of the own intellectual orientation and the specific scientific history of the country in question. Thus, “national social science traditions” (Heilbron 2008) may facilitate or impede such penetration. While these phenomena are hard to quantify, it is for example reasonable to assume that the specificities of French political science (which has historically been strongly connected first to law, and then to Bourdieusian sociology) had an influence on its relative underrepresentation in ECPR (Bouillaud 2009). Whatever the validity of this hypothesis, it should be noted that actors themselves give it credit: they believe that intellectual factors have an influence on their association’s fortunes, and they adapt their strategies accordingly—as will be shown in 3.2.

The data thus suggests that associations’ ambitions are limited by the regional perimeter that they effectively manage to cover. Moreover, these ambitions also evolve over time.

### 3.2. From Strong Intellectual Statements to Ecumenism

As their organisational environment became denser and more competitive (political science having for example up to three European organisations in the 2000s) and political contexts changed (notably in relation to the fall of communist regimes), associations became more acutely aware of their opportunities for growth and their risk of decline. The case of EpsNet shows that these risks were more than just speculative as, after having been funded by the European Union, the organisation failed to gather enough members to remain independent and was eventually absorbed by ECPR. Therefore, on the basis of strategic reviews produced by internal task forces, associations adapted their rules and activities by importing from other organisations what they identified as “best practices”, with the explicit objective of attracting new members.

This organisational competition and isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell 1991) had consequences for the structures and activities of associations. On the one hand, it led to a softening of their conditions for membership: some associations opened their membership to Eastern Europe by reducing fees for scholars located in the region (ECPR, ECSR) and others created “associate” or “affiliate” membership categories to allow non-European, and especially American academics to join (ECPR, EASP). On the other hand, organisations diversified their activities by publishing new journals (the *European Journal of International Relations*, *European Political Science* and the *European Political Science Review* in the case of ECPR; the *Journal of the European Economic Association* in the case of EEA; the *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology* in the case of ESA, etc.), organising additional events and conferences (often dedicated to PhD students) and creating scientific prizes (the Hicks-Tinbergen medal in the case of EEA, the Jean Blondel prize for ECPR, etc.). The organisational landscape thus became increasingly uniform as membership options and activities became more numerous and homogeneous across associations.

This competition also had intellectual consequences. The intellectual ambitions of these associations’ founders were not necessarily endorsed by their successors. The history of associations that sought to imitate the American model shows that they later adopted different strategies. Some organisations, such as ECPR and EASP, sought to soften their initial intellectual stances to be seen as more open and attract more numbers. Others, like ECSR, stuck to their initial choices and grew at a more controlled pace.

Even though the history of ECPR can be described as a success, the organisation faced problems in the course of its growth. While it had initially been funded by a Ford Foundation grant, it was soon faced with the problem of obtaining sufficient resources to remain viable in the long term. ECPR’s...
intellectual objectives then became a problem for its organisational interests, as its closeness to the American field was seen as an obstacle to its growth:

It is still the case that both in general and more specifically in some countries we are viewed by many political scientists as being in some fashion slanted towards the ‘behavioural’ school of political science. [Some institutions in Germany, the UK, Finland, France] have been reluctant to become involved in the ECPR because they are convinced that we do not give enough emphasis to some specifically theoretical and in particular normative aspects of political analysis.\(^{15}\)

This led ECPR’s officers to adopt strategies to soften this intellectual stigma: the intellectual perimeter of the consortium’s activities (conferences, workshops, summer schools) was widened to include a greater diversity of subfields (such as political theory and intellectual history) and methods (qualitative, in particular). The fact that this diversification coincided with a growth of the organisation seems to indicate that this strategy paid off—although the move eventually led, as seen above, to some of its members being dissatisfied with ECPR, opting out of it and founding EPSA.

Similar dynamics were at work when the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology (EAESP) gave up its “experimental” label to become the European Association of Social Psychology (EASP). Others associations, however, followed different strategies. In sociology, ECSR opted for a controlled growth, with most of its member institutions based in Western and Northern Europe, in a move that was designed to avoid increasing pressures for intellectual diversification. ECSR’s strategy had therefore more to do with elitism than ecumenism:

The ECSR is really a consortium in the sense that… Let’s say it’s more elitist I think. One cannot join just like that, one has to be co-opted, it’s a fairly narrow club in a way. That’s my feeling: an institution that would want to join would first have to participate in congresses, present papers and then progressively it would be invited to join the consortium. There is no intent to close the organization completely, but let’s say there is a certain level to reach to join, a certain level of expectations, one has to be up to it.\(^{16}\)

Conceived as resources to promote particular intellectual approaches to the study of social phenomena, associations saw their ambitions evolve because of organisational constraints. Their place and role in the transnational circulation of scientific ideas changed over time.

**Conclusion**

This article sought to study the causes and effects of scientific internationalisation through a study of European social science associations. The analytical choices that underpin this study have several limits. By insisting on the strategic character of internationalisation, the argument tends to minimise the importance of convergence mechanisms at work in the international spaces opened by these associations (journals, congresses, summer schools, etc.). By focusing on associations themselves rather than their members, it does not pay much attention to the exchanges of references, practices, and networks that take place within associations, in the course of routine transnational interactions.


\(^{16}\) Interview with S. Paugam.
This article does not intend to criticise these alternative analytical options. Rather, it holds that its own approach has an original added value for the study of scientific internationalisation.

The article sought to test two hypotheses. The first was that the Europeanisation of the social sciences was a product of the interaction of several social fields. The data corroborated this claim by showing how negotiations that involved scientific, academic, and political logics could trigger an internationalisation of disciplines. The latter could also be seen as a “coup”, a way for actors to cumulate resources that could then be reinvested in the competitions in which they were involved. Thus, the analysis nuances claims laid out by part of the literature that internationalisation is a way for dominant actors to strengthen their dominant position. In this specific case, internationalisation is more often a tool used by marginalised actors to subvert dominant scientific hierarchies.

The second hypothesis was that the effects of internationalisation should be analysed as different in different contexts, rather than being interpreted one-sidedly as “Americanisation” or “creolisation” dynamics. The argument confirmed and refined this idea by showing that Europeanisation could be conceived in different ways by the founders of different associations, and that these initial conceptions could evolve over time. Even when initially conceived as a resource for the Americanisation of disciplines, the nature of the Europeanisation process can change as associations grow. The data also showed that these ambitions do not enjoy equal success in all national European fields, and that associations are often confined to certain geographical areas rather than encompassing the whole of Europe. European associations thus appear to only foster limited transnational convergence.

These conclusions have implications that go beyond the case of scientific disciplines. The article describes internationalisation as a process marked by a strong uncertainty. While multiple actors work to trigger it, none of them seems to control it fully. Internationalisation involves symbolic resources, but these resources may benefit different individuals, and are not stable over time. As it involves, by definition, a growing number of actors, internationalisation becomes harder to control, even for its initiators.

The article also presents organisational factors as playing a specific role in intellectual history. While structures are created to promote particular ideas, they may become increasingly autonomous from this agenda as organisational issues become more prominent. Apparently minor technical, administrative, and organisational changes (such as the choice of including a new type of member, of diversifying activities, importing “good practices”, etc.) can thus trigger important changes in the structure of intellectual fields. Behind the great history of ideas are thus hidden organisational statuses and budgets, management practices, and human resource issues that have an influence intellectual controversies—even though they are not as “noble” as intellectual factors.
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Abstract
After a period of slow growth (1960–1985), journals in the social sciences and humanities which call themselves “European” have expanded rapidly. This process, which is related to the expansive European research and science policy, is shown to have occurred primarily in well-established (sub-)disciplines, and, secondarily, in more applied “studies” (educational sciences, management, urban studies, European studies) or in thematic domains (crime and security, health). Remarkably few “European” journals, however, have a multidisciplinary and innovative intellectual program; most are oriented toward mainstream approaches or have an ecumenical profile. European journals are published most frequently by Anglo-American publishers and edited by scholars from these countries. Countries of similar size and intellectual density like Germany and France lag very much behind the UK in this respect.
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To assure their stability over time, scientific fields require periodicals. More than monographs, treatises and textbooks, journals assure the continuous publication and evaluation of research results, and thus contribute to stabilizing the production and reproduction of knowledge in specific research areas. Because of their serial character, journals are not merely publication outlets or communication channels, they are instrumental in setting standards, policing boundaries, and establishing hierarchies of problems, procedures and producers. Although there is some variation in their significance across disciplines, journals are an essential feature of the institutional structure of modern science and scholarship.² Major changes in research domains tend to be accompanied by the founding of new

¹ The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 319974 (Interco-SSH).
² Although journals have become the standard periodical, several other forms have existed (proceedings, yearbooks, annals, almanacs). On the relative importance of journal articles as compared to books and its variation across disciplines, see Larivière et al. (2006).
journals, and by changes in the balance of power between existing ones. Studying journals can therefore be an appropriate way to examine the dynamics of scientific fields.

While the historical development of journals has typically been a process of growth and differentiation, it is too often ignored that this has taken place within the framework of national systems of higher learning. More than many other pursuits science is an international enterprise, but its practice has been institutionalized in national structures of training, funding, and publishing. Scientific periodicals are no exception. Emerging during the period of the “scientific revolution” they were related to newly established national academies, which switched from Latin to the vernacular; the most prominent ones being the Philosophical Transactions (1665) of the Royal Society (1660) and the Mémoires of the French Academy of Sciences (1666). More than a century later, during what is sometimes called the second scientific revolution, academies and other learned societies were outpaced by more research oriented universities and new professional schools. With the differentiation of the scientific field, and the declining control of academies, general periodicals gave way to more specialized ones. The Journal de Physique (1771), which has been described as the first specialized scientific journal, was followed by a wave of similarly more ‘disciplinary’ journals like the Annales de chimie (1789), Journal de l’École polytechnique (1794), Annales du Muséum d’histoire naturelle (1802), and the Annales de mathématiques (1810). The multiplication of scientific journals since the years around 1800 was an integral part of the process of discipline formation, but these journals were, by and large, national undertakings; journals in mathematics and physics were no exception (Gispert 2001).

In the social sciences journals have played a similar role. Establishing continuity and stabilizing the production and reproduction of research fields was to a significant extent achieved through journals. For nearly half a century, for example, sociological treatises and monographs had been published, but when at the end of the nineteenth century sociology became an academic discipline, scholarship was to a large degree published in journals like the American Journal of Sociology (1895), the Revista Italiana di Sociologia (1897), and the Année sociologique (1898).

Three Modes of Transnational Exchange

While training, research and publishing were organized in national systems of higher learning, rivalries between the more advanced nation states were regulated through international collaboration and exchange. The institutional form through which this was achieved was the international organization, and notable among them were scientific associations and conferences (Boli and Thomas 1990; Boncourt 2016, 2017; Jeannpierre and Boncourt 2015; Drori et al. 2003; Rasmussen 1995). International scientific organizations developed from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. In sociology, for example, alongside local chairs and national journals and associations, an Institut international de sociologie and the Revue internationale de sociologie were founded in 1893 (Fleck 2011: 27–29). International organizations expanded further after the Second World War, when UNESCO initiated and funded international disciplinary associations (Boncourt 2016, 2017; Jeannpierre and Boncourt 2015). Organizing international congresses, these associations published international journals as well. The International Sociological Association (1948), for example, publishes Current sociology (since 1952) and International Sociology (since 1986). Compared to national journals, that is journals where at least the vast majority of editors’ works in one country,
international journals are relatively few in number. In spite of ongoing transnationalization, scholarly journals are still far more often national than international, and so-called “international” journals are hardly ever at the top of the citation hierarchies (Heilbron 2009; Gingras and Heilbron 2009; Heilbron and Bokobza 2015).

The accelerated trend of cross-border mobilities during the last part of the twentieth century, facilitated by technological innovation and driven by neoliberal policies of liberalization and the collapse of communism, produced new forms of transnational exchange as well. To grasp their significance it is useful to distinguish between three modes of transnational exchange. Internationalization, carried out by international organizations, can be seen as the predominant trend of transnational exchange since the mid-nineteenth century. It concerned a relatively small number of agents, who were assumed to represent their country. In the latter part of the twentieth century two relatively new forms emerged. The most widely discussed is globalization, the process through which transnational activities become incorporated into global fields. These global fields include a significantly larger number of actors, countries and regions than the previous forms of internationalization. Far less attention, however, has been paid to a third mode of cross-border exchanges, transnational regionalization, that is the process through which transnational regional fields are established (Heilbron 2014a). The European Union can be considered to be the most advanced case of the latter process, but similar developments are taking place in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

**The Emerging European Research Field**

One of the more salient changes in international social science since the 1980s is that Europe has improved its position within the global field, mainly by instituting a transnational regional field. This incipient European field effectively transcends the various national fields on which it is based, and has obtained a transnational dynamic of its own. In terms of SSH output, Europe currently occupies a position that seems to have become comparable to that of the U.S. (Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014). The share of social science articles in the database of the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) that are produced in Europe (European member states plus countries like Norway and Switzerland) has risen sharply (see Table 1). The only other region with a substantial increase is Asia, but its production is much smaller than that of Europe. As a consequence of the growth of the European production and to a lesser extent Asia, the proportion of articles produced in North America has decreased. Although this growth is partly the result of the Social Sciences Citation Index’s (SSCI) policy to include more European journals in the database, growth is not a statistical artefact, because most of the European journals added to the database were created recently and thus reflect a genuine growth of European social science output (Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014: 630–632).
Table 1: Geographical origins of social science journals included in the WoS / SSCI database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania and CIS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data based on the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI). The geographical origin of a journal is identified through the location of its publisher using the ISSN database.
Source: Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014.

Part of the growth in SSH journals produced in Europe comes from periodicals that specifically use the adjective “European” in their title. Although they represent a small proportion of the total number of SSH journals, “European” journals have become a substantial category of journals and a significant dimension of the European field of SSH research. In this article we present preliminary results of the analysis of a database that we put together of 165 fully or partially English language journals in the social sciences and the humanities, that use the adjective ‘European’ in their title.

Although there are obviously “European” journals that do not explicitly use the adjective “European,” just as there are “European” journals in other languages than English, the selection we have made represents a sufficiently large subset of European SSH journals to be of analytical interest. We will successively analyze the pattern of ‘European’ journal creation, the profile of these journals, their geographical location (based on the publisher and editors) and briefly their intellectual orientation (what is meant by the adjective “European,” do they promote distinctly European conceptions or, on the contrary, adhere to the Anglo-American mainstream).

European Journals Evolving

The development of European SSH journals during the twentieth century is almost entirely concentrated in the decades after 1960. Prior to that year hardly any “European” journals existed. The only “European” SSH journals founded before 1960 concerned “Slavic and East European” studies.

The founding of European SSH journals took off in the early 1960s, and their development indicates two phases of expansion (see Figures 1 and 2). The first phase was between 1960 and 1985 with a relatively low level of growth, the second phase was during the latter half of the 1980s and the

---

4 The database contains all English language SSH journals with the adjective ‘European’ in the title or subtitle, which we were able to identify. The database was initially prepared by Camelia Runceanu using internet search engines, which was complemented through consultation of the library catalogues of the London School of Economics, the Library of Congress as well as the Bibliotheque Nationale and the Maison des sciences de l’homme, both in Paris. This database was subsequently updated, supplemented and corrected by searching the online library catalogues of Northwestern University, the University of Chicago, Columbia University (CLIO), and WorldCat.

5 The Slavonic and East European Review (1922), the American Slavic and East European Review (1945-60), and the Slavic and East European Journal (1956). According to a preliminary search there was one more journal the Revue europénne de psychologie appliquée / European Reviews in Applied Psychology, but this journal was founded as the Revue de psychologie appliquée (1941) and got its European renaming only in 1991, and was incorporated in the database as being founded in 1991.
1990s when the level of growth was much higher. During the first 25 years, 1960–85, on average five to six European SSH journals were created during every five-year period, about one per year, but there is no temporal trend. Journal creation accelerated during the latter half of the 1980s, when 17 journals were created (1985–89), reaching a peak in the 1990s with 34 (1990–94) and 26 new journals (1995–99). Although the rate of newly created European SSH journals slowed after 2000, it remained well above the level of the first phase (1960–85), oscillating between 16 (2000–2004 and 2010–2014) and 26 new journals (2005–2009).

**Figure 1: Newly created 'European' journals in the social and human sciences (1920-2010)**

![Graph showing newly created 'European' journals in the social and human sciences (1920-2010)](Database Bedecarré-Heilbron)

It is likely that the first phase of growth, with the creation of about one “European” journal per year was an increase in absolute terms, but given the general expansion of the social sciences, not in relative terms. The second period, however, with the creation of three to seven “European” journals
per year probably represented a relative increase as well.\(^6\) This particular temporal pattern clearly suggests a link with the more general process of European integration. The first phase of journal expansion coincides with the period following the establishment of the European Economic Community (1957), which lead to a slow growth of European institutions and, since 1973, to a gradual extension of its member states. The second phase of journal expansion coincides with the accelerated European integration that was provoked by the Fall of the Berlin wall (1989) and the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. This phase was marked by the Maastricht Treaty (1992), which formally established the European Union, an intensification of European policy making, also in the domain of science policy, and a continuously growing number of member states until the current crisis.

Directly relevant for the social sciences and humanities was the European science and research policy. A coherent European science policy came into being only in the beginning of the 1980s. Against the background of the deepest economic recession since the Second World War and in the face of mounting international economic competition, European funding for research and development became concentrated in multi-annual ‘Framework Programmes’. Their overall objective was to strengthen the scientific and technological bases of the European economy and improve its competitiveness. The first was launched in 1984, and over the years Research funds increased from 640 million Euros in 1984 to 10 billion Euros per year in the seventh and last framework programme (2007–2013) (Schögler and König 2017).

While the first Framework Programmes contained hardly any provisions for the social sciences and humanities, the Fourth Framework Programme (1994–98) included a full-fledged SSH research program, and continued throughout subsequent Programmes. Merely one to two percent of the total funding went to the social sciences and humanities, but the size of these programs was considerable. Between 1994 and 2006 some 580 SSH projects were funded. Each one of them ran for approximately three years, had an average of ten partners, and could include well over a hundred individual participants. With an estimated output between five to ten thousand books and 20,000 to 32,000 journal articles, European funding and output had become quite significant (Heilbron 2014b). Since every Framework Programme project had to include researchers from several European countries, they functioned not only as tools for allocating funds, but also as an incentive for furthering transnational collaboration. In a fairly short period of time a transitional field of research in the social and human sciences emerged, which was made possible through European funding schemes, and was structured by a growing number of European programmes, organisations and networks. With the launch of the European Research Council in 2007, European research funds increased further still.

European associations, research networks, and journals have thus become an integral part of the institutional infrastructure in the social sciences. The tendency is weaker in the humanities, but nonetheless present there as well. In order to properly understand the role of European journals in this emerging transnational field we will take a closer look at these “European” journals.

---

\(^6\) We have not been able to test this hypothesis, but given the growth of universities in general, and the development of the social sciences in particular, it seems quite plausible.
Disciplines, Studies and Themes

Scholarly journals are first and foremost related to the division of academic labor and to the principles of differentiation of the academic field. In this respect, four broad categories of journals may be distinguished from one another: disciplinary journals, multi-disciplinary journals, journals in newer domains or ‘studies’, and thematic journals.

The first category pertains to journals in the oldest and most established SSH disciplines (philosophy, history, literature, economics, political science, anthropology, sociology, psychology, geography, and demography) as well as in their most important research specializations and sub-disciplines. Sub-disciplinary journals in economics, for example, are typically journals in finance and banking, in international trade, or in agricultural economics. By far most European SSH journals are disciplinary or sub-disciplinary journals (n = 93, see Table 2). The main European journals in the traditional disciplines are typically published by European associations (Boncourt 2016, 2017).

In addition to journals in the ‘classical’ (sub)disciplines, one may add the category of more recently formed domains of study, which have equally become well-established university departments. Most of these domains emerged after 1968, in opposition to the traditional academic division of labor and in alliance with groups outside of the academy. For these domains of inquiry, the object of study had priority over the particular academic approach. In these newer fields or rather ‘studies’, as they are often called, a significant number of “European” journals exists as well. Most of them are in the educational sciences or studies, followed by management, European Studies, and Planning and Urban studies. The third category of journals identified covers thematic journals, which tend to be smaller, more specialized and academically less established than classical disciplines. They concern particular geographical “areas” (American studies, Eastern and Central European studies, Turkish Studies, etc.) and particular themes (security and crime, public health, and a variety of other topics).

Table 2: Newly created ‘European’ journals by type of journal and year of founding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disciplinary journals (classical)</th>
<th>Multi-disciplinary journals</th>
<th>Studies &amp; new disciplines</th>
<th>Thematic journals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960–64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965–69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970–74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975–79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980–84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985–89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–94</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–99</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–09</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fourth and final category includes multi-disciplinary journals. These are journals, which explicitly combine different academic perspectives, not for extra-academic purposes, whether political or professional (as in most transdisciplinary ‘studies’), but to go beyond the academic division of labor and foster scientifically innovative perspectives. Despite the prominence of ‘interdisciplinarity’ in science policy and scholarly discourse, remarkably few European journals are multidisciplinary. Unlike disciplinary arrangements, innovative, multi- or interdisciplinarity work tends to vary greatly across national and local contexts and is under-represented on the European level.

Outside of France, for example—one can say outside of Paris—there are no equivalents for journals like the historical journal the Annales (1929), the journal L’Homme (1961), founded by Claude Lévi-Strauss with a geographer (Pierre Gourou) and a linguist (Emile Benveniste), or Pierre Bourdieu’s Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales (1975). Despite their scholarly prestige and the renown of their founders, none of these journals have been emulated abroad, although certain elements of their intellectual programs have been incorporated by some periodicals outside of France. Historical journals inspired by the social sciences were created in different countries well after Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch launched the Annales, but neither Past and Present (1952) nor Geschichte und Gesellschaft (1975) or Social Science History (1977) are really comparable to the French journal that served as one of their primary examples. Pierre Bourdieu may be the most cited social scientist in the world, yet there is still no equivalent to Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales.

Innovative, multi-disciplinary journals are not only often dependent on charismatic individuals, but also on local, informal networks, specific support structures, and tacit understandings of their intellectual programs. The primary difference with mainstream journals, whether disciplinary or thematic, is their lower degree of standardization. The greater the standardization and formalization of knowledge, the easier it travels across borders and other boundaries. While the most innovative ventures may eventually obtain the highest recognition, by defying the established order with “new combinations,” they do not easily cross the boundaries of their local and national context. Their recognition takes time and they are very hard, if not impossible to emulate.

Disciplinary Journals

The largest number of European journals is in disciplines like economics (n = 21) and law (n = 19), followed by political science (14) and psychology (13) (see Table 3). As compared to disciplines with a lower number of ‘European’ journals (history, philosophy, sociology, literature), these disciplines distinguish themselves not only by larger numbers of staff and students, but also by a higher level of standardization in research output. Because of its formal or experimental character, the dominant research style in economics, psychology and political science is less bound to the context in which it is produced than the more varied and pluralistic research in history, philosophy and sociology.7 Mainstream economics is more international in style, writing and referencing than most research in sociology and anthropology, and these are probably again more international than literature or history. Law is a particular case, because it is a discipline strongly bound to the legal context, traditionally that of nation-states, but increasingly that of European institutions as well. Quite typical

7 A bibliometric analysis of French SSH journals shows that the level of foreign references is highest in economics, followed by political science, anthropology and history, and is lowest in sociology and law, see Heilbron and Bokobza (2015) and Heilbron (2015: 152–180).
in that respect is that virtually all ‘European’ law journals (17 out of 19) were created rather recently, since 1990.

Table 3: Newly created ‘European’ journals by discipline and year of founding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Econ</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Psycho</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Philo</th>
<th>Socio</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Anthrop</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Demogr</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960-64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

European disciplinary journals tend to reproduce the main oppositions of the larger national fields. The five European journals in sociology, for example, include both a comparative and historically oriented journal like the *European Journal of Sociology/Archives européennes de sociologie* (1960) and a mainstream journal based on survey research such as the *European Sociological Review* (1985). The first was founded by Raymond Aron, in conjunction with Ralf Dahrendorf (then still in Germany) and Tom Bottomore (at the LSE) and the title alluded to Max Weber’s broadly conceived *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*. Aron’s journal was trilingual, edited in Paris, published by the French publisher Plon, and supported by the Ford Foundation. Although officially still trilingual, it has been published by Cambridge University Press since 1977, and articles in French and German have become increasingly rare. The two other major sociology journals are published by the European Sociological Association (1995): *European Societies* (1999) and the *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology* (2014).8

As the example of sociology journals illustrates, the adjective “European” has very different meanings. It can refer to an empirical object (in the case of *European Societies*), but it can also indicate opposing conceptions of social science. The *European Journal of Sociology/Archives européennes de sociologie* (1960) alluded to the specifically “European” tradition of sociology, whereas the *European Sociological Review* (1985) was conceived as the European equivalent of the mainstream, quantitative survey research orientation that had developed in the US. Some of these journals developed in close association with professional organizations, like the journal of the European Sociological Association (ESA) *European societies*. The *European Sociological Review* (1985), on the other hand, was the first step towards the creation of an association, the European Consortium for Sociological Research (ECSR), which, like the journal, had a similarly mainstream orientation (Boncourt 2016, 2017).

---

8 The fifth sociology journal, the *European Journal of Applied Sociology* (2008), is more peripheral with a majority of editors from Romania and published by a German publisher De Gruyter. One could consider the *European Journal of Social Theory* (1998) as a sociology journal, but in its orientation it also draws on theoretical traditions from other disciplines. On European sociology, see Fleck and Hönig (2014) and Heilbron (2009).
‘Studies’ and Thematic Journals

Rather than proposing a derivation from the Greek *nomos* (economics), *logos* (psychology, anthropology, sociology, etc.) or *graphos* (geography, sociography), many of the recent domains of inquiry that acquired academic status use the term “studies.” This preference for a more common sense notion and the avoidance of a learned label is typical of their academic position. Many of them emerged and became institutionalized after the university crisis of 1968. Following earlier examples such as “area studies,” the use of the term studies expressed a critique of scientific disciplines’ academic status and the division of labor between them. The common denominator was the primacy attributed to the object of inquiry over the specific academic perspective with which it was treated. This goes for politically motivated projects (women’s studies, black studies, gay studies, etc.) as well as for more professionally oriented projects (business studies, communication studies, translation studies). To speak of ‘studies’ indicates a twofold opposition to the academic order of classical disciplines. It implies, first, that the academic or scientific perspective as such is biased and insufficient, because it excludes, legitimate extra-academic considerations, whether political or professional. Proponents of many ‘studies’ are critical of ‘value-free,’ ‘objective’ and ‘scientific’ ambitions privileging ‘critical,’ ‘professional’ or ‘artistic’ views. The plural of the word ‘studies’ indicates, secondly, that the object in question needs to be approached from multiple perspectives (ethical, historical, psychological, professional); disciplinary monopolies are misplaced, pretentious or fundamentally erroneous. The proponents of ‘studies’ wish to leave the ‘ivory tower’, promote ‘interdisciplinarity,’ and align research and higher education with extra-academic, either political or professional interests.

In this group of “studies” and relatively new disciplines the largest number of recently created disciplines is in the “educational sciences” (n = 13) – overtaking classical pedagogy –, management studies (n = 6), European studies (n = 4), and Planning and Urban studies (n = 4). Other studies (women’s studies, cultural studies, communication studies, information sciences) have only one “European” journal (see Table 4).

**Table 4: Newly created ‘European’ journals in ‘studies’ and new disciplines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Educat sciences</th>
<th>Managem</th>
<th>European Studies</th>
<th>Planning &amp; urban studies</th>
<th>Women’s studies</th>
<th>Cultural studies</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Informat science</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960–64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965–69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970–74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975–79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980–84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985–89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Newly created ‘European’ journals in thematic areas of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area studies</th>
<th>Crime &amp; security</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960–64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965–69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970–74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975–79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980–84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985–89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last category of “thematic journals” includes relatively small domains of inquiry (see Table 5). The largest category is concerned with specific geographical areas (n = 11), other themes are crime and security (n = 4) and health (4). The category “other” is residual and very heterogeneous. It includes European journals for industrial relations, music, European cinema, social work, social security, Jewish studies, homelessness, church and state research, language policy, and migration.

The Dominant Position of the UK and Anglo-American Publishing

When considering publishers and editors, another pattern clearly emerges: the domination of British publishing houses and editors who work in Great Britain. By far the largest number of “European” SSH journals is published in the UK (77), followed at a distance, curiously enough, by the US (20) and the Netherlands (16) (see Figure 3). Similar indications of Anglo-American domination are obtained when looking at chief editors. For the total selection of 161 journals, a sizeable minority of the journals (56, or 35%) had at least one chief editor based in the UK. In 33 cases (20%) UK-based editors were the majority among the chief editors, while 27 journals (17%) exclusively had chief editor(s) based in the UK (and, therefore, no chief editors based in other countries). Overall, chief editors based in the UK account for 25% of the 293 editors, with the second largest group formed by US based editors (11%; see Table 6). In fact, 26 (16%) out of the 161 journals had at least one U.S.-
based chief editor. For 10 journals (6%), there were no other countries represented amongst the chief editor(s): they exclusively worked from the U.S.

Figure 3: Country of origin of the publishers of European SSH journals in 2015 (n = 161)

![Figure 3](image)

The dominance of the UK is also apparent when the journals are classified by the composition of the editorial board. The UK is situated at the top of the list of journals with 1, 2 or 3 chief editors (Table 7). For journals with 1 chief editor, the differences are especially pronounced: 30% of these journals have a chief editor based in the UK, while the next most frequent country of origin is Germany (11%). For the journals with 2 or 3 chief editors the differences become smaller, but the UK still heads the list in all of these categories.

Table 6: Country in which the chief editor(s) of European SSH journals were based in 2016 (n = 161)

When an editor was associated with multiple institutes, the institute mentioned first was recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country where editor(s) is (are) based</th>
<th>Number of editors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (27 countries)</td>
<td>92 (of which 73 from European countries)</td>
<td>31.4% (24.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>293</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Country in which the chief editor(s) of 140 (out of 161 journals) journals with 3 or less chief editors were based (2016)
When an editor was associated with multiple institutes, the institute mentioned first was recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country where editor(s) is (are) based</th>
<th>Journals with 1 chief editor (n = 89)</th>
<th>Journals with 2 chief editors (n = 36)</th>
<th>Journals with 3 chief editors (n = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Netherlands 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Netherlands 7</td>
<td>Germany 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Belgium, Germany, France 4</td>
<td>France 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Italy, Spain 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium, Czech Republic, Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Other 31</td>
<td>Other 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of chief editors</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more selective view of European SSH journals is obtained when considering European SSH journals with the highest impact score in the Thomson Reuters Web of Science database (Jantzen 2016). These journals (n = 22) can be compared according to the country where the publishers are incorporated, the country where the chief editors and editors work, as well as the country where the article authors are localized. In this far more selective sample the dominant position of the UK is even more explicit. For the location of the publishers 45 % are located in Britain, with the US in second place (23 %). Here the combined linguistic and business advantages of the UK and the US play out very clearly. With regard to the chief editors, the pattern is the same. Chief editors from the UK make up 34 % of the total, with the U.S. in second place as well (see Table 8). The UK also tops the list as far as editors are concerned, solely for the number of authors is the pattern slightly different. Authors from the UK rank second (after Germany). Germany and the U.S. are in the top 3 for all the categories, while the only other country that is present in all 4 categories is the Netherlands.

11 For the ‘disciplinary’ category, journals were selected with the highest impact scores for each of the eight SSH disciplines. The complete list of journals is as follows (ranked according to impact factor in the Thomson Reuters InCites Journal Citation Reports): the European Journal of Personality, the Journal of the European Economic Association, the European Journal of Political Research, the European Review of Social Psychology, the European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, the European Journal of International Relations, the Journal of European Public Policy, the European Journal of Health Economics, the European Sociological Review, the European Journal of Social Psychology, European Urban and Regional Studies, the European Journal of Population, the European Journal of Political Economy, the European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context, the European Journal of Ageing, European Planning Studies, the European Management Journal, the European Journal for Philosophy of Science, European Financial Management, the European Journal of Communication, South European Society and Politics, and the European Journal of Industrial Relations (Jantzen 2016).
Clearly, the analysis presented in this paper relies chiefly on indicators of institutionalization. To obtain a more complete picture of the European scientific field it should be complemented by an analysis of the content of the European journals. Although a comprehensive content analysis is beyond the scope of the current paper, some preliminary observations can be added. Jantzen (2016) also studied the abstracts of 882 articles published in 2015 in the most cited journals he selected. He found that 26% of these abstracts referred to ‘Europe’ in some way. The percentage of abstracts referring to Europe was the highest for the *Journal of European Public Policy* (93%), the *European Journal of Political Research* (61%), the *European Journal of Industrial Relations* (59%), the *European Journal of Population* (57%) and the journal *South European Society and Politics* (54%). The focus of these journals is either on cross-border comparative research or on research specifically relating to the transnational European field.

Based on these findings and on the historical analysis presented in the first part of this paper, “European journals” seem to consist of three types of journals. The first category consists of journals that encourage authors to use a genuine European approach in their research (as distinct from, for example, an “American” approach). This is the strongest form of a European intellectual program of which the *European Journal of Sociology/Archives européennes de sociologie* is a good example. It was founded by Raymond Aron in 1960 and advocated a distinctly European, historical and comparative approach. A second category of European journals favors contributions with a European research object. This can relate specifically to either the transnational European field (with a central place for EU institutions and their practices, such as law making or policy making), or to intra-European comparative analysis (e.g., comparisons between European nation states). Finally, the reference to Europe can entail a geographical denomination without any specific content, neither an approach nor a specifically European object of study, but merely the location of the journal. This can refer to the European version of an internationally mainstream type of social science or to the association sponsoring the journal. In this case the “European” label does not affect the content of the articles in a meaningful way, and represents the weakest form of a European intellectual program.

---

**Table 8: Countries ranked according to number of publishers, chief editors, editors and authors for the 22 most cited European SSH journals (2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Publishers</th>
<th>Chief editors</th>
<th>Editors</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>13 (45%)</td>
<td>12 (34%)</td>
<td>103 (19%)</td>
<td>110 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
<td>57 (11%)</td>
<td>93 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>64 (12%)</td>
<td>142 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>33 (6%)</td>
<td>72 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>26 (5%)</td>
<td>48 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>25 (5%)</td>
<td>62 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>10 (2%)</td>
<td>27 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>18 (3%)</td>
<td>37 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>33 (6%)</td>
<td>29 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19 (4%)</td>
<td>38 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5 (14%)</td>
<td>152 (28%)</td>
<td>224 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concluding Remarks

The rise of “European” journals in the social sciences and humanities is a historically recent phenomenon, which roughly corresponds to the process of European integration and policy making on the European level. With the exception of a few journals specializing in a specific area of Europe (Slavic and East European Studies), there were no SSH journals which used the label “European” before 1960. A first phase of expansion took place in the years from 1960 until the mid-1980s during the period following the establishment of the European Economic Community (1957). These were years of a slow growth of European institution building. A second phase of accelerated expansion started in the latter half of the 1980s, following the deep economic crisis of the years around 1980 and the Fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Both contributed to a further extension and acceleration of European integration which were marked by the Maastricht treaty (1992). Of particular significance for this second phase were the European Framework Programs, which funded transnational research and since 1994 included provisions for the social sciences and humanities. Reaching its peak in the 1990s, the creation of European journals slowed down during the years after that, while remaining on a level that was well above that of the first period of growth.

Distinguishing between different types of journals, European journals are mostly disciplinary or subdisciplinary journals (n = 93) in well-established classical disciplines (economics, sociology, political science, anthropology, history, philosophy). The only other significant types of journals were either thematic (n = 34) or more applied and professional ‘studies’ in the areas of education, management, urban studies and the like (n = 31). Perhaps the most remarkable feature of European journals is the extremely small number of multi-disciplinary journals with a strong and innovative scientific program. For renowned French journals like the Annales (1929), Bourdieu’s Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales (1975), or more recently Politix (1988) and Genèses (1990), there are no equivalents on the European level, although they all embody a broad and in that sense more “European” conception of the social and historical sciences. What the European SSH probably need most, is apparently the most difficult to achieve.

Regarding publishers and editors there is a marked domination of the UK, a characteristic which has also been observed for European funding and European networks of co-authorship (Fleck and Hönig 2014; Gingras and Heilbron 2009; Mosbah-Natason and Gingras 2014; Heilbron 2014b), but in the case of journals with the USA in an important secondary position. The only other country which comes close to the USA is the Netherlands, which also hosts a number of large, English language publishing companies (Elsevier, Kluwer). European journals are thus largely published and edited in Anglo-American countries. Only very rarely are European journals published and edited in countries with strong intellectual traditions of their own like Germany, France or Italy, where the mastery of English is less widespread. When a more selective sample of European journals is considered, regarding only the most cited SSH journals, the domination of the UK, or more broadly Anglo-American countries, is reinforced.

The European research space as it has emerged through “European” journals is firmly dominated academically by (sub)disciplinary academic journals and, secondarily, by thematic and more professionally or applied journals. Very few have a strong, multidisciplinary and innovative profile. They are published primarily by Anglo-American publishers and edited by editors from these countries. Countries like Germany, France or Italy are in these respects very much behind the UK and even the U.S. If Brexit provokes a more active role of continental European scholars, that would be an unintended but beneficial effect of rising anti-European sentiments.
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This article is a comparative analysis of the European Values Study (EVS) and the European Social Survey (ESS) using five analytical dimensions: agents, ideas, methods, institutions and context. From the outset, both surveys were closely connected to national and European social science institutions, had ties to the EU, and used survey techniques to address urgent contemporary political and social problems. Despite their similarities, the surveys represent two rather different constellations of social science knowledge production. The EVS emerged from a coalition of Catholic-oriented agents from a diverse set of social institutions driven by political and ethical concerns about social change in the 1960s and 1970s. The EVS used its links to various social institutions to set up and run the survey, and its ethical and political concerns and connections to Catholic Church organisations continued to play a significant role in its constellation. The ESS grew out of a scientific and technical aspiration among well-connected and recognised Western European social scientists. It emphasised rigorous methods and drew on its founding agents’ close relations with European institutions such as the ESF and the European Commission.
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Introduction

This article analyses the social history of two European social surveys in order to understand historical changes in social science knowledge production in Europe. Specifically, I compare the European Values Study (EVS) and the European Social Survey (ESS) using five analytical dimensions. The article shows how the people, ideas and the social context of the surveys—both narrowly understood in terms of networks and ‘local’ institutions, and in terms of wider social changes—interact with and co-shape the organisation and content of social science knowledge production. Since the two social surveys were initiated almost twenty years apart, the comparison allows me to not only account for differences between them, but also to point out important aspects of how the constellation of European social science surveys has changed.

Social science and social surveys have, since their invention, been closely entangled with political claims, aspirations and struggles over institutions and classifications (Bulmer, Bales, and Kish Sklar 1991; Converse 1987; Igo 2009; Porter 2003). Social statistics have played a major role in the development of modern states’ capacities to control and govern societies, and various statistical tools have contributed to constituting modern bureaucracies as powerhouses for regulating modern societies. Using social statistics, social scientists and public bureaucracies have been able to measure, compare and identify social problems and characteristics, and target political measures at specific groups, areas and institutions (Bourdieu 1994; Porter 1995). The power of social statistics has been their apparent objectivity and neutrality in depicting the social. However, as with any other knowledge product, we can also approach social statistics as a symbolic product that has the potential to transform the social reality it is designed to describe (Desrosières 1998). Following the insight that statistical knowledge about society is the product of a constellation of political and scientific forces, I analyse how constellations of social science knowledge production at a European level have shaped our knowledge about European societies. The case study presented here thus provides new knowledge about the constellation of social statistical knowledge production at the European level adding insights to our knowledge about national systems.

More specifically, my analysis of these two cases addresses two central questions in this special issue. First, the article describes the construction of the social science surveys and the different, changing conditions for knowledge production. Second, the two cases can be understood as examples of the emergence of a European field of social science research. Thus my analysis reveals not only historical changes in the constellation of social survey knowledge production but, through the comparative analysis, I also show how two different types of social survey knowledge generation became institutionalised as significant modes of producing knowledge about Europe.

The article is structured in four sections. First, I present the theoretical framework and the two cases. In the second and third sections I analyse the two cases and the fourth section is a concluding discussion.

Constellations of Social Surveys

This article compares the development of two European social surveys in order to understand their different trajectories and constellations. I use the concept of ‘constellation’ to denote how ways of thinking, specific techniques and tools, institutions and people entangle in a specific pattern of social science knowledge production (Fourcade 2009). In order to account for the constellation of the two surveys, the article follows a five-pronged methodological approach comprising agents, ideas, methods, institutions and context (Fleck 2015a, 2015b). Using these five perspectives, the article
addresses different levels of analysis as well as various activities in social science knowledge production. As such they offer a robust analytical framework for structuring the comparison.

First, the article looks at the agents involved. Much history of the social sciences has focused on individual thinkers, their trajectory and social and intellectual development. I also draw on a prosopographical approach, that aims to describe the agents involved as a social group characterised by age, numbers, educational background, professional trajectory, positions and access to various social resources (Broady 2002; Fleck 2011). Second, the article analyses the central ideas guiding the two projects. It studies the idealistic heritage of the projects, as well as their political and scientific ambitions (Kauppi 2010). Connected to the analysis of ideas, the article proceeds to analyse the methods applied. Much history of the social sciences addresses big ideas and consecrated theories and theoreticians. However, the mundane techniques and methods with which we create knowledge about the social world are crucial in order to understand the trajectories, success and failures of social science endeavours (Desrosièes 1998; Platt 1996). The fourth analytical dimension is institutions. To conduct large scale transnational social surveys, research institutions—such as university departments, public and private institutions—play a major role in financing academic projects, providing organisational frames for them, and legitimising them politically (Bourdieu 1988, 1998). Finally, the article analyses the context of the two surveys. Here, I investigate relations between political agents and institutions, especially how broader political and social concerns and conflicts were translated into social science questions and projects, both in setting up the projects and during their completion. The concept of ‘context’ is undoubtedly the hardest to define since it aims to capture large-scale and long-term changes in the social conditions under which the projects take place. Especially in an analysis like this, covering more than a generation of scholarly work, the context changes during the process. In the analysis, I address each of the five perspectives one by one and, in the conclusion, I discuss how they are interrelated.

The paper analyses two European social science questionnaire surveys: the European Values Study (EVS) and the European Social Survey (ESS). These surveys are two of the most widely used social surveys in Europe and are quite distinct from the Eurobarometer inasmuch as they are academically driven. Thus, the two cases provide an opportunity to understand the formation and structure of European social science projects. Within the field of survey research, both surveys have come to be recognised as providing high quality data, and for their contribution to the field of survey methodology (Bréchon 2012; Heath, Fisher, and Smith 2005; Jowel et al. 2007). The EVS was initiated in the late 1970s and its first waves were launched in 1981, with successive waves in 1990, 1999 and 2008. The next is currently being prepared for 2017. In 1981, the EVS covered the Western European countries. Since then, the EVS has expanded, and by 2008, it covered 47 countries in Europe, including most of the former Soviet states. Thematically, the surveys focus on values, with questions ranging from religious and moral issues to the environment, politics and society, family, and over time has included an increasing number of socio-demographic questions. The first wave of the ESS was conducted in 2002, and it has been conducted biannually ever since. It covers most of the EU member states, but has also been conducted in Iceland, Russia and Ukraine. The survey consists of a permanent module and a rotating module. The survey focuses on social policy issues, political and moral attitudes in the core module, while the rotating module concentrates on shifting central themes that are often related to the social problems of the European welfare states (e.g. ageing, migration, family and justice). In 2012, the ESS was established as a European Research

1 The Eurobarometer is a biannual social survey conducted by the European Commission since 1974. The purpose of the Eurobarometer is to provide knowledge about public opinion on political issues for the European Commission.
Infrastructure Consortium. The two surveys were launched twenty years apart and that difference will, of course, influence the analysis. I regard this difference in time span as an opportunity to understand both the contemporary differences and historical changes in the production of survey knowledge in Europe.

Table 1: Overview of the cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>European Values Study</th>
<th>European Social Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries covers</td>
<td>13 in the first wave increasing to 47 in 2008</td>
<td>Between 20 and 31, mainly Western Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central topics</td>
<td>Human and moral values</td>
<td>Social and political attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis draws on interviews with central agents in the two surveys, as well as on documents ranging from descriptions in grant applications through the survey websites, to technical reports and academic publications. The interviewees were strategically selected in order to represent different periods, positions and tasks in the two surveys. The interviews were conducted both face-to-face and via phone, and were subsequently transcribed.

**European Values Study**

At first glance, a striking feature of the EVS is how much it has changed over time. A simple explanation for this is that the project covers an entire academic career span. Hence, the agents who launched the EVS in the mid-1970s are now gone, and the researchers who joined the ESV as young scholars in the late 1970s and early 1980s are now well-established professors who are about to retire and hand over the survey to younger researchers. All in all, the long-time span of the survey admits many opportunities for changes in all aspects.

**AGENTS**

The agents involved in the first phase of the EVS came from different backgrounds and institutions and brought together not only academic assets and expertise, but also resources from politics, business and various Catholic Church organisations. In the late 1970s, the Catholic theologian and priest Jan Kerkhofs, and the sociologist and rector of the Catholic University in Tilburg Ruud de Moor, initiated a study group about values and social change in Europe. They gathered well-connected agents around them, mainly drawn from the Benelux countries, the UK, Germany and France. The group consisted of people like the founder of the Eurobarometer, and former secretary of Jean Monnet, Jacques-René Rabier, David Heald, a devout Catholic and the UK head of Gallup (who carried out the Eurobarometer), Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, former president of WAPOR, visiting professor at the University of Chicago and closely connected to German Christian Democratic parties, and professor Jean Stoetzel, the first president of WAPOR and one of the agents who imported Gallup to Europe after World War II. Thus, the agents involved in the EVS had not only an ‘academic’ interest in the subject of values and social change, but also strong political concerns and connections. Three aspects linked the founding agents of the EVS. First, they shared a connection to the Catholic faith and institutions. Second, they were associated with survey methods and international survey organisations, and third, they shared a centrist or Christian-conservative political outlook (Interview with British researcher in the two first rounds). In other words, the
project was established on a conservative foundation, both scientifically (drawing on the consecrated methods, theories and paradigms) and politically.

Over time the constellation of agents involved in the survey has changed, and today most are researchers from universities or research institutions like GESIS, the German data archive for the social sciences. When the second wave of the survey was launched in 1990, many of the original members had already been replaced by academics. This was the result of an active strategy pursued by the academics in the survey’s governing bodies, with the intention of strengthening the survey’s academic reputation and anchoring it in academic institutions (Interview with member of the executive committee). Of the current national programme directors, the majority are university professors or are connected in some other way to academic institutions. However, this immediate impression—stemming from the directors’ official positions—obeys huge differences, especially between Western and Eastern European countries, most notably the former Soviet Republics, which reflect major differences in the national organisation of higher education. In the 1990s, the EVS recruited programme directors and survey organisations throughout Eastern Europe through its connections to church organisations, different private research organisations, ministries and national research institutions. Thus, many of the researchers involved in the EVS were not only academically interested in values and social change, but also used the EVS as a vehicle to position themselves and their institutions within their country (Interview with Eastern European program director). In the Western European countries, connections—especially to Catholic Church organisations—were maintained through financial support for the EVS and the association with Catholic universities. All in all, despite the apparent changes, the agents still constituted a heterogeneous group with connections to various social fields and institutions, with reasons for participating other than ‘purely’ academic ones.

**IDEAS**

The ideas guiding the EVS were, of course, closely connected to the people involved and their trajectories. Thus, the core concern of The European Values Systems Study Group in the late 1970s was social changes triggered by social movements, migration and secularisation, and the changes in family patterns that had characterised Western societies in the 1960s and 1970s (Arts and Halman 2014). More politically oriented concerns included the effects of European integration in the light of very different national ‘value systems’. Not only were these themes interesting and relevant from a social science perspective, they were simultaneously the concern of church organisations and conservative political organisations, which monitored the social changes in the 1960s and 1970s with both fear and anxiety (Kerkhofs 1991). Thus, running through the survey was an ethical concern, informed to a very large degree by a Catholic Christian outlook. As one of the researchers involved explained:

...there was also a quite Catholic orientation to this. Gordon Heald, head of Gallup, was interested in Christian issues and Kerkhofs was a Catholic priest. ... It was not a political agenda, but rather a concern driven by an ethical standpoint. In general we were criticised a lot by other academics. They were dismissive of the European Values Survey for not being fairly grounded in strong sociological premises. Which was true, since the project consisted of different elements struggling to make sense. (Interview with member of the British team in the first two rounds)
These ideas were transformed into items in the first questionnaire, which contained 355 items divided into seven different areas. The seven areas were: perception of life, with 95 items (27 %); work 38 (11 %); family 49 (14 %); politics and society 43 (12 %); religion and morals 90 (25 %); and sociodemographics 34 (10 %). Among the questions was the now famous Rosenberg question about general trust (Question 208) and Inglehart’s post-materialism scale. Questions on religion and morals were prioritised along with questions on perceptions of life, reflecting the importance of religion in the group’s perception and its concerns about the erosion of moral, and especially religious, values in Europe. But there were also new questions based on the group’s concerns, such as a question about the Ten Commandments (Question 208). In other words, societal concerns—of political, social and religious kinds—played an important role in defining the EVS and in shaping the basic questionnaire.

Over the years, other issues and ideas have become part of the survey and its justification, but the concerns underlying the initial surveys still inform the questions asked and the framing of the results. Thus, initial anxiety about changes in moral values and their consequences for Europe and European identity still inform key publications (Arts, Hagenaars, and Halman 2003; Arts and Halman 2014). Over time various events—such as the end of the Cold War, the introduction of the Euro and the financial crisis of the 2000s—have marked the different waves of the surveys and have led to publication addressing events such as values changes in Russia and Eastern Europe and secularisation processes (Ester 1997; Halman and Riis 2003; Halman and Voicu 2010). Perhaps the most important change, however, was the survey’s move away from being ‘issues-driven’ towards becoming a ‘research infrastructure’ providing high-quality data about Europeans’ values. From the third wave in 1999 onwards, the production of data became more important, and data quality and practices related to that concern came to challenge the original constellation of the EVS, as will be seen in the following section.

**METHODS**

As we have already seen, the central agents responsible for setting up the survey were all, in one way or another, institutionally committed to the questionnaire survey format as the primary mode of producing knowledge about social issues. The method was taken for granted, with issues about quality and documentation only becoming salient in the later period of the survey. In its first years, ethical and political concerns were the driving force in developing the project. This can be seen in two ways. First, many of the items in the first questionnaire were existing items that the team collected from various sources and incorporated into the EVS questionnaire. In itself, this was ordinary practice in survey research, but in the case of the EVS, it meant that there was little homogeneity in measures, scales and formulation throughout the questionnaire. Second, the practical application of the survey was left to Gallup, which drew on organisation and experience gained from running the Eurobarometer (Harding 1986).

Since the late 1980s, methods and documentation have become more important. In the 1980s, while preparing the second round, Ruud de Moor recruited researchers from the Methodological Department at Tilburg University to the survey. One of the researchers explained how survey methodologists regarded the EVS in the 1980s:

... The main group of people working with [the EVS] were the ones in the marketing area. This resulted in many isolated questions on different topics; and they never thought about scaling and reliable measurement. They seemed to think that you could ask people about how religious
they are the same way you would ask them about the butter in their fridge... (Interview with Dutch methodologist)

Thus, improving the quality of the technical part of the surveys has been a major concern. This quality improvement process targeted three areas: the questionnaire; the sampling; and documentation.

In the preparation of the second round (1990), the questionnaire as a whole, as well as single items, were already being reconsidered and a number of questions were replaced or reformulated. Over time, the trend has been to introduce more socio-demographic questions and to ensure consistency in scales and measures. This was not an easy task, however. First, because of comparability, it is always a delicate issue to replace or rephrase questions in repertory surveys. But in the case of the EVS, the organisation of the survey further amplified this problem. As a central researcher recalled:

One could propose an item, and then get overruled several times because of not very convincing arguments, like threats that people would leave the project, if certain items [they were using in their research] were left out... A major problem in EVS is that there are people who are interested in politics, or in religion or a third domain, and all of them fight for their own items.... They do not care about the measurements or the questionnaire as a whole. (Interview with member of the Executive Committee)

Thus, the questionnaire was negotiated in the Council of Programme Directors, a diverse group of researchers with very different academic backgrounds, quality criteria and research interests. Simple technical criteria were often decisive.

The second methodological issue for the EVS was sampling and fieldwork. In the first round (1981), the EVS relied on Gallup's methods, network and expertise. Practices varied hugely, with some countries using random sampling, others quota sampling, and there is very little documentation about dropout rates or any other aspects of the fieldwork (Ashford and Timms 1992; Harding 1986). These problems were not remedied in the second rounds conducted in 1989 and 1990. The members of the EVS shared a keen interest in obtaining data from the former communist countries, an interest that overshadowed concerns about the fact that that data had been collected in haste by Allensbach in Germany with little documentation or time to build up national survey organisations (Interview with member of Executive Committee). However, from the third wave onwards, one of the main priorities at the EVS team in Tilburg was to ensure homogeneity in sampling procedures and fieldwork. During the third and fourth waves, random sampling was introduced, despite resistance from some country programme directors due to costs and national traditions.

Third, from late 1990, the EVS began to document the survey more thoroughly. Since the late 2000s, the EVS has been facing increasing demands for documentation and quality control (Halman 2001). The EVS could not change how the first waves were collected and documented, so their strategy was to try to meet the increasing demands by relying on documentation and ‘reconstruction’ of the steps taken in earlier surveys. However, since this documentation of the surveys was done more than twenty years after completion of the fieldwork, it was not always easy, or even possible, to obtain information about sampling, fieldwork or other relevant parameters.

The increasing attention to measures, fieldwork, sampling and documentation also reveals how the priorities within the EVS changed over the course of the survey, with increasing attention given to more technical issues of survey knowledge production.
INSTITUTIONS

The EVS emerged out of a coalition of—predominantly Catholic—universities, Catholic Church organisations, Christian Democratic political think tanks, private opinion polling institutes and the European bureaucracy. Thus the survey grew out of political institutions and, as I argued earlier, this influenced the initial concerns that guided the survey. During the first round, the EVS relied heavily on contacts and funding from Catholic Church organisations and Christian Democratic think tanks, as well as on access to Gallup’s survey organisation in Europe. In other words, the EVS was established at the intersection of different social institutions or fields, and it was not until the late 1980s that the survey was anchored within a university department. Only in the 1990s did the survey become dominated by academics. As one researcher explained, discussing the first survey:

There was some confusion about what is this creature EVS and who should look after the first wave? Ruud de Moor raised his hand and agreed to take it on. There was not really any competition over who wanted to have the responsibility, but rather that Tilburg in the end agreed to assume the responsibilities... De Moor probably thought that it was good for Tilburg and its sociology department to be in charge of the EVS. There were a few researchers from Tilburg who were really interested in the first wave and had the quantitative capability. (Interview with member of British team in the two first rounds)

In this way, the EVS became institutionalised at a particular academic institution and within a national sociological framework with a strong tradition in quantitative methods, even though the institution in question was marginal within the national sociological field (Becker and Leeuw, 1994). Over time, the survey’s connection to academia and universities has been strengthened and the institutions that form the backbone of the EVS today are all academic institutions.

As many of the founding members withdrew from the surveys, and in order to strengthen its academic reputation, the EVS attempted to formalise its organisation and build relations with recognised academic institutions. Thus, in the late 1990s, the EVS became associated with the German data archive GESIS and, during the organisational formalisation process, universities from Eastern and Southern Europe were incorporated into the different working groups and executive committees. The collaboration with GESIS (and its predecessor ZUMA) had a long history. The formal collaboration started in 2002, when GESIS took over as the archive for the EVS datasets. From then on, GESIS took on the job of archiving and documenting the data, not only for the 2008 wave, but also reconstructing the documentation for the first three waves (Interview with member of the German EVS team).

On an organisational level, the EVS had evolved from initially being a loose organisation located at the intersection between academic, political and civic society institutions, to being a more formalised organisation anchored primarily in academic institutions. However, the ties to the institutions crucial in establishing the EVS were not severed. Thus, collaboration with, and funding from, church organisations continued to be important well into the 2008 wave.

CONTEXT

Seen from the perspective of social scientists, one of the most attractive aspects of the EVS data is the long time span it covers. With the first wave conducted in 1981, and a new one coming up in 2017, the EVS data provides knowledge about attitudes and values ranging from the introduction of democracy in Spain and Portugal, through the fall of the Berlin Wall, to the introduction of the Euro...
and the financial crisis in 2007. Thus the EVS data represents a potentially important resource for understanding major changes in Europe over almost the last forty years. On the other hand, all of these major social events are entangled with the survey throughout all its stages, including the questions asked, countries included, methods applied and, perhaps most importantly, how the results were framed and interpreted. As already shown, the EVS was located at the nexus of various societal institutions from the very outset. One of the main concerns when setting it up was the future of European integration, especially economic and political integration in the EEC. Through Rabier and Kerkhofs, the EVS was connected to the EEC and its Brussels bureaucracy (Kerkhofs 1991). Despite this, the EVS never received any support from the EEC, except for symbolic recognition (Interview with member of Executive Committee). However, the concern about European integration stayed with the EVS, and around the time of the second wave this became an important aspect when the surveys expanded into Eastern Europe. As one of the Polish researchers recounted: “Yes, it was the slogan [...at the time...] that Poland should come back to Europe...”. Hence participation in (Western) European research projects like the EVS was framed as a part of the ‘integration of Europe’ after the end of the Cold War. The way in which the context shaped the survey varies widely between countries, however.

During the whole project, this concern about European integration and its connection to political and social changes framed all waves of the survey, ranging from its social settlement to the ways in which it was framed and legitimised, as well as practical problems pertaining to data quality. In the publications from the EVS, broad changes in the political and social context are used to justify the survey. As one of the publications resulting from the second wave stated:

The 1990 survey was carried out around a time of considerable potential and actual political change. Countries within and around Europe were beginning that process that has now resulted in some of the most sweeping and extraordinary changes within living memory. The demise of the Communist system of government in the USSR, the fall of the Berlin Wall and re-unification of the East and West German States, the rise in nationalistic fervour among the Baltic states, and the imminent abolition of trade barriers between member countries of the EEC are all changes which affect the lives of Europeans at some level. (Ashford and Timms 1992: 4)

Thus, EVS researchers used the changing social and political context continuously to update and frame their research.

**European Social Survey**

We now turn to the ESS, which was launched in the 1990s; the first round of interviews was carried out in 2002. It is, in other words, a much more recent social science endeavour than the EVS. In the following sections, I will analyse the European Social Survey using the same five dimensions.

**AGENTS**

Whereas the agents who initiated the EVS came from different social fields, those who founded the ESS were predominantly well established North-Western European academic researchers with strong ties both to national and European social science institutions. These leading researchers not only had experience in conducting social science research at the national level, but had also been involved in different ways in several international survey research projects. Intellectually, they all
played a central role in debates in European sociology and political science about stratification, comparative politics and political attitudes; they subscribed to the techniques of social surveys and the theoretical foundations of post-war US social science (Steinmetz 2007). These properties become clearer if we look more closely at three of the agents who were central in setting up the ESS. Max Kaase played a crucial role in setting up the ESS. Before setting up the ESS, Kaase had directed and participated in a number of highly visible European projects in comparative politics (Barnes and Kaase 1979; Kaase and Newton 1995). Here, he not only gained experience with directing large-scale European social science research projects, he also developed connections to European scientific institutions like the European Science Foundation and like-minded scholars, especially in Northern and Western Europe, through institutions like the European Consortium for Political Research and the European University Institute in Florence (Boncourt 2015). One of the researchers he was connected to via the ESF was Swedish sociologist Robert Erikson, co-authoring *The Constant Flux* with John Goldthorpe (1992). Erikson was recognised for his research on social stratification, but he also played a central role in coordinating European sociological research through the European Consortium of Sociological Research (1991) and its flagship journal the *European Sociological Review* (1985). He also had connections to the European Science Foundation and to the European Commission as an advisor on social issues. The last agent I will present here brought much experience of carrying out and administering large national and international surveys to the ESS. Roger Jowell was a British social scientist who had headed the British National Centre for Social Research since the early 1980s and had been instrumental in setting up the British Attitudes Survey in 1983. He also developed and chaired the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) in its first years (Smith 2012). It was these technical and administrative capacities, alongside his abilities for obtaining funding for various projects, that Jowell brought to the ESS.

The researchers initiating the survey drew on their extensive networks and connections to researchers throughout Europe. Most researchers recruited to serve as national coordinators were well-established and controlled resources and institutions in their home countries within university departments or governmental research institutions. Scientifically, researchers with a strong methodological focus dominated the group, reflecting a key concern for the ESS, namely the quality of survey research in Europe.

**IDEAS**

From the outset, the main idea guiding the ESS was not rooted so much in a specific social concern, political idea or specific theoretical framework, as in the ambition to produce high-quality data for comparative social science research and to improve and standardise the quality of survey research in Europe, thereby advancing social science knowledge. The idea guiding the ESS was, in many ways, in line with the post-WWII constellation of social science, or what Steinmetz has called ‘methodological-positivism’; i.e. the belief that social science knowledge could be advanced by increasing the amount of empirical data and refining empirical techniques in order to avoid bias and measurement errors (Steinmetz 2005). In the twenty years prior to initiating the ESS, Kaase especially had been involved in comparative research projects and had gained first-hand experience with the problems of achieving reliable and comparable data about social structures and political attitudes in Europe. The idea was thus to:

…chart stability and change in social structure, conditions and attitudes in Europe and to interpret how Europe’s social, political and moral fabric is changing ... and ... to achieve and spread higher standards of rigour in cross-national research in the social sciences, including
for example, questionnaire design and pre-testing, sampling, data collection, reduction of bias and the reliability of questions (European Social Survey 2015a).

These two main purposes differentiated the ESS from similar European social surveys in at least two respects. First of all, the ESS aimed to chart long-term changes, which distinguished it from the European Commission’s Eurobarometer survey. In addition, the ESS’ biannual setup, its focus on social policy issues, and its rotating module enabled it to address pressing political issues and placed it closer to policy issues than the EVS or ISSP. The issues taken up in the surveys were classical issues pertaining to social policy and comparative politics, ranging from political attitudes and media use to identity, religion, socio demographics and items about humans values. In this way, the ESS sought to provide data for established sub-fields, mainly in political science and sociology.

The second main idea guiding the project was its strong emphasis on high-quality data, rigor in methods and research in survey methodology. The project benefited from its initiators’ experience with obtaining data in projects like Political Action (Barnes and Kaase 1979), the ISSP (Smith 2012) and Beliefs in Government (Kaase and Newton 1995). The ESS was to deliver high-quality data and, through methodological research, improve the general standard of social survey research in Europe. The emphasis on methods and techniques also served to legitimise the projects by drawing boundaries between rigorously produced survey data and other forms of social science knowledge production.

**METHODS**

As previously pointed out, ‘methodological rigour’ was the cornerstone of, and perhaps the most important way to, legitimise the ESS, as a consequence, methods and techniques were at its centre. In the blueprint written for the ESF Standing Committee for the Social Sciences in 1996, central decisions about methods and techniques were already taken (European Science Foundation, Standing Committee of the Social Science 1996). The blueprint outlined a model for a biannual survey with a core and rotating module, which would enable the ESS to address different themes in greater depth than was allowed for in the restricted core module. Since the first round in 2002, the rotating module has been dedicated to themes like migration, health, welfare state attitudes, family and work etc. (European Social Survey 2015b).

The scholars setting up the ESS shared a strong ambition to improve and standardise social survey research in Europe, from the construction of questionnaires through sampling, to archiving and documentation. In constructing the questionnaire, the ESS drew on established scales and items and a number of expert groups wrote recommendations both for themes and specific items and scales. The sources varied from Israeli psychologist Shalom Schwartz’s Human Value Scale, through different items taken from social survey programs (such as the British Social Attitude Survey, International Social Survey Program) to ILO’s classification standard for occupation (Erikson and Jonsson 2001; European Social Survey 2001). As a result, a number of items were dismissed due to their quality, and others were reformulated in order to live up to the common quality criteria. Likewise the Central Coordination Team established guidelines and criteria for the task of establishing sampling frames, survey organisations, translations and data management, and monitored and advised the national teams regarding the implementation of these criteria. Implementation was guided by the notion of equivalence. In practice, this meant that the survey did not have to be carried out in exactly the same manner in all countries, but the results—i.e. the data—
needed to be comparable and deviation had to be accounted for (Interview with member of the Central Scientific Team).

In selecting methods and techniques, the ESS balanced on a knife-edge. One hand there was the survey’s raison d’être: rigour in methods and the ambition to improve quality standards in social surveying. On the other, the surveys simultaneously had to produce results in the form of data every two years, and that data had to fit into established disciplinary frameworks, discussions and ways of producing social science knowledge, including the use of specific items and scales. Thus, in order to meet expectations from disciplinary environments, the ESS employed items and scales that did not always live up to the requirements of certain specialists.

INSTITUTIONS

Looking at the institutions that form the core of the ESS, we find primarily Western European universities and research institutions. In the last few years, both Eastern and Southern European institutions have been integrated into the organisation. Thus, the seven institutions that comprise the core scientific team today (2016) are: City University London (UK), NSD (Norway), GESIS (Germany), The Netherlands Institute for Social Research/SCP, (the Netherlands), Universitat Pompeu Fabra (Spain), University of Leuven (Belgium), and University of Ljubljana (Slovenia). However, much of the success in establishing the ESS was due to support from European institutions. Throughout its more than twenty-year history, the ESS has been closely connected to significant European scientific and political institutions. For example, the project was formally initiated by the ESF and the ESF also served as its secretariat and funded the first working groups that led to the blueprint in 1999 (European Science Foundation, Standing Committee of the Social Science 1996; European Science Foundation, Standing Committee of the Social Sciences 1999). Further, the ESF played an important role as the arena in which social scientists like Max Kaase and Robert Erikson could build networks. It also served as the institution linking the ESS to national funding agencies and, more importantly, to the European Commission’s research policy bureaucracy. Thus, the ESF ensured and continuously reaffirmed the support from national funding agencies in setting up the survey and connected the ESS to the European Commission, both by influencing calls and by conveying the ESS’ viewpoints to the EC research bureaucracy (Interview with member of expert group to the Social Sciences Standing Committee, ESF).

In a similar manner, after 2000, European institutions and political processes played an important role in institutionalising the ESS as a European research infrastructure. In the early 2000s, central researchers in the ESS worried that the dependence on short-term funding from national funding agencies and the European Framework Programmes was untenable if the ESS was to fulfil its ambition to provide data for long-term comparisons. In the eyes of the ESS, the project needed a funding base that was less dependent on shifting points of view in the European Commission and national research policies. Just as in the establishment of the project, a European institution became an important tool in changing the ESS’ organisation and funding scheme. In the early 2000s, the issue of research infrastructures returned to the agenda of European research policies (Hallonsten 2014). Countries all over Europe found it increasingly difficult to fund and run large-scale research infrastructures, so the European Council established the ESFRI (European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures). In 2006, 2008 and 2010, the ESFRI published roadmaps with a view to endowing a number of existing and future research facilities with the qualities of research infrastructures (European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures 2006, 2008, 2010). Among the few social sciences and humanities projects was the ESS. The hope among the leaders of the ESS
and the head of the ESFRI Social Science and Humanities Section was that the EU would take over
the funding of European research infrastructures, thereby simplifying their relationship to funders.
However, in the end the solution became a consortium (called an ERIC, European Research
Infrastructure Consortium) with member countries obliged to pay an annual fee covering the
running costs of the infrastructure. This model was designed to secure long-term funding but, in
many countries, it also meant that the source of funding for the ESS shifted from independent
research funding agencies to the involved countries’ ministries of research, thereby drawing the ESS
closer to political institutions.

All in all, it is clear that connections to powerful European institutions—the ability to interact with
them and to position the ESS in relation to them—and to European research policies are crucial in
understanding the history and structure of the ESS.

CONTEXT

The context of the ESS and its institutional constellation are interrelated. Therefore large-scale
changes in EU research policies and political setups influenced the political context in which the ESS
was embedded and contributed to shaping the ESS and the knowledge it produces. Support for
research had been a theme in European collaboration since the mid-1950s. Before the early 1980s,
that support had primarily taken the form of intergovernmental institutions such as the CERN
(1954), the European Science Foundation (1974) and the European University Institute (1976), but
thereafter it was expressed through the Framework Programmes (Guzzetti 1995). The Framework
Programmes primarily served as an economic instrument to support industry and agriculture, with
only limited focus on social science issues and basic research. From the social sciences perspective,
an important change was ushered in with the Maastricht Treaty in 1992. The Maastricht Treaty
expanded the scope of the EU to include issues such as employment, life quality and social cohesion,
all classical concerns in the social sciences. In this way, central concerns for the social sciences—and
for the ESS—were slowly incorporated into the Framework Programmes from the forth Framework
Program, which ran from 1994–1998 and thereafter with a focus on social integration and social
exclusion in Europe (Schögler 2013). Hence, the ESS was established during a period in which issues
central to the founders came onto the EU agenda as political issues, and when formal frameworks
for supporting projects like the ESS were already in place.

In the process of turning the ESS into a European research infrastructure, it was influenced by large-
scale changes that affected its organisation and knowledge production. The concerns about large-
scale research infrastructures were in many ways closely connected to the political project of
establishing a European Research Area as well as to the ambition in the Lisbon Declaration about
turning Europe into the world’s leading knowledge economy (De Elera 2006). The European
Research Area was presented as a scientific equivalent to the European Single Market, ensuring the
coordination and circulation of knowledge and research in Europe, which was intended to ensure
better use of the resources invested in the sciences in Europe. Connected to this broad political
ambition, the issue of the organisation and funding of research infrastructures arose in the early
2000s and the European Commission established an expert group to advise it on how to manage,
fund and organise large-scale research infrastructures. The focus was primarily on large-scale
facilities in the natural and technical sciences, such as observatories, research icebreakers and
cyclotrons costing billions of Euros. Many countries found it increasingly hard to find ways to set up
and fund such facilities, and a ‘European solution’ for research infrastructures fitted well with the
political ambition to establish a European Research Area. In this process, the social sciences and
humanities were included as a subgroup. This subgroup was headed by Bjørn Henrichsen, Director of the NSD, who was one of the core members of the ESS in charge of data management and archiving (Interview with member of the Core Scientific Team). Once again, the ESS became closely entangled with important political processes and, throughout the late 2000s, the ESS prepared its organisation and practices to become a European Research Infrastructure. Again, political processes and concerns had shaped the organisation of the ESS.

The formation and internationalisation of the ESS can thus be seen as closely interwoven with political changes in Europe that offered a range of opportunities that the ESS could exploit due to its well-connected and powerful agents.

**Concluding discussion: Changes and continuity**

The two cases compared here provide an opportunity to understand the constellation of social survey knowledge in Europe and to discern how projects like the ESS and EVS have contributed to the emergence of a field of European social science knowledge production.

The two cases show how relatively successful social science projects are constructed in relation to different institutions and fields at the European level, and enable insights into the constellation of European social science knowledge production in the future. As the analysis shows, the five dimensions are often interwoven and, by way of conclusion, I will now discuss their interconnectedness in order to illustrate the constellation of the two surveys and the forms of knowledge production they represent. Table 2 provides an overview of the main properties of the two surveys.

**Table 2: Properties of the EVS and the ESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European Values Study</th>
<th>European Social Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agents</strong></td>
<td>Catholic-oriented academics and agents at the intersection of social science, politics and business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Ideas**             | Initially: anxiety about social change and European integration  
Later: Data provider | Providing high quality data for use in academic research  
Improving survey research in Europe |
| **Methods**           | Survey, relying on local/national traditions/practices | Surveys, equivalence, centrally monitored techniques, documentation about production of the survey |
| **Institutions**      | Think tanks, universities (mainly Catholic), Catholic church organisations.  
Increasingly university departments GESIS | ESF and national research councils, EU research funding agencies |
| **Context**           | Western European ‘modernisation’, secularisation and changing values, end of the Cold War, increasing European collaboration | ‘An integrating Europe’  
Maastricht treaty => expansion of the Scope of the EU  
European Research Area  
European Research Infrastructure |

At first glance, the two projects bear many similarities. Both are recognised as important European social surveys providing longitudinal data on central social science topics (Heath et al. 2005). Still,
the trajectory and constellation of the two surveys differs in important respects. Looking at the agents involved, we find that very different constellations of actors initiated the two surveys, and that they were guided by different ideas. Where the EVS was initiated by agents from different social fields, united by common political and ethical concerns—not least their connections to the Catholic Church—the ESS was cast as a scientific project and initiated by well-connected Northern European social scientists. Common to the two surveys is the fact that the agents who initiated them were well connected to both national and European institutions and commanded substantial institutional resources that they put to use in establishing the two surveys. But the social resources mobilised were quite different. For example, the two groups of founders looked rather different in terms of academic recognition. Where the ESS could mobilise renowned researchers within sociology and political science who commanded recognition and technical scientific resources, the initiators of the EVS were not recognised in the same way by their academic peers. The origins of the initiating agents and the ideas guiding the two surveys were, as we saw, closely connected. Thus, the EVS started out driven by strong political and ethical concerns about the consequences of the large-scale social changes that were sweeping through Europe, while the ESS’ ambition was to advance social scientific knowledge production by providing high quality data and improving survey methods in Europe. This meant that the role played by methods was different in the two surveys. The EVS began by relying on established institutions (especially Gallup) and different national practices, and the ESS set itself the goal of establishing new standards for social surveys in Europe. In this way, rigour in methods and survey methodology research became the hallmark and main legitimation of the ESS. Over time, concerns about methods have become a more central issue in the EVS and have transformed the survey’s role, moving it towards becoming a data provider. As was the case for the agents, both surveys had strong ties to European and national institutions from the outset. The EVS was connected to a wide range of institutions ranging from universities and think tanks to opinion polling institutes, all connected through Catholic organisations and faith. On the other hand, from the very beginning the ESS was, well connected both to national and European scientific institutions (the ESF, research funding agencies, scientific associations etc.) and, through them, to the EU research bureaucracy. Throughout the ESS’ history, this connection to EU institutions has been crucial in terms of obtaining funding—first through the Framework Programs and later as a research infrastructure—and for the institutional recognition of the project. Finally, let us turn to the context of the two surveys. Here, the changing political and social conditions in Europe have shaped how the EVS has framed its knowledge production and organisation. Thus, the fall of the Berlin Wall and end of the Cold War in around 1990 led to the expansion of the EVS into Eastern Europe and a number of publications on value systems and changes in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet countries. In contract, in the case of the ESS the changes that have been most influential have been the changing constellation of the EU and EU research policy represent important contextual changes that made the ESS possible. Thus, the ESS can be understood as a manifestation of the political ambition to establish a European Research Area; not as the direct product of this, but as the outcome of an ongoing interaction with, and use of, the institutional openings offered by the political processes and academic agents guided by a specific vision of social science knowledge production.

All in all, the analysis shows that despite the apparent similarities between the two surveys, their constellation and trajectory differ, helping us to understand both their different modes of knowledge production and their ties to political institutions and processes in Europe. Both surveys were established by powerful agents and were associated with influential institutions—both at the national and European levels—and both mobilised recognised models in addressing pressing contemporary issues.
The analysis highlights two important aspects of the emergence of a field of European social sciences research: the first regarding the process of establishing European social science research projects; and the second concerning the kinds of knowledge production that become dominant at the European level. As the analysis shows, the two projects built on networks and relations with existing powerful institutions, suggesting that the emergence of a European field of social science tends to benefit agents and positions that already occupy dominant positions in national constellations of social science knowledge production. Likewise, regarding the forms of knowledge, we observe that both projects relied on well-established forms of knowledge production, methods and theoretical concepts. Thus, the process of establishing a European constellation or field of social science seems to be primarily characterised by a confirmation of the already dominant positions of the agents involved, as well as of particular theoretical conceptions and the survey method. Thus the two projects—despite their differences—both contribute to consolidating a particular mode of knowledge production as dominant within the emerging European field of social science. Remarkably, this form is quite similar to that which dominated the social sciences at national level in Europe in the post-war period, namely scientistic, US-produced survey research (Steinmetz 2007). The question that thus arises is whether the emergence of a European field of social science research will lead to a narrowing of social science knowledge production, as occurred in the US after 1945, or to a more pluralistic constellation. Only time will tell.
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Abstract
This article analyses the conditions under which political attempts at influencing the activities of scientists succeed or fail. It does so by assessing the impact of European politics on the development of the social sciences and humanities. More specifically, it focuses on the creation of the European University Institute (EUI) and studies the extent to which European institutions succeeded in orientating EUI scholars’ scientific agenda, in a direction favourable to European integration. The article argues that this attempt only enjoyed limited success. It shows that the increasing autonomy of the disciplines under study meant that political injunctions had trouble gaining currency. The politicisation of sciences thus appears to be hampered by the changing structure of disciplinary fields.
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Introduction
European integration is deeply interwoven with knowledge production. As early as the 1940s, advocates of European integration identified science and culture as key instruments for the advancement of the European project. A university institute, the Bruges College of Europe, was created in 1949 to train future European elites (Schnabel 1998). The Euratom Treaty, which founded the European Atomic Energy Community in 1957, was signed to set up scientific, technological and political cooperation around nuclear energy, with a view of deepening European integration (Krige
European museums such as Jean Monnet’s House were created to promote Europe in the eyes of its citizens (Mazé 2009; Cadot 2010; 2014). Research centres like the Institut de la Communauté Européenne pour les Etudes Universitaires in Lausanne were given the task to develop a research agenda specific to European integration (Petit 2006; Calligaro 2013). European research Framework Programmes and other funding schemes were launched to sponsor scientific initiatives of particular interest to the European institutions (Koenig and Schoegler in this issue).

While the existence of connections between European politics and the history of sciences in Europe has been pointed out, few studies have assessed the implications of these connections for the development of disciplines: how did European research policies further or impede the institutionalisation of disciplines? Did they promote the development of particular paradigms, methods, ideas? Did they take scientific agendas closer to political ones—and, in particular, closer to topics and approaches directly connected to the European integration project?

This article seeks to answer these questions by looking at the case of the European University Institute (EUI). The EUI was legally created in 1972 and opened its doors four years later at the Badia Fiesolana, on the outskirts of Florence, Italy. Its first president was the Dutch politician Max Kohnstamm, former Secretary to the High Authority of the European Community for Coal and Steel. In the academic landscape of the time, the EUI was an atypical institution. In contrast to most of the other universities, it was research-oriented and only trained PhD candidates. Setting aside the dominant natural sciences, it focused on the social sciences and humanities (SSH) and established four departments: history and civilisation (HEC), economics (ECO), law (LAW), and the political and social sciences (SPS). While most other universities were part of a national system of higher education, the EUI had a transnational character: created by an international convention between European Community member countries (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxemburg, and the Netherlands), it gathered professors and PhD candidates from all European member countries. As an institute founded as part of the European integration process and hosting disciplines which are, by nature, closer to political topics, the EUI is a stimulating case for observing the effects of European politics on sciences.

In recent years, European studies scholars have taken a growing interest in the sociology of ideas. Constructivist studies paved the way by emphasising the role of norms in the social construction of European institutions (Checkel 1998; Christiansen, Jorgensen and Wiener 1999; Rosamond 2003). Critical and reflectivist sociologists of European integration built on this idea and argued that knowledge producers (scientists, experts, consultants, lawyers, economists, etc.) played a key part in shaping the EU, understood as a “political, legal, economic, social, cultural and philosophical phenomenon” (Vauchez 2008; Favell and Guiraudon 2009; Mudge and Vauchez 2012; quote in Adler-Nissen and Kropp 2015: 157). They suggested that the social sciences of European integration had “theory effects” on the latter (Adler-Nissen and Kropp 2015) and should, therefore, be studied in their own right (Rosamond 2000; 2015).

While this literature claims affiliation with the “new sociology of ideas” (Camic and Gross 2001)—as in Adler-Nissen and Kropp 2015—it tends to only take up parts of this approach’s agenda. It does explore the interactions between European politics and the social sciences, but its main interest is in assessing the impact of these interactions on European integration. By contrast, their impact on scientific development has received less attention. This article seeks to contribute to filling this gap. In line with previous studies in the history and sociology of science (L’Estoile 2007; Mespoulet 2007; Fourcade 2009; Steinmetz 2013), it looks at how political actors (in this case, in particular, European
institutions\(^1\) and contexts (European integration) influenced the development of the social and human sciences. Rather than arguing, as has been done for example in the case of the Cold War, that political contexts have an almost mechanical impact on the type of knowledge that scientists produce (Oren 2003; Erickson et al. 2013), this article analyses the conditions under which political attempts at influencing the activities of scientists succeed or fail (Solovey and Cravens 2012). In line with the Bourdieusian sociology of science, it argues that scientists may accept or resist attempts at “politicising” their activity, and that the extent to which they do so depends on the particular structure of their disciplinary field and their own position within it (Bourdieu 2001; Lagroye 2003). The article elaborates on the idea that the structures of scientific fields serve as mediating contexts which, like prisms, refract external influences and adapt them to the specific logics of disciplines (Bourdieu 1993; Maton 2005).

This argument rests on the comparative analysis of the early years of the HEC and SPS departments of the EUI.\(^2\) It focuses on the setting up of the social, institutional and intellectual structures of these departments, and on the way in which they coped with injunctions for political relevance. While the study is predominantly internal, it is situated in the broader context of disciplinary fields.

The study uses qualitative material drawn from archives and interviews.\(^3\) We consulted the archives of the EUI itself and personal funds (Table 1). We also conducted interviews with former professors and officials of the EUI, officials of the Directorate General for Information (DG X) of the European Commission, and members of the Liaison Committee of Historians (Table 2). The argument also rests on secondary sources on the creation and history of the EUI (Palayret 1996).

The article first presents the political impulse behind the EUI’s foundation and the setting up of the HEC and SPS departments. It then analyses the scientific controversies which soon emerged between the appointed professors. A final part shows how these internal struggles undermined the Europeanist research agenda originally envisaged for these two departments.

\(^1\) As an institution created by a multilateral treaty, the EUI was also subject to the influence of European national governments, who had delegates on the Institute’s High Council. The minutes of the High Council’s meetings show, however, that the scientific orientation of the EUI was not a contentious issue, as national delegates largely limited themselves to confirming the views of the Academic Council—a body comprising the EUI’s president and academic staff. High Council debates were more heated when they dealt with funding, e.g. when the number of recruitments for managing the EUI library had to be decided (“Compte rendu de la 2ème réunion du conseil supérieur tenue à Florence, les 21 et 22 novembre 1975”, Historical Archives of the European Union (HAEU), Folder 102, 13 January 1976, IUE 2/76). While these questions are important, they are of secondary interest to this article. There is no doubt that the EUI was the subject of debates at the national level, e.g. within higher education ministries, but given there scattered character these debates could not be traced in the framework of this research.

\(^2\) The article is based on the merging of two studies, respectively focused on the history of European integration and on the history of political science. This accounts for the focus on the HEC and SPS departments which could not, unfortunately, be completed by studies of their LAW and ECO counterparts.

\(^3\) Part of the research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 319974 (Interco-SSH).

\(^4\) Some of this material has only recently been made available to the public, due to a thirty-year embargo on the consultation of EUI documents, and to the fact that Hans Daalder only donated his own records to the University of Leiden in 2014.
Table 1: Archives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archives</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Historical Archives of the European Commission (HAEC), Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Historical Archives of the European Union (HAEU), Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European University Institute</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Historical Archives of the European Union (HAEU), Florence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Daalder</td>
<td>Former SPS professor (1976–1979)</td>
<td>University of Leiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michel Dumoulin</td>
<td>Member of the Liaison Committee of Historians by the European Commission</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Lastenouse</td>
<td>Former European Commission official</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Lipgens</td>
<td>Former HEC professor (1976–1979)</td>
<td>HAEU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emile Noël</td>
<td>Former European Commission official; Former President of the EUI (1987–1993)</td>
<td>HAEU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Place and date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Lastenouse</td>
<td>Former European Commission official</td>
<td>Brussels, 3 September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name kept anonymous</td>
<td>Administrator of the EUI academic service</td>
<td>Florence, 15 March 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A University Institute for Legitimising Europe

The EUI was, from the outset, an institution built in line with a Europeanist agenda, i.e. with the explicit objective to promote European integration. Since its creation in 1952, the Press and Information Service of the European Commission (EC), forerunner of the Directorate General for Information (DG X) created in 1967, had indeed identified the university milieu as one of its priority targets ("milieux prioritaires") (Reinfeld 2007). It recognised the part played by universities in the nation-building process, and suggested that they could play a “similar role in the formation of the European unity” (Reinfeld 2007: 67): they could highlight “the dynamism and the irreversibility of the integration process”⁵ and “lend the phenomenon [European integration] a sort of legitimacy of a great significance by making it the object of research, teaching and examination”.⁶

The foundation of the EUI rested on this rationale: the new institute was to contribute to “the development of a European consciousness that is essential if we are to reach our final objective [...].

---

which is the political integration of Europe”.  

The ambition to provide access to this “European frame of mind and dimension” was also what justified that the Institute be centred on the SSH rather than the natural sciences: the former were seen as “presenting a particular interest for European unification” as they could, more than the latter, produce narratives that would further legitimise European integration (Loth 2012). In light of this objective and disciplinary focus, it also made sense for the EUI to have a proper transnational character: while physics and other natural sciences were seen as transnational by nature, SSH were described as marked by national traditions, “with the result that history does not come out the same whatever you do in France, in Germany, in Belgium, in Britain or in America”. Transnational collaboration between scholars of different nationalities was therefore seen as essential for achieving the Institute’s objectives.

The implementation of these principles and the setting up of the EUI were entrusted to a preparatory committee made up of two representatives of each state coming either from higher education (university rectors or professors) or higher education administration (members of ministries). It first produced a document outlining the “academic profile” of the new Institute and emphasised the need for it to focus on “largely international phenomena” rather than “national phenomena, for the treatment of which member states’ existing universities would be better equipped”. More specifically, it defined “democracy” as a priority field of investigation for all departments. It also identified department-specific agendas which, in the case of SPS, focused on “the relationship between central and peripheral powers”, “the development of least favoured regions”, and “internal and international migrations” and, in the case of HEC, on the “European historical consciousness” (e.g. “the history of the European idea”, “the notion of state”, “the evolution of cultural exchanges in Europe”, etc.). These research agendas are further indications of the close connection between the Institute and the challenges facing European integration.

The existence of a desire to give a political and pro-European dimension to the development of the SSH at the EUI is obvious. However, whether these aspirations would bear fruit depended heavily on the personnel that would be chosen to implement them. The task of hiring a first group of professors, also handled by the preparatory committee, was therefore key to the process. While these scholars would only be at the Institute on a temporary basis, the fact that they could set up the structures of the new EUI from an (almost) blank state meant their actions could have huge bearings on the future of the Institute.

---

7 Gaetano Martino, then Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs, quoted in Palayret 2001: 9.
8 French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, quoted in Palayret 1996: 121.
9 Etienne Hirsch, then President of the European Atomic Energy Commission and Chairman of the Interim Committee mandated to plan for the future European University, quoted in 1962 in Bulletin from the European Communities 85: 6.
11 Public policy studies have long shown that the implementation of initial principles cannot be taken for granted. The social structure and practices of the groups of actors tasked with implementing them, as well as the power relations between these actors, all play key part on the impact (or lack thereof) of these principles (Mégie 2010).
12 As the EUI was meant to rely only on temporary staff, professorial appointments were to be made for three years. While this length was later extended (standard appointments are now for five years, with possible extensions), the principle of having no permanent professors was retained.
13 On the impact of initial choices on the later development of institutions, see the literature on path dependence mechanisms, e.g. Palier 2010.
The appointment of these professors took place in two steps: applications were first centralised by member states, who were in charge of finding relevant candidates; and the preparatory committee then selected the eight new professors, who were formally appointed in 1975. While gaps in the archives make it difficult to know exactly who applied and what criteria were taken into account in the selection process, two principles seem to have presided over the committee’s choices: the group was to be balanced at the disciplinary level (two professors per department) and at the geographical level (balance between member countries); and different schools of thought were to be represented in order for the Institute not to “commit to a single way”.\(^{14}\) Informal correspondence between the members of the preparatory committee hints at additional, informal criteria: fluency in multiple languages (Italian, French, English), international connections and reputation, and broad social science and “non-professional culture”.\(^{15}\)

The three newly appointed SPS professors\(^{16}\) had different trajectories and positions in the field of political science. Jacques Georgel (France, 42 years old) specialised in the study of political institutions\(^{17}\) and regimes\(^{18}\) in France and Spain. He held the *agrégation* in law (1962) and was a professor at the University of Rennes (1962–1976). While he published his work in French, some of it was subsequently translated into Spanish and Italian.\(^{19}\) Hans Daalder\(^{20}\) (Netherlands, 47 years old) was a specialist of the comparative analysis of political parties and systems\(^{21}\). A professor at Leiden University, he had also had frequent fellowships in the United States in the 1960s. He also was a founding member of the new European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR, see below) (Daalder 1997). Maurice Cranston (UK, 55 years old) was a political theorist and the author of intellectual biographies\(^{22}\) and conceptual analyses.\(^{23}\) A professor at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), and the President of the International Institute of Political Philosophy, he had also held fellowships abroad, mostly in the US, in the 1960s and 1970s but also in France in 1977.

The differences between these scholars were emblematic of the broader structure of political science at the time. There was then no widespread agreement on what political science was, and what


\(^{16}\) While Maurice Cranston was not, strictly speaking, part of the initial group of two professors, he was appointed soon after, in 1977.


\(^{19}\) “CV de Jacques Georgel”, in “Choix des huit premiers professeurs”, HAEU, Folder EUI-14, 12 March 1975, no. 366/75 (EN 44).

\(^{20}\) While Giovanni Sartori had initially been appointed to this position, he was quickly offered a chair in political science at Stanford University, with Daalder chosen to replace him at the EUI (Sartori 1997).


paradigms and methods it should use. Political studies had emerged in different ways in different countries, under the institutional umbrella and intellectual influence of more established disciplines. In France, as exemplified by the case of Georgel, they were intertwined with constitutional law. In the United Kingdom, as embodied by Cranston, they were closely connected to history, the history of ideas, and normative philosophy. The situation was, however, different in the US. While political studies had originally developed along the same historical and normative lines as in the UK, they had undergone, in the 1950s and 1960s, what has been retrospectively labelled as a “revolution” (Dahl 1961) with the rise to prominence of behaviouralism. The promoters of this paradigm veered away from the history and ideas to focus on the behaviour of political actors. They also contended that political studies should be more autonomous from neighbouring disciplines, and develop their own methods and theories. This claim was accompanied by an aspiration for the discipline to have more “scientific” standards, based on sophisticated, chiefly statistical, methods, and on a deductive, theory-driven approach. Originally marginal, behaviouralism gradually gained weight in the US (Hauptmann 2012) and spread internationally through various conferences and networks. It notably became represented in Europe through the ECPR, a consortium of academic institutions created in 1970 with the objective of helping the diffusion of behaviouralism and statistical methods on the old continent (Boncourt 2015). The three SPS professors thus approached political phenomena in fundamentally different—and, to a certain extent, rival—ways: Georgel, with his background in law, wrote about politics from a distinctively institutional and constitutional perspective; Daalder, a founding member of the ECPR, followed a more behaviouralist approach that focused on actors, such as political parties; and Cranston approached the subject from the normative study of great authors and concepts.

By contrast, the professors recruited at the HEC department did not represent significantly divergent historiographical traditions. The vague term of “civilisation” intended to cover research on “European idea” or “European historical consciousness”. Although names of philosophers, anthropologists, historians of ideas but also of specialists of medieval Europe appeared in the discussions of the preparatory committee, two professors of late modern and contemporary European history were eventually selected, thus excluding other geographical and temporal focus: Charles Wilson, 42, a business historian from Cambridge University who had held fellowships abroad (Harvard, Delaware, Tokyo); and Karl Dietrich Bracher, 53, a renowned specialist of the Third Reich from Bonn University, with a similar international profile (with fellowships at Stanford, Princeton, Oxford, and Harvard). Bracher, who had a mixed profile of historian and political theorist, was chosen for the Chair of Contemporary European History. At the time of his appointment, he was working on a history of Europe in the 20th century. The department also recruited an assistant professor, specialist of contemporary international history, Peter Ludlow, from the University of London. Educated in Oxford, Cambridge and Göttingen, Ludlow had published on German religious history and on Europe in the interwar and World War II period. These first appointments indicate the preparatory committee’s intention to focus the activity of the HEC department on contemporary Europe. A specific project, designed in parallel to the staff selection

25 EUI, Réunion Comité préparatoire Histoire et Civilisation, 1 October 1974; EUI, Décision du conseil supérieur portant création de huit postes permanents de professeurs attachés à l’Institut, HAEU, Folder EUI-14, 12 March 1975, no. 366/75 (EN 44).
process, reflects a further objective: to develop research specifically on the history of European unification.

At the initiative of the European Commission, its Secretary-General and the EUI’s President Kohnstamm signed in 1975 a contract regarding a “Projet d’histoire de la Communauté européenne” funded by the Commission and to be conducted at the HEC department, which was to open in September 1976. The project was to set up an international consortium of historians in charge of writing the history of the European Communities. As such, it was in keeping with the idea of creating synergies between scholars of several European countries and producing knowledge on European unification. The EUI board asked Pascal Fontaine to produce a note concerning the realisation of this project. A professor at Sciences Po Paris, Fontaine had been Monnet’s personal secretary since 1971 and stemmed from a “European family” who actively participated in the design of a “récit des origines de la construction européenne” (Cohen 2007: 20). His involvement indicates that this historiographical project was part of a larger design aiming at the production and promotion of a European “grand récit”.

The profile of the professor eventually chosen to conduct the project was in keeping with this political objective. When K. D. Bracher found himself in the impossibility of taking up the Chair of Contemporary European History, the position was offered to Walter Lipgens, 50, a convinced European federalist. Critical towards the deleterious effects of nationalism in Germany and in Europe, he was an advocate of European unification, which became the central theme of his research from the mid-1960s onwards. He dedicated a monograph to the projects of European federation forged by the European Resistance movements during World War II. When he was appointed at the EUI, he was working on the book, Die Anfänge der europäischen Einigungspolitik, published in German in 1977 and translated in English in 1982, which was to become a major reference for the emerging discipline of European integration history. The book located the birth of the European unity movement in the spirit of the Resistance against Nazism. With this focus on ideas and non-governmental actors, Lipgens broke with a general trend among historians who analysed European unification with the methods of diplomatic history and who hence put the emphasis on the actions of governments and diplomats. Pivotal to Lipgens’s analysis was the crisis of the European nation states, too weak to remain in control of their destiny, making unity the only way to preserve Europe and its culture.

---

The choice of Lipgens and the project of European integration history gave the HEC department a clearly Europeanist research agenda, which soon provoked controversies. Likewise, the competition between different intellectual traditions that took place within the SPS department raised the question of the researchers’ position with regard to European integration.

2. Politicisation and Scientific Controversies

The newly founded EUI was a blank academic slate: in contrast to national universities, it was the first of its kind and did not have to comply with the complex set of norms, rules, and laws that shaped national academia. The initial staff was in charge of setting up everything from scratch, i.e. inventing rules, hiring PhD researchers, ordering books for the library, presiding over the refurbishment and equipment of the rooms to meet the needs of personnel and activities, etc.33

This extensive room of manoeuvre and the lack of constraints from existing structures could have meant that the initial political agenda of the EUI would quickly take hold. The history of the departments under study suggests, on the contrary, that this attempt to link scientific activities to a political project faced strong resistances. These resistances were not a simple case of scientists disagreeing over the extent to which sciences should serve a political agenda. While this question was part of the equation, it was only one aspect of broader paradigm competitions. In other words, the existing intellectual structures of disciplinary fields had strong bearings on the extent to which scientific activities at the EUI could be politicised.

Faced with the task of leading the scientific life of the department (e.g. by organising doctoral seminars, launching and coordinating research projects, inviting visiting scholars, etc.), professors in the SPS department took different courses of action. In line with the efforts of ECPR, Daalder saw the EUI as a place where he could promote a behaviouralist blend of political science, with an emphasis on methodology, comparison, and empirical data. This choice was tangible in the list of professors that he invited to the department during its first year of activity: SPS hosted specialists of the study of party systems, pressure groups, the “overload of government”, and computer-assisted statistical analyses. Most of them had had professional experiences in the US, and many were members of ECPR’s executive committee (such as Stein Rokkan, Richard Rose, Dusan Sidjanski, and Rudolf Wildenmann). The connection to ECPR was quickly made explicit: the department became one of its member institutions in 1976, and the Consortium sponsored the organisation of an EUI summer school devoted to “comparative European politics” in 1977.34

Jacques Georgel’s activities were of a different intellectual orientation. He held a seminar on political institutions in the nine European Community states, in the framework of which he invited colleagues who gave talks on the French political system, and on European integration: Jean-Pierre Cot (University Paris 1) focused on “Competence ideology and political propaganda under the Fifth Republic”, Jean Rivero (University Paris 2) lectured on the methods for protecting freedom in liberal Europe, and Pierre Mendes-France gave a course on “historical events in relation to European integration—the notion of democracy”. Thus, in contrast to Daalder’s, Georgel’s agenda was more directly in line with the EUI’s proposed focus on European integration, and the scholars whom he

33 Hans Daalder, “Those first years at the Badia”, undated, communicated personally by the author.
invited had very different profiles from Daalder’s hosts: two of them were specialists of public law (Rivero, Cot), and one was a policy-maker (Mendès-France).\textsuperscript{35}

The second year saw the setting up of Maurice Cranston’s seminar on the “concept of State”. Centred on political philosophy, it also drew upon “the historical perspective, together with contributions from legal theory, the subject being one which naturally invites an ‘interdisciplinary’ approach”.\textsuperscript{36} The list of invited scholars reflected this interdisciplinary emphasis, as it included political science, sociology, law, and philosophy scholars.

These parallel developments did not come without tensions. While disagreements were initially latent, they became more formalised on the occasion of a debate about “the future of political sciences at the EUI” in 1979. In an attempt to clarify the department’s “intellectual profile” and go beyond parallel individual initiatives, the members of the department sought to agree on a strategy for future appointments and activities.

An important correspondence was produced about these questions by members of the department Daalder, Georgel, Cranston, Giuseppe Di Palma (a specialist of “empirical political science” meant to temporarily replace Daalder, whose professorship would come to an end the following year), Rudolf Wildenmann (a specialist of the quantitative study of politics and political parties, who would take over from Di Palma after one year on a normal three-year professorial contract), Athanasios Moulakis (a professor of political philosophy who would start his professorship in 1979 and eventually take over Cranston’s role at the end of the latter’s contract), Stefano Bartolini, and Peter Mair (former Daalder’s PhD students, who had then become assistants to the department\textsuperscript{37}). Daalder, Mair, Bartolini, and Di Palma argued for the structuration of the department around a deductive, empirical, comparative, and to a certain extent quantitative political science oriented towards the realisation of collective projects. Cranston, Georgel, and Moulakis stressed the importance of the study of ideas and institutions, and presented political science research as a more personal endeavour. They criticised what they saw as “American-style political science” (“political science à l’américaine”) and contended that it should, in their view, make room primarily for the history of ideas, and for a “European-style political science” (“science politique à l’euro péenne”).

Researchers are spread into five seminars that correspond to four orientations: European-style political science, American-style political science, political ideas, sociology. [...] With 20 researchers obliged to follow seminars, we cannot in four directions in a profitable way; additionally, very few of them know how to use a computer. We therefore need to concentrate our efforts. In what areas?

a) Where our lack of competence will be the least damaging, which will allow the Institute to develop its influence and build a reputation which, for now, does not exist.

b) Also where we will be the most able to meet the expectations set by the Convention, i.e. to deepen European culture. [...]
It does not take a great expert to realise that it is easier, less expensive, and more adequate to the goals set by the Convention to direct research towards the history of ideas, also called political philosophy. This is, in my view, a priority.

The second orientation of the department should be chosen between three possibilities: international relations (neglected until now), European-style political science, sociology.\footnote{As hinted in this quote by Georgel, this paradigm opposition had implications for the way in which members of the department saw the EUI’s role with respect to European integration. While Daalder and others, in line with the behaviouralist idea that political science should be autonomous from neighbouring disciplines and from politics itself, argued that the Institute should be concerned with science only, other members of the department saw it at their duty to produce knowledge that would be useful for European integration.}

From the beginning there was substantial disagreement between those who saw ‘true’ academic research (generally consisting of theoretical and comparative study) as the paramount task of the Institute, and whose who thought of the EUI as a brains trust for the Community, a European Brookings.\footnote{The two camps also pushed for different appointments. Georgel and Cranston supported the appointment of Vincent Wright, a professor at the Oxford Nuffield College who specialised in French political history, and was the founding co-editor of the new journal \textit{West European Politics}. Daalder and others supported the appointment of Peter Flora, then professor in Cologne and whose work, labelled “macrosociology”, sought to operate a wide-scale comparison of European welfare states, on the basis of collective research. This ambition resonated with EUI research on European parties in that it put the emphasis on the multivariate comparison of European societies.}

These appointments gradually led to the end of the debate. Flora, together with Di Palma, Mair, Bartolini, and, later on, Wildenmann, strengthened the emphasis of the department on a comparative, deductive, and collective conception of European social science research. Political philosophy and the history of ideas remained represented, notably through Moulakis’s presence, but the more juridical and institutional approach that Georgel embodied declined after his departure as his successor, Vincent Wright, moved closer to the type of work undertaken by Bartolini and others (Wright 1997: 170). The Europeanist agenda, as one of the aspects of the debate, was thus eclipsed by a broader paradigm struggle and the rise to prominence of scholars who pursued other objectives.

In the HEC department, the adoption of a Europeanist agenda also gave rise to debates. In the discussions about the project “History of European integration”, divergences emerged over Fontaine’s and Lipgens’s openly federalist approach. Ludlow warned against the risk of a too federalist stance and about the teleological dimension that this historiography of European integration could take:

\begin{quote}
We say that we want to write a history of the European Community? But what is the latter?
\end{quote}

[\textit{original emphasis}] Western Europe is a Community in process of formation, without a single


\footnote{Hans Daalder, “Those first years at the Badia”, \textit{op. cit.}}

\footnote{Stefano Bartolini and Peter Mair (1979), “Report on the future profile of the department of political and social sciences”, Daalder Archives, Folder 7.2 / 27.013, December 1979.}
centre and without a clearly defined future. There may one day be a single political entity, but there are at the present, as they have been in the past, many different forms of association and cooperation, and as historians of European integration we must allow for the variegated and partial character of what we are trying to describe. We have to base our work on a concept of Europe which is neither a collection of nation states, nor, still less, a new nation: a conceptual framework which allows free rein to the many different elements, official and unofficial governments and multinational companies, market forces and cultural and ideological enthusiasms, pro-Europeans and ‘antis’, which have moulded the politics of our community.41

Lipgens’s view contrasted with Ludlow’s:

Because of the process of European integration which strongly differentiates Europe after different ways: as the continued development of the history of the nations and as the common history of integration with common institutions, common patrimony of archives, etc. The scientific historiography of the national histories goes further in our countries. The History Department of the European University Institute considers as its duty the promotion of the multinational cooperation indispensable to the study of the common history of Europe. For the European Community, it is also important to acquire a proper and historical consciousness resting on scientific bases.42

Lipgens described the project in terms of a tangible political commitment: the European Community needed a scientific knowledge of its history, and the EUI would produce it. Lipgens’s objective was to write “a common history of Europe”, and the transnational nature of the object of study made it necessary to change research methods, not only through the “multinational cooperation” of historians of various national backgrounds, but also through the study of the “common patrimony of archives”. The goal was set on stimulating historical research on the integration process, especially by identifying and making accessible important sources like archives and official documents. The project was formally launched in September 1977 during an international symposium at the EUI.

The project contributed substantially to institutionalising European integration as a field of research. Although only one of the originally planned books on the archives of European integration was published,43 and only one of the four monographs proposed was produced, the latter was of importance. This was Lipgens’s History of European Integration. The Formation of the European Unity Movement44—the English version of his 1977 monograph in German. Its translation in the framework of the EUI project allowed the book to find a much wider audience, and it quickly became a work of reference for European integration history. The project also laid the foundations for the development of a transnational cooperation among scholars interested in European integration—which was one of the Commission’s goals. The scholars involved across Europe in the project continued to collaborate and their common work contributed to the emergence of history of European integration as a discipline.

41 Letter from Peter Ludlow to Pascal Fontaine, 6 March 1976, HAEU, Folder EUI-10, 1974–1981.
However, another objective—that of turning the HEC department into a permanent and attractive research centre on European integration history—was not achieved. This failure is mainly due to the complex relations that bound the project “History of European Integration”, Walter Lipgens, the EUI and the European Commission. In September 1979, Lipgens’s contract at the EUI ended. He did not ask for a renewal and returned to the University of Saarbrücken. Lipgens was indeed an already well-established professor in Germany and a longer stay at the EUI, which was still a young institution with limited means and prestige, was not necessarily beneficial for his career in his home country. His departure triggered a conflict regarding the future of the project. In October 1979, Lipgens expressed the desire to pursue the project in Saarbrücken and asked for a transfer of the European Commission’s subsidies devoted to the project. The European Commission refused, arguing that the project was legally attached to the EUI and could not be carried out in another research institution. However, no professor at the HEC took on the project. Peter Ludlow had initially been involved in the project but he had remained skeptical towards its Europeanist stance. He ceased to collaborate with the project in 1980 and eventually left the EUI in 1983. As a result, the project stopped at the EUI and was partly continued in Saarbrücken, supported by private sponsors.

At the end of 1970s, the realisation of a Europeanist research agenda was hence jeopardised in both departments. The following developments confirmed this trend.

3. Struggles within the Departments: The Europeanist Research Agenda Eschewed or Challenged.

The late 1970s saw some of HEC and SPS scholars express reluctances to see their scientific activities be connected to a political agenda favourable to European integration. The early 1980s saw a deeper setting aside of this orientation.

Within SPS, while the question of the connection between the EUI and European integration was part of prior paradigm debates, it was soon eschewed in the framework of new disciplinary competitions. Peter Flora’s appointment indeed introduced sociology in a department that was before exclusively concerned with political science. While EU political scientists and sociologists shared, as has been pointed out above, a common idea of what social science should be about, they

---


48 Lipgens and his former student Wilfried Loth carried on several parts of the project at the University of Sarrebrücken with a subsidy from the Volkswagen Foundation. See Wilfried Loth, Preface, in: Documents on the History of European Integration, vol. III, The Struggle for European Union by Political Parties and Pressure Groups in Western European Countries 1945–1950, Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1988, viii.
still had different disciplinary interests. The struggle between paradigms was thus gradually replaced by a struggle between disciplines.\(^{49}\)

The two disciplinary branches became increasingly distinct from one another. The appointments of Wildenmann (1980), Ian Budge (1982), and Jean Blondel (1985), all former chairs or directors of the ECPR, signalled the institutionalisation at the department of an “uncompromising” blend of political science. Budge and Wildenmann especially were advocates of a very statistical approach to the study of politics, which focused on the variable-driven comparison of large numbers of countries, while paying little attention to their specific, more qualitative history—as Daalder was more inclined to do. The appointment, in 1982, of Philippe Schmitter, a scholar who defined himself both as a sociologist and a political scientist,\(^{50}\) did not significantly alter this dominant orientation. On the sociological side, Gosta Esping-Andersen’s appointment, in 1985, as Peter Flora’s successor, confirmed the institutionalisation of the comparison of welfare states at the EUI. As sociology became durably established, tensions between the two disciplines became increasingly vivid.

Different stumbling blocks underpinned these tensions. They were, first and foremost, about chairs: both disciplines sought their own growth and the wider possible representation of their subfields. Tense debates over “what should be the next chair: sociology of family or public policy?” often resulted in “a very ambiguous chair definition which everybody was happy with”, which would not really solve the problem as the “the fight” would then resume during the selection of candidates.\(^{51}\)

As S. Bartolini’s account underlines, this “fight” became intense enough to threaten the very existence of the department:

> It became a bit tense [between political science and sociology] as soon as the numbers generated group dynamics. When the department, by the end of the 1980s, began to be a department with seven or eight professors, the question of the next chair became a controversial issue. […] The department was torn apart by profound conflicts between sociologists and political scientists […] and every new chair was a fight between political scientists and sociologists. […] So much so that in 94, Blondel, when he passed on [the head of department] to me, said “we have to split the department”, divide it into two. […] From my training and my understanding I thought that was absolutely ludicrous and I worked very hard to overcome this.\(^{52}\)

These quantitative staff concerns overlapped with political considerations. The opposition between political science and sociology appeared to be intertwined with rivalries between the “right” and “left” wings of the scientific field: sociology was described as leaning more towards the left than the blend of political science that was then developed at the EUI. As in the case of the literary field (Sapiro 2001), the use of these political classifications did not mean that properly scientific oppositions declined in importance or relevance. Rather, the use of the “left” and “right” categories stemmed directly from the intellectual structure of both disciplines at the time:

\(^{49}\) Daalder, “Those first years at the Badia”, op. cit.

\(^{50}\) Schmitter was the author of concept of “neocorporatism” (Schmitter 1982) and had developed an interest in some of the key behaviouralist research topics (interest groups). He had an international trajectory (educated in France, the US, and Mexico, he had a degree from the University of Geneva and a PhD from Berkeley, and held a professorship at the University of Chicago) and was connected to the ECPR networks (interview with P. Schmitter).

\(^{51}\) Interview with S. Bartolini.

\(^{52}\) Ibid.
This department [...] was started by political scientists and by political scientists who did not have a lot of sympathy for sociology or sociologists. [...] I can’t say that was a political discrimination but there was a clear separation. [...] As a rule sociologists came out of leftist politics and most political scientists didn’t come from the right right but from the centre let’s say [...]. In many universities they had relatively little contact. This place supposedly brought them together but for the first few years there was really no sociology at all. And it started with Hans [Daalder], then with Rudolf [Wildenmann]. [...] Daalder had been trained in part in the United States and his approach was more historical than most Americans but still very much—political science was about parties and elections, period, and that’s the foundation. [Daalder’s successor] Wildenmann was even more that way, because with Wildenmann [...] it was not only American political science, it was Michigan political science, very much into survey research, very much focused on predicting elections, trying to understand party identification, hard core American political science. And I would say relatively—I wouldn’t say naïve but suspicious of theory and certainly theories, because if you talked about theory in those days, you had to deal with Marxism. And that was also one of the difference: most of sociology was one way or another, to differing degrees obviously, orthodoxy was rooted in the class structure, that was the core.53

Thus, contrary to prior paradigm debates, these diverging political views had little to do with European integration. They also indicated an intensification of scientific competitions between the two disciplines under study rather than a subordination of scientific activities to political agendas. They are, therefore, further proof that the initial Europeanist agenda of the EUI failed to become a structuring axis for the SPS department.

Within HEC, the position adopted towards European integration and the intervention of the European institutions played a much more determining role. While another economic historian, Peter Hertner, succeeded Charles Wilson, the Chair of Contemporary European history remained vacant after Lipgens’s departure in 1979. There are three explanations for this. First, in this period, the EUI was a young institution with limited means and staff in comparison with the main national universities. A temporary contract in Florence was therefore not necessarily attractive for professors wishing to anchor their career nationally. Second, the conflict between the Commission and Walter Lipgens, which brought to light the financial and institutional bounds between the EUI to the EC institutions, discouraged many historians jealous of their scientific independence from applying.54 Third, after Lipgens’s departure from the EUI and the end of the initial ‘History of European integration’ project, the European Commission’s efforts to promote history writing on European integration moved away from Florence. In 1982, the Commission organised a symposium of historians and launched a new international research platform: the Comité de liaison des historiens près la Commission européenne. Funded by and closely collaborating with the Commission, this Committee, which Lipgens actively contributed to set up, largely took up the objectives of the project initially designed at the EUI (Calligaro 2013).

It was only in 1983 that the Department appointed Alan S. Milward to the Chair of European Contemporary History. Previously chair of European Studies at the University of Manchester, Milward was an economic historian, partly influenced by the Marxist theory in the sense that he based his historical analysis on the understanding of the forces responsible for economic change.

53 Interview with P. Schmitter.
54 Interview with an administrator of the EUI academic service.
Unlike most neoclassical historians and his predecessor Lipgens, he saw the State as one of the most powerful of these forces in contemporary Europe (Lynch and Guirao 2012). While at the EUI, Milward started to work on his controversial book *The European Rescue of the Nation-State* in which he considered European integration as an instrument that helped weakened nation-states face problems of national welfare. This thesis was in complete opposition to the official “*grand récit*” promoted by the European institutions, in which a united Europe was presented as the *telos*, as the driving force behind the integration process.

When Milward was appointed at the EUI, the EC was actively promoting this “*grand récit*” and designated European culture and history as vectors of political unification. The Milan European Council of June 1985 launched the campaign People’s Europe and approved the Adonnino and Dooge reports, which both called for symbolic and cultural initiatives. The president of the new Commission formed in 1985, Jacques Delors, put a European cultural policy high on his agenda. The action of the EUI’s president Werner Maihofer, who took up office in 1982, was in keeping with this agenda. A German jurist and politician, former Federal Minister of the Interior and member of the pro-European liberal party FDP (Free Democratic Party), Maihofer supported initiatives that put an accent on European culture and history, while strengthening the link with the EC. In 1984, he signed an agreement with the European Commission which established the Historical Archives of the Communities at the EUI. The same year, Maihofer proposed to create an interdepartmental chair entitled “History of European culture”, eventually attributed in 1985 to Daniel Roche, a French specialist of cultural history. In 1986, the EUI opened a Research Centre on European Culture. In the second half of the 1980s, the Institute also hosted meetings of Jean-Baptiste Duroselle’s project *Europe: a History of its People*, launched in 1985 and supported by the European Commission.

These actions faced resistances from the HEC department. Members of the department criticised the chair on the “History of European culture”, which they saw as a product of the EC’s desires. In reaction to later developments, Alan Milward openly denounced the fact that the EUI’s scientific orientation was strongly influenced by the EC’s political agenda, and remained reluctant to cooperate with the EC institutions on scientific projects. Rather, he developed his “revisionist” thought, clearly breaking with Lippens’s theses and minimising the role of federalist ideas of the Resistance in the emergence of the post-war European institutions. He actively fought against teleological approaches to European integration and contributed to deconstructing founding myths like the one of the founding fathers. As a consequence, he established his reputation as an “Anti-Lipgens” or

---

58 This agreement is accessible here: [http://www.eui.eu/Documents/Research/HistoricalArchivesofEU/Contract.pdf](http://www.eui.eu/Documents/Research/HistoricalArchivesofEU/Contract.pdf)
60 Letter from Alan Milward to Michel Dumoulin, 4 May 1984, Michel Dumoulin’s private archives, Folder ‘Groupe de Liaison des Historiens’.
61 Interview with an administrator of the EUI academic service.
63 Alan Milward, *The lives and teachings of the European saints*, in: *The European rescue…*, op.cit., 318–344. On the criticism of functionalism and federalism as teleological and ideological theories, see Alan S. Milward, Frances Lynch,
“demythifier” of European integration.64 To this extent, Milward’s stay at the EUI contributed to a detachment and normalisation of the historiography of European integration vis-à-vis European institutions.

By the mid-1980s, a Europeanist research agenda was no longer represented in the SPS department. In HEC, contemporary European history, originally conceived as a key discipline for the promotion of the unification project, was no longer dominated by this normative approach.

Conclusion

This article sought to analyse the conditions under which political attempts at influencing the activities of scientists succeed or fail. It did so by assessing the impact of European politics on the development of the social and human sciences. More specifically, it focused on the creation of the European University Institute and studied the extent to which European institutions influenced EUI scholars’ scientific agenda, in a direction favourable to European integration.

While the creation of the EUI had clear political motives, this political agenda did not feed directly into EUI scientific activities. Rather, the positioning of their research towards the European political project was, from the outset, a contentious issue for the professors recruited in the early years of the EUI. In the SPS department, the debate on the role of social and political sciences in the context of European unification was embedded in broader paradigmatic and disciplinary struggles. These struggles eventually eclipsed the question of the scholars’ political stance towards the European project and partially account for the weakness of the European integration agenda within the SPS department by the mid-1980s. EC institutions sought to be more directly involved in the research agenda of the HEC department, notably by funding a research project on the “History of European Integration”. Several developments account for the failure of the original objective of turning the HEC department into a pivotal platform for European integration history: first, the tensions resulting from the institutional interference in scientific research, which some embraced in an open attempt to give more solid grounds to European unification, and others resisted in the name of scientific autonomy; second, the intellectual disagreements over the interpretation of European integration, which some scholars described as driven by non-governmental federalist movements, while others saw the effort of governmental actors to restore the nation state’s power as its main driving force.

The case of the EUI shows that political attempts at influencing the development of sciences tend to face resistances and have unintended consequences. As scientific fields develop, they become increasingly structured by specific norms (such as the idea that scientific activity should be value-free and politically neutral), rules (e.g. processes for hiring new colleagues), and controversies (debates between paradigms, approaches, methods, ideas). The institutionalisation of these specificities strengthens the autonomy of scientific fields, to the point that external and notably political injunctions have trouble gaining currency, and are refracted and bent according to the structures of fields. By claiming to be acting in the name of science, scholars may be able to eschew or even criticise such injunctions. Paradoxically then, an institute initially created with the objective of promoting European integration can instead provide room for the development of a critical


discourse on the process, as in the case of Alan Milward, who made this revealing acknowledgment in one of his books:

I am profoundly grateful to the European Community and to the President of the European University Institute, Herr Werner Maihofer, for supporting so enthusiastically research which must have appeared at first to be coming to wholly unwanted conclusions. To how many national governments could a similar tribute be paid?  

This autonomy of scientific fields, however, is only relative, and different regions of science are not equally autonomous. For reasons linked to their own trajectory and the structure of their particular discipline or research area, scholars are not equally receptive to political injunctions. As has been shown by the comparison of the HEC and SPS departments, some disciplines may be the subject of stronger political investments than others. Two hypotheses may be put forward to explain the special attention paid to history by European institutions.

The first is related to the specific identity-building and legitimising capacities attributed to history, since historiography was seen as able to participate in the elaboration of a narrative that Europeans could identify with. Jean Monnet, his close collaborators and EC officials in charge of information were strongly concerned with the historicisation of the political project that they were defending. They had, very early on, envisaged the history of Europe or of its founding fathers as an instrument for the promotion of political unification (Cohen 2007, Calligaro 2013). A second related explanation is the lack of interest of the discipline for European unification that these EC officials could observe in the mid-1970s.  

In this period, European regional integration had become an object of research in several SSH disciplines like law, economics and political science. In comparison, the study of European unification and of the emergence of the EC was marginal in academic historiography. Stimulating this research through financial support and through the creation of international projects therefore appeared as a relevant political objective. The idea of developing a history of European integration platform at the EUI was, thus, part of a broader effort in the historiographical field.

The politicisation of scientific disciplines appears to be determined by complex social negotiations that depend on the structure of disciplinary fields (itself linked to their relative professionalisation and autonomisation), the needs of political institutions (e.g. the need for legitimising narratives), and the social representations of disciplines and their powers (such as the perception of history as a discipline able to produce such narratives). These multiple parameters have different consequences for the development of disciplines, even in the framework of a single institution. In the two cases under study, however, the attempt to legitimise European integration with social scientific and historical knowledge fell short of ambitions. This negative case provides a counterweight to narratives that insist on the role of sciences in the strengthening of their political patrons.
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Abstract
This paper analyses how the emergence of transnational research funding by the European Research Council (ERC) affects the competition for status among disciplines and what this means for the social sciences in particular. Two notions are of analytical importance here: the idea of a European transnational field, and investigating disciplines by comparing research capacity and performance. The field structure was examined for a sample of 12 countries and 30 disciplines from all scientific domains. The study not only sheds light on the status of the social sciences and humanities, when compared to the physical, engineering and life sciences, it also allows insights into disciplinary comparisons within one domain. Results indicate that the relative capacity of the social sciences and humanities in Europe is far from being reflected in their ERC grant performance, retaining the significance of national funding in that domain. Nevertheless, ERC funding in the social sciences and humanities is proportionally larger for some countries (United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands) than for other countries within the European Research Area.
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Introduction and Research Question
This contribution begins with the assumption that scientific disciplines can be regarded as collective actors competing for status, reputation and resources in a dynamic social field.1 The structural position of the social sciences and humanities in an anticipated 'hierarchy of the sciences' has always been rather peculiar. However, it is not clear how, and to what extent, recent transformations of both

1 Some arguments of the paper are outlined in more detailed form in Hoenig (2017).
European universities' practices of governmental steering and transnational research funding have imposed obstacles or created new opportunities, particularly for these disciplines. How are hierarchically structured disciplines represented in a European transnational field? Is the hierarchy of the sciences subject to structural transformations by virtue of European research policies and its enforced competition for 'excellence'? How does the existence of transnational research funding affect the internal structure of disciplines in their competition for status and power? And why do particular countries seem to be better equipped in the competition for reputation and reward than others?

This contribution scrutinizes how the emergence of transnational research funding affects the competition for status among scientific disciplines and what this means for European social sciences and humanities. An empirical comparison of countries and disciplines undergoing that recent change may provide insights into their relative status and dynamics within the transnational field of the European Research Area (ERA). The conceptual and methodical approach suggests two streams of inquiry, centring on both the notion of a European trans-national field and on the relation of disciplines' research capacity and performance. In contrast to a 'methodological nationalism,' examining scientific fields within their particular national frameworks, I undertake a comparative study of cross-national variations in academic disciplines and their status in a European transnational field.

The paper starts by clarifying the notion of a European transnational field, indicating a particular framework for an empirical case study on the European Research Council (ERC). In contrast to the European Framework Programmes (FPs) promoting mission-oriented, transnational collaboration of scientific institutions, the ERC is a more recent funding scheme for supporting individual early career researchers, exclusively based on the criterion of 'scientific excellence.' A short description of the most recent phase of European research policies and the role of the ERC is given, and the research design outlined in more detail. Findings of a systematic comparison of research capacity and performance are given by country and discipline. Results show that in the most recent phase of European research funding the social sciences and humanities seem to proceed under increasing pressure from the natural and life sciences.

Towards a European Transnational Field

Theorizing scientific disciplines and its underlying power relations has a long tradition in sociology (Comte 1851; Snow 1959; Lepenies 1985; Abbott 2001) and has also stimulated research on determinants of a country’s rate of scientific growth (Ben-David 1971; Merton 1973; Clark 1983; Crothers 2000). In analysing the historical formation of the social sciences (Heilbron et al. 1998; Wagner et al. 1991), distinct ‘national traditions’ in sociology (Genov 1989; Koniordos and Kyrtsis 2014; Levine 1995; Nedelmann and Szтомпка 1993) more recently transcended towards the notion of an internationalizing scientific field (Gingras 2002; Heilbron 2004; Heilbron et al. 2008). This short study on the ERC may serve to exemplify how a research funding institution of genuinely European scope affects the scientific disciplines differently and thus sets in motion a dynamic with particular—often unintended—consequences for the social sciences and humanities.

---

Research capacity of researchers by country is measured as the number of researchers in fulltime equivalents of university-based scientific personnel with postdoctoral qualification level or higher, as documented in country-specific higher education statistics.
At the historical height of a strong controversy between ‘structuralist’ and ‘constructivist’ traditions in a newly emerging specialty—the sociology of science (Cole and Zuckerman 1975)—it was Pierre Bourdieu who derived the notion of the scientific field, emphasizing the hierarchical relationship of disciplines as socially structured (Bourdieu 1975). Drawing upon his distinction of forms of capital, he analyzed the relationship between scientific and academic capital as explaining the disciplines’ relative location in terms of supposed autonomous versus heteronomous poles of the field (Bourdieu 1984, 2001). Whereas high scientific prestige is characteristic for formal disciplines such as mathematics, philosophy, the humanities, and the social and natural sciences, academic capital accounts for applied sciences, in particular medical and law faculties, indicating their close relationship to powerful institutions within academia and beyond. Bourdieu recommends analyzing the scientific field in relation to other fields of power in order to locate its position in the social space, and then reconstructing the internal structure of scientific disciplines to investigate power relations within that field (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992).

Bourdieu’s notion of science as a distinct ‘field’ implies an assumed or anticipated center-periphery-structure of agents—disciplines or institutions for example—in a tension or continuum between autonomous and heteronomous poles of disciplines and institutions. When applied to an anticipated transnational field, it can also characterize power relations between differently structured public science systems in Europe. When operationalizing these conceptual notions empirically, the scientific capital of actors—such as countries, institutions or disciplines—is indicated by their research publications; the most important source of symbolic prestige. With some restrictions for the social sciences and humanities, which enjoy a particular publication culture not comparable to those of the natural sciences, taking actors’ bibliometric profiles into account might enable comparison of their scientific capital. Conversely, the actors’ social and economic capital can be characterized by their share in the distribution of research grants.

The thesis is that the countries and disciplines that perform successfully in the competition for ERC grants are those that can also be conceived of as relatively close to powerful forces in terms of social and economic capital. Since the specific case of the ERC grant so represents high scores of scientific capital and symbolic reputation, the analysis of the transnational scientific field must consider the high transferability of one form of capital towards another. Equally it might be the case that the European transnational field is structurally influenced by strong actors beyond the European space, such as U.S. elite universities, which hold a powerful position in a global hegemony of higher education and research (Marginson and Ordorika 2011). Apart from the fact that several ERC panelists are based in U.S. research universities, a large number of ERC grantees have also been trained there, so there is a significant transatlantic influence upon the ERC. Organizationally, the ERC explicitly takes the U.S. National Science Foundation as one of its role models, which also heavily influences its normative concept of ‘frontier research’ (Flink 2016; Hoenig 2017). This also mirrors the ERC’s emergence as an institutional instrument to realize the ambitious goals of the EU’s Lisbon Strategy vis-à-vis its American and Asian competitors.

A Short History of European Research Funding for ‘Excellence’

As both a social phenomenon and approach, Europeanization initially emerged in the field of international relations, political sciences and law, but more recently also found resonance in sociology. Usually a distinction is made between two approaches (for example, Graziano and Vink 2007): The ‘institutionalist’ approach interprets Europeanization as supranational institution-building that affects institutions and policies at the domestic level of EU members; the
‘interactionalist’ approach is interested in transnational practices of populations in border regions, tourism, for example. In fact, the ERC exemplifies an innovative case of institution building at the supranational level, which is of great relevance to the social organization of science in Europe.

The history of European science policies shows a fundamental continuity, in that from the beginning science and research was not understood as an end in itself, but rather as instrumental for reaching other economic and political goals of the European Union (Guzzetti 1995, 2009; Hoenig 2010). Nevertheless, since its founding, several normative shifts have occurred in the overall cultural goals of European science, indicating distinct phases of science policies, as outlined in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Dimensions and phases of European research policy, 1952–2017

From the 1950s onwards, the founding members of the European Union (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands) aimed to start joint research initiatives, such as Euratom, which were led by the idea of strengthening ‘industrial competition’. In 1973, three additional states joined the EU (Denmark, Ireland, United Kingdom), and in the 1980s three further countries, with fragile economic structures, became new EU members (Greece, Portugal, Spain). Both events increased the need for a better transnational cooperation of existing research initiatives aimed at economic innovation, as implemented by the Research Framework Programmes (FPs). A focus on the social sciences and humanities in the FPs resulted from the new members’ efforts to integrate social coherence and cohesion as an additional goal in European research policies.

With successive rounds of enlargements in 1995, 2004, 2007 and 2013, economic and social disparities between EU members were not only seen as those between the north and south of western Europe, but also between western and eastern Europe. In 2000, the ERA was called into life, focused on the economic goals of the Lisbon Strategy ‘to become the most competitive knowledge region in the world.’ Simultaneously, it was envisioned as a genuinely supranational institution for research funding, the ERC, to realize the ERA’s ambitious cultural goals and to strengthen scientific excellence. In 2004, the supranational institution ERC was founded by the European Commission, launching its first call for research proposals in 2007. This European research policy was primarily a normative shift from promoting transnational integration of research institutions towards the
sponsoring of individual researchers and their institutions, exclusively based on the criterion of ‘scientific excellence’.

The ERC’s history as an institution is a rather short one and, with less than 1% of the entire research capacity of researchers in Europe, its quantitative relevance also seems quite limited. Nevertheless, the supranational funding institution is of particular relevance in several ways. The ERC represents a new institutional invention of supranational scope and of potential importance to other similar research funding councils. By setting a new indicator of symbolic reputation, its normative impact upon the entire scientific community is remarkable. For those researchers and institutions successfully competing for ERC grants, it also results in considerable material resources for research in particular fields of science. In this way, ERC funds are also influential for the cognitive definition and future vision of research of ‘excellence.’

The need for a common supranational level of science policy is legitimized in the way of a whole constellation of argument first laid out in the Lisbon Strategy of 2000 and within the ERA as a policy-concept. This then served as a starting point for the development of the ERC as a supranational institution, which became regarded as a means of implementing the cultural goals of the ERA, culturally authorized by four main arguments. Based on an assumption of Europe’s innovative backwardness and infra-structural fragmentation, an increasing demand for developing scientific ‘excellence’ through competition was identified and the international mobility of its researchers was seen as necessary to promote.

In order to reduce internal disparities within the ERA, ERC science policy actors frequently hint at the structural funds that support regional research capacity and infrastructure in respective member states. However, the ERC itself has made a considerable contribution to the enforcing of social stratification and inequalities between public universities and entire science systems, which is confirmed by the recent findings of the FP evaluation. The notion of the ERA is characterized by a general belief in the primarily beneficial effects of research of extended scales and scopes. But are the consequences of these always the same for any fields of science? To answer this question,

---

3 Both early careers and established researchers can submit proposals for five-year projects to the ERC; although the approval rate is only about 10%, indicating a fierce evaluation process, successful projects are funded with about 1.5 to 2.5 million euro. The ERC aims at promoting scientific independence of young researchers after their PhD and at generating investigator-driven, ground-breaking research. While the ERC is generally open to all fields of science, the share of projects in the social sciences and humanities nevertheless remains limited to 15–17% of the overall budget.

4 The history of the ERC has been scrutinized by several authors: Winnacker (2012) as the previous Secretary-General of the ERC has given an experience-based account of these formative years. Flink (2016) provides a historical account of the science policy leading to its institutionalization. Based on the author’s experience, interviews with policy experts, and archival material, König (2017) reconstructs the institutional formation of the ERC as an European agency. Gornitzka and Metz (2014) also conducted interviews with European science policy experts and explain the ERC history as a sequence of successive phases along institutional theories of various kind. Based on insights into processes of cumulative advantage (Zuckerman 1977, 1998), an empirical analysis of how the ERC contributes to elite-formation and sharpened stratification in science is given by Hoenig (2017).

5 More particularly, of the overall ERC budget of 7,673 million euro from 2007 to 2013, the EU-15 (pre-2004 members from western Europe) received 84%, the EU-13 (post-2004 EU members from central and eastern Europe) received 1.5%, associated countries received 14.3%, and countries beyond Europe received 0.3%. Among countries of the EU-15, 26% went to the U.K.; 17.6% to Germany; 15% to France; 10.7% to the Netherlands; 6.3% to Spain; 6.2% to Italy; 4.3% to Sweden; 3.8% to Belgium; 2.8% to Austria; 2.3% to Denmark, and to Finland each; 0.8% to Portugal, Greece and Ireland each; and 0.01%, or 1 million euro, to Luxembourg (see HLEG 2015: 32).
empirical research on its effects upon scientific disciplines and its competitive dynamics and classificatory struggles is needed.

**Research Design**

In this short study, effects of ERC funding upon countries, disciplines and their development are quantitatively examined for a sample of 12 countries and 30 disciplines. I compare a sample of researchers differently located in the social structure of the ERA by secondary statistical analyses of publicly available data. Comparing research capacity and performance by country and discipline allows me to derive insights into which disciplines and countries are encouraged as winners in the competition for symbolic recognition and economic reward, and which are the losers in that comparison. In addition, to describe the selection of applicants by evaluators at panel level, I compare the number of ERC proposals submitted to those approved within seven calls (2007–2013). The empirical results obtained provide answers to the question of whether, and to what extent, the panelists’ consensus on approvals differed by cohort or grant type, by country and discipline.

Documenting research capacity by country and discipline provides insights into their relative weight within the internal structure of the European transnational field, as a capacity baseline against which performance indicators can be contrasted. Following Merton and Ben-David, the indicator of the total number of researchers can be treated as a valid predictor of the rate of scientific advance in the respective country and scientific field. Supranational databases, such as EUROSTAT and OECD, provide only aggregated data on researchers in six groups of scientific disciplines—as defined in the OECD Frascati Manual (OECD 2002, 2007)—in different economic sectors, but not data at the disciplinary level. This lack of supranational data forces us to look for data on university researchers per scientific discipline at a country-specific level, which is publicly available as part of higher education statistics in most European countries. Nevertheless, the rather time-consuming data gathering provides a good empirical baseline for cross-national comparisons of scientific disciplines across Europe.

In addition, the relation of performance indicators, such as those of scientific publications and ERC grant distributions, can be compared systematically and correlated. Bibliometric indices on scientific publications can be obtained from the Web of Science database, and are also available from the Leiden Ranking. In fact, bibliometric country profiles correlate with the funding indicator or the number of grants. Conceptually this indicates a relatively close and direct transformation of scientific towards economic capital.

---

6 The social structure of the ERA refers to stratified features of public science systems such as increased market-based competition and institutional differentiation between universities as largely determining the institutionalized means of researchers to realizing the ambitious cultural goals of the European Lisbon Strategy.

7 I am indebted to Charles Crothers for suggesting this line of inquiry.

8 [www.leidenranking.org](http://www.leidenranking.org). A recent evaluation report on the Research Framework Programmes found high correlation scores for these two indicators (HLEG 2015).

9 But the rank correlation between bibliometric performance, measured by the Leiden Ranking, and grant performance measured in grants, partly depends on characteristics of the respective public science systems: In countries where public universities are the most important actors of scientific research, such as Britain or Sweden, these are generally high. In countries where public research organizations, such as the French CNRS or the German Max Planck Society, are much more successful in obtaining ERC grants, these correlations are low. The Leiden Ranking is restricted to universities only, and thus public research organizations are often excluded from the analysis.
Results: Comparing Research Capacity and Performance

Research capacity was measured using the number of full-time employed academic university personnel by country and discipline, while the relative weight for countries and disciplines was also calculated in the ERA sample at large. In terms of the number of researchers, Germany, Britain, Spain and France contribute most to the sample, while Italy and Sweden are in the middle field, and each of the remaining countries amount to not more than 1 or 2%. In terms of research capacity by scientific domain, in Britain, Switzerland, Sweden and Finland the proportion of the social sciences accounts for a quarter of the research capacity, while in France, Slovakia and Spain the same is true for the humanities. The natural sciences are strong in Austria, Germany and Britain, and the engineering sciences are represented particularly strongly in France, Croatia and Slovakia. The proportion of medical and agricultural sciences is higher than average in the Netherlands, Switzerland, Italy and Germany. These findings support other studies (Glänzel et al. 2008; Schulz and Manganote 2012) that show the share of social sciences to be particularly high in Anglo Saxon countries, natural and engineering sciences to be strong in former socialist countries, and biomedical sciences highly represented in western countries.

Figure 2: ERC grants 2007–2011 in sample, per country and scientific domain, in %


While the social sciences and humanities contribute less than 20% to the

10 The following sub-section is based on findings that are outlined in more detail in chapter 9 of Hoenig (2017).
11 Country-specific data were retrieved from the internet in 2013 and in most cases refer to the academic year 2011 (see Table 1 in the Appendix). Academic university personnel refers to public and private universities of the higher education sector; non-university research organizations had to be neglected, since the comparability of statistics on these remains restricted.
Overall sample of funded research projects, this is 45% for the physical and engineering sciences, and 36% for the life sciences. An according distribution of project budgets across disciplines is annually renewed in the ERC work program, and legitimized by similar distribution rates among the disciplines in national research funding. In the social sciences and humanities, Britain, the Netherlands and France are particularly strong, accounting for 63% of all grants in the sample; a higher grant concentration in that domain when compared to the two other domains.

Reasons for this might lie in the weak position of these disciplines in non-Anglo-Saxon countries, or in the relevance of language issues in this field that positively discriminates countries with more pronounced proficiencies in English. In addition, both the British and the Dutch science systems introduced country-wide evaluation procedures among public universities from the 1980s and 1990s onwards. They also developed attractive national funding schemes, especially for early-career researchers. France’s strong position in the social sciences and humanities can be explained partly by a sharp institutional differentiation of research-only organizations, such as the CNRS, from mostly teaching-oriented public universities. In the physical sciences, France in particular performs strongly; in the life sciences, several western and northern European countries are better represented than in other domains.

Figure 3 indicates these capacity country profiles (pillar 1), which are compared with a bibliometric indicator and ERC grants (pillars 2 and 3), given in relative frequencies. The comparison results in varying groupings of countries. First, countries winning in that comparison—in the sense that their research capacity is to a higher extent reflected and valued in the performance indicators—are Britain, France, the Netherlands and Switzerland. To some extent this is also valid for Italy. The second grouping of countries includes Sweden, Austria and Finland, which are represented, to a balanced extent, on the capacity and the performance sites. The third grouping consists of one western and four southern or eastern European countries (Germany, Spain, Italy, Slovakia, Croatia) that lose in the comparison.

Since the late 1990s, European programs have been explicitly interested in promoting problem-oriented, interdisciplinary research projects instead of funding discipline-oriented knowledge production. Therefore, the ERC’s panel classification system is not structured along scientific disciplinary lines, but by research specialties that mirror the expertise of the multidisciplinary panels’ evaluators. For the researcher, this creates some practical difficulties in unambiguously assigning research projects to particular disciplines. Nevertheless, on a more fine-grained level, scientific disciplines in these domains can be compared, allowing definite statements about which of them have a better chance of success in the supranational competition than others. By retrospectively applying ERC panel descriptors to the project title of approved projects, these can be inferred.

13 This refers to national funding organizations such as numerous British research councils, the German DFG, the French ANR, the Spanish CSIC, the Dutch NWO, the Swiss SNF, the Italian CNR, or the Austrian FWF.
14 By contrast, the three countries with the largest number of grants in the physical and engineering sciences account for 58% of the sample and five countries for 75%. In the life sciences, three countries account for 56% and five countries for 74%.
16 For comparing capacity with performance sites by discipline, the OECD Frascati Manual Classification (OECD 2002, 2007) was used for aggregating data of national higher education statistics, bibliometric data obtained from Web of Science research areas, and ERC statistics obtained from panel descriptors.
differentiated by their anticipated disciplinary fit; Figures 4, 5 and 6 give domain-specific results by discipline.

Figure 3: Comparing research capacity and performance for 12 countries. Capacity in % of full-time equivalents of researchers, performance in % of Web of Science documents and in % of ERC grants.

Source: Own calculations for a sample of 12 countries based on national higher education statistics (column 1), Web of Science data 2012 (2), ERC Indicative Statistics 2007–2011 (3).

Figure 4: Disciplines in the social sciences and humanities, comparing research capacity and performance.

Source: Author’s own calculations based on national higher education statistics and ERC Indicative Statistics 2007–2011 for a sample of 12 countries.
Figure 5: Disciplines in the physical and engineering sciences (PE), comparing research capacity and performance

Source: Author's own calculations based on national higher education statistics and ERC Indicative Statistics 2007–2011 for a sample of 12 countries.

Figure 6: Disciplines in the life sciences (LS), comparing research capacity and performance

Source: Author’s own calculations based on national higher education statistics and ERC Indicative Statistics 2007–2011 for a sample of 12 countries.
Across all countries in the sample, when research capacity is measured as university personnel in full-time equivalents (pillar 1), all three domains have a relative weight of about a third. Among the social sciences and humanities, the large disciplines are economics, language and literary studies, education and law, while the cross-national weight of sociology is between 1 and 2%. Mathematics, informatics, physics and chemistry are comparable in size, while there are also many smaller-sized sciences. Among the life sciences, biology and clinical medicine can be thought of as large disciplines.

In Figures 4, 5 and 6, the second pillar refers to the ERC grant distribution in relative frequencies in each of the disciplines. The total number of grants in the social sciences and humanities is less than half of those in the physical and engineering sciences, and about half of the life sciences. Quantitatively, most grants are acquired by economics, history and psychology, sociology is located in the middle field, with education and media studies rarely represented. The majority of disciplines in the social sciences and humanities, therefore, lose in the comparison of capacities and ERC grants. Among the physical and engineering sciences, the majority of disciplines obtain much more importance than is actually indicated by their research capacities.¹⁷

The relative success of any single discipline in the ERC system depends on the characteristics of the institutionalized research program itself, such as its classification system. While the ERC panel system cannot be fully explicated here, it should be provisionally mentioned that the relative amount of space dedicated to different disciplines within it indicates, at least in part, which disciplines are of particular interest for European research policy (Fleck and Hoenig 2014). Therefore, these disciplines are expected to perform better in the Europe-wide competition for grants. In a quantitative comparison, the relative weight of the SH domain decreases from 37% capacity to only 19% in terms of ERC grants. Conversely, the physical, engineering and life sciences are increased from about 60% to 80%, because they are positively discriminated against by the funding program.

Recently, the ERC has published data on evaluated, versus granted, research proposals, which allows me to undertake a data analysis on approval rates of submitted ERC proposals per cohort and discipline. While that analysis does not allow clarification of why applicants apply or not, it does describe to what extent the panelists’ consensus in evaluating proposals may differ among disciplines at panel level¹⁸ as well as how approval rates change over time.

Average approval rates among advanced researchers with 10–15% of all grant applications are higher than among starting ones with 8–10%. But disciplinary differences are more pronounced than was expected, in particular among advanced researchers. In a sample of six disciplines,¹⁹ approval rates are highest among senior physicists, and proposals from history and sociology both achieve much lower rates of approval. In the senior cohort, approval rates are generally relatively stable across time; among junior grantees, after the first call with less than 3% of all proposals approved there has been an annual increase of approvals, whereas since 2010 approval rates have been steadily decreasing in all disciplines.

How can we explain these reputation differentials of cohorts among the disciplines involved? Stronger differences of reputational scores among the older scientists seem to create higher consensus and approval rates by panelists, and do not find any similarity with the early career

¹⁷ Because bibliometric coverage varies by discipline, bibliometric indicators were omitted in that comparison.

¹⁸ For research on varying degrees of consensus among multidisciplinary panelists of grant peer review in the United States, see also Lamont (2009).

¹⁹ Sample disciplines were sociology, history, economics, physics, chemistry, biotechnology.
applicants. Dynamics of cumulative advantage and disadvantage might magnify with ageing in science and across a researcher’s biography, indicating a stronger Matthew Effect (Merton 1973) among senior researchers than among those more junior. Differences in approval rates of the two cohorts might also reflect that senior and junior candidates for ERC grants are exposed to different evaluation procedures. While the early career applicants have to pass a second stage of the evaluation process, consisting of an interview with evaluators, this is not applied to senior candidates whose research is assumed to be ‘already known’ to their peers. Because panelists are expected to come to a unanimous decision concerning candidates’ approval, mechanisms of collegiality among panelists that reduce uncertainty in collective decision-making might be stronger vis-à-vis senior candidates who are already considered highly reputable.

Less internally coherent disciplines, or more heterogeneously composed panels, such as biotechnology, sociology and history, show more uncertainty among panelists in coming to a consensus. There are also panel specific differences in the number of researchers acting in dual roles; i.e. being recruited as a panelist after having previously successfully acquired a grant, or receiving a grant after having acted as a panelist. These differences in panel composition might also contribute to differential approval rates among the disciplines through mechanisms of social closure, both among potential grantees and panelists.

Some countries perform better in disciplinary approval rates than others. Among junior grantees, the average approval rate is 9% of submitted proposals across all domains. In the social sciences and humanities, Britain, France and the Netherlands perform particularly well. In the physical and engineering sciences, and the life sciences, Switzerland and France are more successful than countries from southern, eastern and northern Europe. For senior grantees, parallel data show a slightly different picture. In the social sciences and humanities the strongest rates are those of France, Switzerland and the U.K with an average approval rate of 11% in which senior scientists seem to have some advantage. In the physical and engineering sciences, the average approval rate among seniors is 14%. Several countries perform above that level, such as Switzerland, the Netherlands, Sweden and Austria. Among senior life scientists, the average approval rate is the highest at 17%. Switzerland, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands and the UK, however, achieve an even higher level. Thus, in most scientific domains, northern, southern and eastern European countries perform weaker than the western European countries. In the social sciences and humanities, country-specific grant concentration seems to be highest among senior scientists from STEM disciplines (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) with the distribution of grants more dispersed across countries.

Conclusions

In this paper I hoped to highlight some relevant features of dynamic social processes that are crucial for the scientific community involved in deep structural transformations initiated by European research policies. In particular, I was interested in the question of how the emergence of transnational research funding affects competition for status among scientific disciplines and what this means for the social sciences and humanities located in an anticipated hierarchy of the sciences. Two research streams were of conceptual and empirical importance for the analysis of status competition among disciplines. First, the idea of a European transnational field, something explicitly envisioned by European science policies, and partly emerging through new funding agencies such as the European Research Council has only recently been subject to sociological analysis. Second, the notion of disciplines has scarcely been investigated both in terms of research capacity and
performance, something that seems highly relevant in the development of an adequate understanding of power relations in the field.

Conceptually, the analysis was oriented towards Bourdieu’s distinction between scientific and academic capital, in order to understand the hierarchy of the disciplines in a supposed European transnational field. The analysis has revealed the relative weight and position of disciplines both towards a powerful European funding agency, external to the scientific field, as well as within the internal structure of disciplines in a transnational framework. The fact that at the macro-level of analysis the bibliometric indicator seems to be systematically related to the funding indicator also provides supporting evidence for Bourdieu’s notion of the transformation of scientific to economic capital at transnational level.

Merton’s insight that research capacity determines the rate of scientific advance in any country has led to a systematic comparison of the number of researchers by country with the country’s performance in terms of scientific and academic capital. Empirically I operationalized these sorts of capital by bibliometric profiles of disciplines derived from the Web of Science database and by research grants approved by the ERC in the first five years of its existence. I investigated the internal structure and power relations between countries and disciplines in that European transnational field by statistical comparisons for a sample of 12 countries from the European Research Area and 30 disciplines from all scientific domains.

Neither in transnational media of scientific communication, such as the Web of Science, nor in European grant distributions does the representation of the social sciences seem to fully reflect the remarkable research capacity of scholars actively researching in that domain across Europe. This might also depend on the higher importance of regional collaborations and public audiences within the social sciences and humanities, on their historically close relation to the nation state and that they significantly retain national funding. Although there are remarkable country differences in ERC funding, through that most recent European program of ‘funding for excellence,’ the social sciences do not apparently encounter many opportunities to improve their position within the hierarchy of the sciences. Rather, they seem to be confined to the position of the structural owner of a ‘41st chair of the academy’ (Merton 1973) in European science.
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### Appendix

**Table 1: List of data sources used for cross-country comparison of research capacity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Responsible institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Annual intellectual capital reports of universities</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Science and Research. <a href="http://eportal.bmbwk.gv.at/portal">http://eportal.bmbwk.gv.at/portal</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>German, French, English</td>
<td>Database on professors at universities in Switzerland</td>
<td>Rectors’ Conference of the Swiss Universities. <a href="http://www.proff.ch/professor.search.do">www.proff.ch/professor.search.do</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Annual report education and culture: higher education personnel</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Education and Research, National Statistical Institute. <a href="http://www.destatis.de">www.destatis.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Statistical office of the Ministry for University and Research</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, University and Research. <a href="http://statistica.miur.it">http://statistica.miur.it</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>2011, 2012</td>
<td>Dutch, English</td>
<td>Assessment reports of universities QANU quality assurance, Netherlands</td>
<td>QANU Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities. <a href="http://www.qanu.nl">www.qanu.nl</a> respective university websites and reports, Royal Academy of Sciences Netherlands, <a href="http://www.knaw.nl">www.knaw.nl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Staff in higher education institutions 2010/2011</td>
<td>HESA Higher Education Statistics Agency. <a href="http://www.hesa.ac.uk">www.hesa.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract
This article investigates how the European Union contributes to the academic fields of social sciences through its major research funding instrument, the Framework Programme for Research. It does so asking two principal questions: How does the EU research Framework Programme (FP) work? And what are this funding programme’s ambitions concerning the social sciences? These programmes provide the largest targeted funding for these fields, bring together researchers throughout Europe and producing a sense of “belonging” for a larger scholarly community. Yet the underlying economic policy aims, and the marginal position of “SSH” labelled programme, within larger structures treat the social sciences as a residual category. Thus there remains a certain ambiguity as to what can be expected from these programmes for the social sciences.

Keywords
SSH—Social Sciences and Humanities; European Framework Programmes; European Research Funding; Sociology of Social Sciences

Introduction
There can be little doubt that the European integration project has contributed greatly to the development of science and research in Europe. It has fostered and institutionalized scientific cooperation (e.g. Krige 2002; Strasser 2002; König 2016), established an inter-national space for scientific expertise (e.g. Barry 2006; Felt and Wynne 2007), created a major research funding instrument (e.g., Muldur et al. 2006; Schögler 2014), and, as several accounts have claimed, turned into a policy area in itself (Guzzetti 1995; Krige and Guzzetti 1997; Krige 1997; André 2006, 2008, 2009; Madsen 2010). This is also true for the social sciences. Research in this domain has been funded in programmes dealing with technology assessment, as well as in matters concerning health,
environment, employment or energy. Parts of the social sciences, and to a limited extent also the humanities, are being funded in institutionalized forms; through the intergovernmental implementation of the European University Institute in Florence or the creation of a European statistical agency—Eurostat—or the establishment of European survey programmes, for example. Since the early 1980s, multiannual EU funding programmes—such as FAST (standing for “forecast science and technology”)—were established, aimed at making specific social scientific knowledge available to policy-makers (Guzzetti 1995: 99–101).

This article is concerned with the political and administrative processes of establishing funding schemes for research projects at the EU level. It deals with those parts of the European Union’s major multi-annual research funding instrument, also referred to as Framework Programmes (FP), that explicitly address the social sciences via thematic calls for projects. How is this particular kind of EU research funding policy towards the social sciences formulated?

To answer this question, we will seek to understand the formulation of social science foci by investigating the broad intentions of the multiannual programmes as well as taking into account technicalities of micromanagement and related decision-making procedures. We aim to explain the complex interplay of underlying structures and policy principles that, to researchers—as addressees and, sometimes, also beneficiaries of funding opportunities—often remain opaque. A further aim is to investigate the ambitions of the programmes set up under the FP format to fund research in the various fields of social sciences.

“Clouded-sky” research funding refers to funding programs that define thematic foci, which are used by scholars to generate detailed research proposals. It is usually called “mission-oriented” research and has been the mainstream approach for the FP format to fund research (at least until the European Research Council was set up, which is explicitly addressing blue-sky research). The metaphor of “clouds” draws on at least two elements shared by thematic funding and clouded-sky programmes (see also Schögler 2014: 5–6). First, clouds (missions) hide the blue sky, which can, nonetheless, be imagined as existing behind them. Also, clouds are literally closer to the ground and therefore represent less ambitious research. Yet the blue keeps shining through and represents the intrinsic research interests scholars may incorporate into project proposals. Second, politically predefined missions need to be interpreted and call texts leave space for diverging disciplinary perspectives, just as clouds are often perceived subjectively to represent imagined, different shapes.

In this article, we first provide some fundamental information on how the FP format works in section 2. Then, in section 3, we look at the political procedure of negotiations that delineate the broad intentions of various editions of the FP format and the role of social sciences therein. Section 4 examines “Work Programmes”—i.e. strategic documents containing calls for proposals—as documents that shape the content of knowledge-making. In an effort to trace the effects of micromanagement, we analyze successful project bids and the institutions participating in these programmes in section 5.1 In our conclusion, we return to more fundamental questions concerning the relationship between the social sciences and the EU research funding programmes.

1 This article does not examine what sort of research is actually funded; and it does not look into the results of research projects (for a take on evaluating projects see the FP7 funded project IMPACT-EV). While those would have been interesting research questions, they were outside the scope of this article.
Preliminaries of EU Research Funding Policy

Two main proponents of European research policy once provocatively stated: “Europe today has no research policy” (Ruberti and André 1997: 325). The quote aimed to highlight that, at the time, there was no primary policy interest in research as a long-term and disinterested means of knowledge-making. Yet, the same two proponents also acknowledged: “research was present from the very early stages of European construction” (Ruberti and André 1997: 331; see also Banchoff 2002: 7–8). With the 1986 Single European Act, research policy turned into formal European policy, though still restricted to certain fields.

Since the mid-1990s, research policy at the European level has taken off with the political and programmatic implementation of the European Research Area and the Lisbon Declaration at the European Council in 2000 being important early milestones. The construction of a “knowledge-based society” at the center of the European Union’s aims (Madsen 2010: 44) put knowledge, research and research policy firmly on the political agenda. The 2007 Lisbon “Treaty on European Union” put science and research officially on the European stage (TEU Art 3(3), and TFEU Art 179–190).

To a fair extent, these political ambitions revolve around the Framework Programme for Research (FP), a multi-annual research funding programme run by the European Commission. Since 1984, it has developed into a powerful instrument for research funding in different areas of science policy. It has been, and still is, perceived by politicians as an important lifeline to support the establishment of a “knowledge-based European Union”, ultimately with the purpose of contributing to economic growth.

The FP budget developed from an average €640 million per year in the first edition, to about €7 billion per year in FP7, reaching €9.6 billion in 2012 (European Commission 2012a) and €9.9 billion in 2015 (European Parliament 2016: 11–12). It should increase further, although cuts are planned at some point (see EUA—European University Association 2016). This impressive growth in the research budget exceeds even the general increase in financial means available to the European Union. In 1970, the research budget only accounted for 1.8% of total EU expenditure, while figures in FP7 are closer to 7% (6.1% in 2011 and 6.9% in 2012). The numbers for the first years of Horizon 2020 are at 6.1% in 2015 and 6.5% in 2016 (for budget number see European Commission 2016b).

In his analysis of the European research area, Nikos Kastrinos (2010) makes two observations. The first is that, despite the emphasis on research priorities and thematic orientations, European research funding is, by and large, moving towards a “diffusion-oriented model”, prioritizing capacity building over fulfilling a distinct mission (Kastrinos 2010: 301). This is also the case with the recent, eighth Framework Programme, better known as “Horizon 2020”, which consists of three pillars: “excellent science”; “industrial leadership”; and “societal challenges”. In other words, the FP has been moving to an all-encompassing policy instrument by funding research. Yet within this policy instrument thematic foci have proliferated, some of which are also directed towards the social sciences.

Kastrinos’ second observation is that, as the FP format has been amassing weight, as well as layers, of goals its various sub-programmes have emerged as points-of-reference for the member states, both in terms of themes (such as prescribing “societal challenges”) and orientations (diffusion
instead of mission). This, too, is a trend that has only increased with “Horizon 2020”. The role of 
FP funding schemes and themes is of particular importance here because, despite the limited means 
available for the social sciences compared to the overall FP budget, and despite several national 
funding schemes targeting research in the social sciences and humanities, “in comparative terms this 
has been the largest targeted programme in Europe” (Kastrinos 2010: 304) for “SSH”.

Kastrinos’ article focuses on the social sciences and humanities in the analysis of research funding 
policy in Europe, and it concedes that so-called challenges are “politically defined” (Kastrinos 2010:
308). However, it says little about the ambitions (if any) behind the programmes created and then 
assigned to fund research in the social sciences. Given that the entire EU research policy is 
dominated by the objective to generate “innovation”, how do the social sciences fit in? Dual 
ambitions can be distinguished. The first one, related to mission-oriented research policy, is to 
exploit social scientific knowledge making to advance certain political goals (such as, better policy 
decisions). The second, related to diffusion-oriented research policy, is to bolster a social-scientific 
knowledge base with the expectation of indirect effects (such as better-trained experts).

Before delving into the technicalities of EU research policy-making, it is first important to 
understand how the FP format “works,” that is, how it is crafted in the political realm of EU 
institutions, and then operationalized in the bureaucratic space of (mostly) the European 
Commission. Basically, two layers of legal text can be distinguished, each negotiated in different 
realms, at different times, and by different participants.

First is the “policy layer.” The key text here is the Decision by the EU Member States that establishes 
an edition of the multi-annual Framework Programme (initially, an edition ran for four years, but 
since the seventh edition it has run for seven years to fit budgetary planning), in addition to “Specific 
Programmes”, that is, subsets of the programme carving out the aims and goals of those subsets in 
greater detail. There are other important texts in this layer, such as the “rules for participants” (in 
earlier versions, these were not always separate texts but annexes to the main text). This is also the 
level where, metaphorically, the clouds are hung in the sky.

The texts in the policy layer result from negotiations, starting with a number of public consultations 
triggered by policy documents, stakeholder events and bottom-up mobilization. The European 
Commission also relies on a range of advisory boards dealing with strategic questions at different 
levels that reach from call texts to overall research strategies (see VERA 2012: 9; Schögler 2014: 166). 
In the last three editions, negotiations alone lasted for over two years, not least because they take 
place in two arenas. One is the Competitiveness Council and the ITRE Committee of the European 
Parliament (the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy), in which the national ministers of 
research and science and Members of the European Parliament negotiate the draft (and 
supplements) of the FP Decision. The other arena is made up of heads of government, who broker a 
deal about the EU’s multiannual financial framework, which—inevitably—entails a budget line for 
spending taxpayers’ money on research.

Once the first layer of texts is adopted and the edition of the FP format is up and running, the rather 
general objectives in the texts describing the subsets of the programme are interpreted. 
Metaphorically, this is the space where the clouds are formed into recognizable shapes. This work is 
continuous and mostly carried out by European Commission services, with support of deliberately

2 Various editions of the FP use the term “priority” and later “challenge” to describe the programs dedicated to clouded-sky research 
funding. For the rest of this article, we will use the term “program” in order to avoid misunderstandings.
appointed advisory boards consisting of scholars and other experts, as well as representatives of national ministries gathered in a so-called “Programme Committee”. Technically speaking the Commission drafts so-called “Work Programmes,” texts that transfer the—often lofty—policy layer descriptions into more detailed calls for proposals.

**Projecting Social Sciences on the Policy Layer**

The Council of the European Union adopts each “Decision” concerning an edition of the FP. The policy layer, where the scope of a certain funding line or programme is decided, does not reveal discussions about the intention of this given programme. Instead, we are left simply with legal texts, which are by definition a compromise, rather abstract, full of legal annotations, and not easily accessible.

The easiest way to assess the role and relevance of social sciences as the object of a separate funding programme within a given FP edition is through budgetary allocations. Table 1 provides an overview of absolute and relative budgets allocated to programmes dedicated to the SSH. However, even simple numbers referring to the budget available for project funding within programmes directed at clouded-sky research are only comparable to a certain degree. The length of the FP editions has changed and the number of EU member states and associated countries has grown, which leads to a higher overall budget. Further, new forms of funding instruments (e.g. funding networking instead of research projects in FP6), various so-called “horizontal actions”, or plans to “embed” the social sciences in other parts of the programme (the fifth and eighth editions) make such comparisons tricky.

The table, however, does provide an angle on how social scientific research funding is designed within these programmes. It shows three important issues. First, even though the overall research budget has increased with each, successive edition, the share of money allotted to thematic programmes is decreasing, from more than 80 per cent to less than 40 per cent. While shrinking in comparison to the development of the overall programme, the budget allocated to clouded-sky research funding has increased in absolute terms. Second, until the seventh edition, funding for social sciences—or as it is termed from the sixth edition onwards, “SSH” (more below)—has remained rather stable in absolute terms, and also in its share, where it has been pegged to between 1% and 2%.
Table 1: “SSH” programme budget from fourth to eighth edition of the FP, in million ECU/EUR, current prices (own calculations)³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FP-budget</th>
<th>Thematic programmes</th>
<th>% budget for thematic programmes</th>
<th>”SSH”-thematic programmes</th>
<th>% of FP-budget for ”SSH” programme</th>
<th>% of thematic priority budget for ”SSH” programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP4 1994–1998⁴</td>
<td>13,215</td>
<td>10,946</td>
<td>82.83%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP5 1998–2002⁵</td>
<td>14,960</td>
<td>11,987</td>
<td>80.13%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP6 2002–2006</td>
<td>16,665</td>
<td>12,026</td>
<td>72.16%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP7 2007–2013</td>
<td>55,806</td>
<td>32,743</td>
<td>58.67%</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon 2020</td>
<td>77,028</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>38.56%</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon 2020 (estimate)⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third, the financial contributions made to the social sciences show that, while it is only a small slice of the cake, the research budget explicitly allocated to the social sciences has steadily grown within the overall Framework Programmes’ budgets, and even slightly outgrown the average increase in budgetary allocations made inside the thematic funding programme. The most significant growth seems to have taken place in the eighth edition ("Horizon 2020"), which—at least in numbers—indicates a doubling of the budget. However, this number contains manifold elements that are not directed towards funding research projects in a narrower sense, and the Commission itself has emphasized that the programme is not directed towards the social sciences in particular. By extrapolating the budget dedicated to research projects that do target the social sciences in the first four years of Horizon 2020, a total of about €420 million is to be expected (in contrast to the €623 million allocated in the seventh edition of the FP⁷). Simultaneously, the social sciences are supposedly being “streamlined” into other parts of Horizon 2020, meaning that, in theory, more researchers can become part of interdisciplinary endeavors.

³ Horizon 2020 budget, based on Factsheet (European Commission 2013a); FP6 (European Commission 2008b); FP5 and FP4 on CORDIS data (CORDIS 2009; 2015).
⁴ The numbers refer to the budget allocated to FP4 after the accession of Austria, Finland and Sweden (plus 115 million ECU) and include EURATOM funding.
⁵ This budget is part of a larger section in FP5 called: “Improving human research potential and the socio-economic knowledge base” (European Commission 2010).
⁶ This extrapolation is based on the addition of budgets dedicated to calls targeting the SSH in the Work Programmes 2014–15 and 2016–17. This includes the calls abbreviated as: EURO, YOUNG, REFLECTIVE, INT, REV-INEQUAL, ENG-GLOBALLY, and CULT-COOP. The budget for research projects thus amounts to about 127 million EUR in 2014–15 and 115.5 million in 2016–17. For the Work Programmes see: (European Commission 2017).
⁷ Of which €580 million was spent on research projects, which excludes expenses incurred by the Commission for administrating and running the programme (see European Commission 2016c).
Another approach towards the policy layer relies on investigating the terminology used, which can give an indication of what exactly policy-makers are thinking when addressing social scientific research. The first time “social sciences” were specifically addressed in a separate subset within the FP format was in its fourth edition, from 1994 onwards, and immediately following the Maastricht Treaty (Kastrinos 2010: 300). Since then, the terminology has varied. Figure 1 depicts the various denominations used to address social scientific research, revealing some interesting patterns. In the beginning, the notion of “socio-economic” research prevailed, but this was soon evened out by the term “social science”. Since the FPs sixth edition (FP6), the humanities were also officially included in the FP and added to the social sciences (Smith 2003). From then on, social sciences and the humanities were represented together under a crisp acronym, “SSH” (“social sciences and humanities”) (European Commission 2002: 2). In the seventh edition (FP7) “social sciences” is only used occasionally. The term “socio-economic” now stands on an almost equal footing with “SSH”.

Figure 1: Denominations for social sciences in the Work Programmes of fourth to eighth edition of the FP, own calculations. Data based on word-frequency analysis

One should not expect too much from a hermeneutic interpretation of the use of “social science”, “socio-economic science”, and “SSH”. Nevertheless, it should be noted that putting social sciences and economics in one programme must have posed an enduring problem about what is actually to be addressed, and what is to be expected from research funded under this programme. As is commonly agreed, the boundaries of what constitutes “social sciences” and neighboring fields are necessarily quite loose.8 The issue must have become even more protracted when the humanities

---

8 Discussion about what constitutes “the” social sciences can be followed back at least to the 19th century, with the famous Methodenstreit between Gustav Schmoller and Carl Menger, but also the attempts of Dilthey (“two spheres of knowledge”) and Windelband (“idiographic” vs. “nomothetic” approach) to characterize a distinctive geisteswissenschaftliche (humanistic) epistemology. Later, Snow’s attempt to distinguish between “two cultures” (Snow 1959) would embark on a similar narrative. And even later, Lepenies (1985) and Kagan (2009) would speak of “three cultures”, i.e. natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.
were formally introduced to the same programme. A solution was found with the acronym “SSH”, which can probably be interpreted as a bureaucratic attempt to aggregate a broad field of different, and quite heterogeneous, scientific activities (epistemologies, methodologies, and research topics).

“SSH” is similar to another popular acronym in the same area, STEM (“Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics”) in the sense that, instead of classifying epistemologies along methodological questions, it groups scientific knowledge using ontologies, the content of what certain fields of scientific knowledge are (supposedly) concerned with.9 Unlike STEM, however, which has become a preferred object for policy-makers to increase the quality of human resources of a nation, the context and “etymology” of SSH in EU policy insinuates that it is a rather residual category.

As the dedicated funding programme became better endowed, the later editions of the FP have become the largest single programmes dedicated to research in the social sciences and humanities under the label “SSH”, whatever that may entail. Vested interest in this funding opportunity increased and expanded, and members of various communities now readily perceive themselves as part of the label “SSH”. For example, empirical evidence has been collected to prove that projects funded under the label “SSH” have similarly relevant results as those in the sciences (Olmos-Peñuela et al. 2014). Representatives of “SSH” have also become increasingly vocal about securing their stake in the FP. For example, public discussions on the SSH-part of the eighth edition of the FP (“Horizon 2020”) started in 2010, three years before its actual launch (cf. Young 2013).

Institutionally, too, the case remains unresolved. In some national contexts, economics is perceived as a separate domain. In Germany, some faculties have the names of “Sozial- und Wirtschaftswissenschaften” (i.e. social- and economic sciences), which hints at a differentiation of the two. The situation is similar in France, although they are categorized together. In the UK, the ESRC (Economic and Social Research Council) only knows social sciences as one category (‘management and business studies’ is not included in their funding schemes) (ESRC 2017). In contrast, in the Universal Decimal Classification used for libraries, economic sciences are treated as a sub-unit of social sciences, and the same goes for the OECD Frascati Manual (OECD 2015). Our aim is not to decide which of these is right or wrong, rather it should be clear that, while they have to be understood as “historically contingent construct that does not correspond to ‘ontological features’ of knowledge” (Sala 2013: 85), they became—and remain—a powerful tool to classify research in terms of institutional organization, self-perception and assigning of resources and career trajectories.

9 In the USA, the label STEM was formally introduced in the early 2000s to strengthen education in the fields of “science, technology, engineering, and mathematics” (Bybee 2013). Similarly, the label “HSS” (standing for, unsurprisingly, humanities and social sciences) has emerged in the U.S.A. of late (Brodhead and Rowe 2013). Various reports and studies reveal that even those who are asked to transfer the (political) idea behind STEM and HSS into (academic) practice do not really understand the meaning of these labels (Breiner et al. 2012; Brodhead and Rowe 2013; Fairweather and Paulson 2008; among others). To our best knowledge, no study examining the meaning of SSH in Europe exists. The few studies that are concerned with “SSH” explicitly take the label at face value (see, for example, Remæø 2005; Kastrinos 2010; Olmos-Peñuela et al. 2014).
A third inroad to understanding the intention of funding the social sciences is to interpret the substructure of the dedicated programmes (Table 2). It shows that three elements remain stable pillars over time. First, the economic dimension is dominant, which reflects the aims of the European Commission to use the Framework Programme to analyze and enhance economic development in Europe. Similarly, aspects of the European integration process also remained central. Second, the main topics that have been continuously addressed in those editions were on science and technology, education, and social exclusion. These, then, seem to be the key areas in which policy-makers expected the social sciences to provide relevant new insights useful for the overall EU integration process. It’s also noteworthy that the relationship of knowledge, science, technology and society is an explicit topic in these programmes, although separate “science in/and society” programmes were also launched. This reflects the emphasis on interdisciplinarity, which has been an important feature of European research funding policy in general. Third, adding the humanities to the funding slot did not change this perspective dramatically, even though “culture” became a more important point of reference from the fifth edition of the FP onwards, where the topic of citizenship, a “European” society, a European public sphere etc. was introduced.

The brief history of the social science programmes within the various FP editions shows that the social sciences have become a stable component of these programmes, even though the name and meaning has changed from socio-economic sciences to “SSH”, and even though budgetary allocation...
indicates their continued peripheral position. This is further emphasized by the successful introduction of the label “SSH”, which functions as a residual of various and heterogeneous fields. Also, the overall scope of the various programmes in this layer indicates the policy-based nature of these programmes. But how has this been transformed into questions for scholarly research?

Work Programmes Shaping Social Scientific Knowledge

Work Programmes are the “most political texts” of European research policy. Michel André (2013) argues that they are even more important than the legal material instating the Framework Programmes, as they contain the formulations referred to in research proposals, peer evaluation and ex-post evaluations of the funding programme itself. Moreover, by predefining relevant topics, methodologies and discourses, these documents delineate the ambitions of social science research funding, which are also visible in the kinds of institutions interested in participating (see section 5). To get a better understanding of the processes that lead to the formulation of Work Programmes, the malleability of topics, and the influence of Work Programmes on (successful) project proposals, this section will follow the journey from a “keyword” to a successful bid for project funding.

Work Programmes are made up of call texts, specific research targets, technical specifications concerning funding instruments, and the scope of participants eligible for a call (e.g. small and medium-sized enterprises, non-governmental organizations, associate countries etc.). Wording is decisive in who responds to a call; who feels that they have the expertise to contribute to the further development of a certain subject area and, more importantly, who wins a bid. The material available to us offers the opportunity for a longitudinal textual analysis of calls within the seventh FP. Based on four subsequent versions of the text, we identified alterations made over time. The winning bids and their project descriptions were compared to the calls and the most decisive changes made within the latter.10

The technical procedure in FP7 started with the European Commission as the responsible institution taking the initiative.11 In an informal consultation phase, expert groups, results of consultations, plans from prior programmes etc. were processed by administrators to produce a first draft, which was then open to “inter-service consultation”; i.e. comments of relevant units within the European administrative body. Then the “Programme Committee”, consisting of representatives of every member-state, commented on several draft versions of the document. Usually, the committee pre-debated their positions informally as majorities are necessary to implement changes to the documents in official meetings. In addition, officially appointed expert advisory groups provided formal feedback on draft versions. The aim was a balanced position that was the outcome of negotiations, which tried to accommodate manifold stakeholder requests. A policy officer of DG Research puts it thus:

Then [...] from the initial text to the last text there is sometimes a huge difference and sometimes you feel: OK this adjective this is the German adjective, this is the Italian flavour,

10 The specific process leading to, and agents involved in, every single alteration of the final call text observed here cannot, however, be traced back due to a lack of empirical material. In any case, an observation would only be possible for a mere fraction of negotiations, especially as the centralized and formalized interaction is only part of the deal. In every member state the Programme Committee members interact with stakeholders, some stakeholders have direct access to administrators and the interaction within the Commission would also be difficult to monitor over a longer period of time.

11 See André (2008) for a detailed mapping of the administrative procedure in FP7.
this is Polish flavour and in the end this is not Shakespeare, Dahl, Dante or Goethe, but a topic, which is at least European. Maybe not wonderfully written, but at least which covers all the EU stakeholders. The academic communities through the advisory group, the Member States through the committees and the different policy interests through the inter-service consultation of the DG. (IW-Schögler/Commission 2013 minute: 02:00)

These procedures help pool the heterogeneous group of social scientific disciplines and topics into governable units. The experts, engaged as helping hands, reflect this as they are mostly appointed in their role as representative of their disciplinary field (see European Commission 2016a). In other domains, such as energy, expert groups are not solely comprised of academics, but also representatives of non-governmental interest groups, industry and so on.

In FP7 every research project funded in the thematic “SSH” programme started its development from a list of keywords reflecting the main policy aims of the programme. Then several drafts of the text were produced. In what follows, two calls will be scrutinized: a call on economic underpinnings of social innovation; and a call on temporary migration and mobility in Europe. In each case four items were available: the list of keywords; extracts of a first draft (DV1); the second draft (DV2); and the published version (FV). The material offered here is only an extract of these calls issued in 2013 to exemplify the kinds of alterations possible during the drafting process and linking these to the projects—or better project proposals—winning the bid. Breaking down changes on a textual, or word-for-word, level makes visible content-related and syntactic or structural modifications. We are interested in highlighting changes within the boundaries of a topic, or in methodological perspectives as such shifts represent negotiations of the ambitions of the social science programme on a micro-level.

Example 1 is from a call that was later placed under “Activity 8.1: Growth, Employment and Competitiveness in a Knowledge Society”, with an overall maximum budget of €14.5 million. The first entry of the table shows a list of topics to be included in the first activity. It delineates certain topics or dimensions, but it does not provide any information on the perspective to be taken by researchers. In DV1, the basis for further negotiation is set. Unfortunately no information on the process leading to DV1 is available, the Programme Committee meeting (and other instances named above) offer room for negotiation, however.

Example 2 deals with temporary migration and...
mobility in Europe. It is from a call later placed under “Activity 8.3: Major trends in society and their implications”, which was allocated a total maximum budget of €11 million. There the keywords already mention the economic-policy dimension that has been identified above as a constant element of the social science programme.

In the examples 1 and 2 the underlined parts illustrate additions and the scored-out elements removals from previous versions of the Work Programme text.

Example 1: SSH.2013.1.1-1 Economic underpinnings of social innovations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Economic underpinnings of social innovations—strengthening innovation towards European societal challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of social innovations and their economic properties and specificities; economic characteristics of social innovation in comparison to non-technological and technological innovation; economic aspects for institutional and organisational diversity in providing societal innovations (business/market, public sector, civil society, networks..); variety of financial models; role of public policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research dimensions**

To Research is needed to understand what works, how and why for successful social innovations research should: and how public policy, including European perspective can facilitate them:

- Elaborate how institutions (including incentives, norms, laws), public sector and markets function (or not function) for the weak poor, marginalised and vulnerable in the society and economy by taking into account the gender dimension
- Develop stronger concept(s) of social innovation in comparison to the economic, (purely profit-oriented) technology based innovation and non-technological innovation models; elaborating differences and similarities between technological and social innovations as well as the specific (economic and social) drivers of and barriers for social innovation;
- The nature and co-evolution of technology based growth and social innovations, including institutional and organisational innovations to facilitate systemic change; taking stock about the past—successful and less successful—models providing social innovations (microcredit, mutual self-help, corporations co-operatives) and identifying their economic underpinnings;
- The changing importance of various actors, factors like skilled and creative people and creative entrepreneurs and technologies, incl. networking as well as the relative roles of state, business, including creative industry and civil society in the provision of social innovations along its life cycle; as well as economic conditions for pilots or prototypes to scale up;
- Development for public policy instruments for effective financing and self-financing, public-private partnerships, networks to support social innovations; in particular to identify what role EU level initiatives and instruments can play in comparison to the Member states and regional;
- Developing indicators to measure social innovations (inputs, outputs) and measuring their contribution to well-being as well to smart growth, new economic activities and employment (economic rate of return) across countries and regions by taking into account the development of National Accounts;
- Evaluation methods for the economic and social impact of social innovation initiatives, programmes and policies in European and/or global cross-country comparison.

**DV2 to FV**

Research is needed in order to understand what works, how and why it works for economically successful social innovations and how public policy, including the European perspective, can facilitate them:

includes DG RTD, DG ENTR, DG REGIO and DG MARKT. The aims of the group are to exchange information and avoid overlaps. The aim of DG RTD on this issue is to provide support to both research and policy in order to develop political initiatives.” (European Commission 2012b).
Elaborate Explain how institutions (including incentives, norms, laws), public sector and markets function (or not function) for in looking after the poor, marginalised and vulnerable in the society and economy by taking into account the gender dimension; and the economy, taking the gender dimension into account.

There are a few important issues in these examples. They show how the cloud is shaped and that this is done differently from case to case. In Example 1, content-related changes from DV1 to DV2 mainly relied on adding further information to the text. First, “institutions” are defined more specifically, opening the call for approaches not necessarily dealing with organizational forms of institutions. Then, the understanding of “economic innovation” is specified as purely profit-oriented and “creative people” are transformed into “creative entrepreneurs.” In both cases the rewording entails a semantic change relevant to the definition of the research object at stake. Further, a new research dimension is added to the topic, dealing with the development of indicators. Between May 2012 and the final version published in July the same year, changes remain lexical and syntactic.

In Example 2, the most notable difference found between DV1 and DV2 is where the insertion “migrant-centered, multi-disciplinary” specifies the call. In contrast, the changes between DV2 and the final version (FV) remain syntactic and stylistic. The first addition targets the methodological approach to be considered in project proposals. Where “comparative perspective” covers anything from a statistical analysis of migration-flows to a comparison of migration-laws and policies in different countries, such studies become more difficult to conceive once the descriptor “migrant-centered” is also to be taken into account. The second major insertion in “Part II” spins the call text in a similar direction by refining the object of research.

Example 2: SSH.2013.3.1-1. Addressing European governance of transnational mobility: assessing forms of temporary migration and mobility to Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List</th>
<th>3. Origins, impact and governance of short term seasonal and circular migration in the EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating governance of migration flows and patterns at EU and national level in the area of seasonal labour in agriculture and other fields; links with current economic crisis and future implications; exploring links with circular migration as well as evaluating scope and future prospects of existing instruments and mechanisms such as mobility partnerships; links with irregular migration in seasonal labour; (fundamental) rights of seasonal migrant workers; comparative dimension across countries; link with global approach to migration and role of third countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV1 to DV2</th>
<th>Research dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| DV2 to FV | Building on and advancing taking forward previous EU research in the field, the analysis should be conducted from a perspective that is migrant-centred, multi-disciplinary, as well as and comparative perspective, both between European countries, and with other regions of the world. The When |

Again, the draft minutes of the Programme Committee meeting offer some insight in the discussions, however, no explanation for actual changes that were decided is given: “One of delegations took the view that the topic ‘Addressing European governance of transnational mobility: assessing forms of temporary migration’ (Activity 3) should also include medical migration aimed at obtaining the care available in another country or at less cost. There was also the issue of seasonal migration of ageing people to the southern regions.” (European Commission 2012b).
addressing this topic, the following research dimensions should be considered when addressing the topic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part II</th>
<th>DV1 to DV2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The analysis should finally identify the main drivers of different temporary forms of mobility for individuals and their subsequent migratory patterns, contributing to the understanding of their social, cultural and historical dimensions. Existing studies provide conflicting accounts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The various stages of consolidating the call text can also be interpreted as an attempt to strike a difficult balance between openness and specification. This is particularly obvious in the changes between DV1 and DV2 in Example 1. These changes indicate a broadening of the topic, including special foci, such as “gender dimension”. Simultaneously the approach prescribed as being acceptable is considerably narrowed to developing indicators.

The two examples also show that there is a strong connection between call-text and project bids. The call resulting from the text in Example 1 funded two projects (out of 13 submissions) (European Commission 2013b). The first “aims at establishing best practice metrics for capturing the impact of social innovation” that will help the Commission to build “smart economies that reduce inequality and socio-economic marginalization” and takes a country comparative perspective. In the call-text these elements are mainly found in the first two bullet-points of relevant research dimensions, which were both subject to alterations. The second project takes a hands-on approach by promising to create “concepts, models and instruments for policy makers, innovators, investors and intermediaries”. This reflects the call’s specific aim for developing indicators. This project also takes a very materialistic/economic perspective, stating that it “investigates how social innovations can enable the most vulnerable in society to become economic assets.” This reflects the major addition to the call text that emphasizes the economic dimension of social innovation (next to “well-being”) (quotes see project description, CORDIS).

For the second call (resulting from Example 2), two projects were also funded (from 15 submissions to this specific topic) (European Commission 2013b). Again both are closely related to the specificities of the call text, and importantly also to amendments made during the negotiation process of its wording. Tracking alterations in the work programmes thus makes visible that specific (disciplinary and policy-related) interests may have been lobbied into the documents, which ultimately had an impact on the winning project proposals. This strong connection needs to be understood in contrast to earlier programmes. For example, the fifth FP edition preceded the calls with the annotation that

> These [descriptions/research questions] are intended to be illustrative of the scope and content of the work to be undertaken within a particular Task. However, it is not excluded that a proposal may not directly respond to a specific research challenge or question; it may address parts, combinations of these parts or closely related issues. (European Commission 1999)

The fourth edition included a similar preface. Later editions no longer provide this leeway. In other words, they make stronger efforts to pre-define the research topics that are adequate for a project proposal. From the examples given, we can take that even minor adjustments in keywords are sufficient to influence the design of research (proposals) funded in these programmes and such changes also affect the kinds of social science research funded. In contrast to blue-sky research, negotiations to define topics take place between policy-makers, administrators and scholarly experts at the stage of drafting the call text, which eventually leads to a decoupling of advances in
disciplinary fields that are then used by researchers to orient themselves when writing a project proposal. As the wide variety of member states participating in these projects has shown, and as will be discussed below in more general terms, this is also reflected in the types of institutions participating in, or rather in those not responding to, clouded-sky research funding.

Participants and Funding Instruments
CORDIS, a database by the European Commission, contains all projects funded under the FP format and allows us to extract those entries found under the SSH (and precursory) labels (see Table 3). The different funding instruments can be re-organized in three types: (1) research project funding, i.e. the allocation of funds is used for funding researchers and their work; (2) networking activities, which can take various forms and be restricted to short-time events or long-term recurring meetings, workshops etc. and (3) support actions, which include flexible forms of additional funding for certain projects or networks, cooperation with companies and also funding for supporting institutions and stakeholder events.

Table 3: Number of “SSH” projects per FP (Calculations based on CORDIS data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CORDIS</th>
<th>Research projects</th>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Support actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>∑ Y/average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP4</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP5</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP6</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP7</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of entries increases from the fourth to fifth edition, decreases in the sixth edition and increases again in the seventh edition (FP7). It is worth remembering that FP7 was operative for seven years, whereas the other FPs only lasted 5 years. Nevertheless, the trend is also stable on a year-to-year average. In FP5 and FP6, a large number of non-research project actions were funded. This included the rather cost intensive “Networks of Excellence” in FP6. Their aim was to coordinate existing research efforts throughout Europe over a longer period and offered support of up to €5.5 million. In some cases this included well over 20 participating institutions in the SSH domain. Funding of research networks is a paramount example of the efforts of the European Commission to distance itself from becoming a traditional research funding body. Within the “SSH” programme, project funding was reinstated as the main funding instrument in FP7. Support actions were principally used to prepare Horizon 2020 and fund the ongoing organization of the programme.

16 For FP4-FP7, data could be allocated quite easily to the respective “SSH labelled” programme. For H2020 a data-set is also available for ongoing research and other activities, however, its organisation leaves too many uncertainties—especially concerning networking and support actions that are run within the SSH labelled challenge.
The coordinating institution that communicates with the European Commission and takes a particular responsibility in organizing the project is a key actor in every project. The second group of actors are participating institutions, also referred to as “partners”. The suggested analysis of FP7 should be taken with a pinch of salt, not least because the database does not provide the names of affiliated researchers, which makes a more detailed analysis of participating individuals impossible. However, trends regarding the types of institutions and the orders of magnitude for the number of institutions involved can be deduced from the data. The number of coordinating institutions being considerably lower in FP7 than the number of participating institutions, we have attempted some comparisons for FP7 and FP6 (no data is available for the coordinators of FP5 and FP4).

In FP7 most coordinators (50) are based in UK institutions, followed by 38 from Germany and 29 from Italy, sharing third place with the Netherlands. This produces a clear “East-West” divide in coordinators. Of the 253 projects, only two were led by Hungarian institutions, two by Polish and one was based in Lithuania. As associated countries, Switzerland (8), Norway (5) and Turkey (1) hosted more coordinating institutions. Comparable countries in size and geographic location such as Austria (13), Finland (9) or Denmark (5) could also host more project coordinators.

Breaking down the data at the organizational level shows a representation of central institutions only taking place to a limited extent, and by far less than in other funding schemes. Taking the case of the UK as an example, it is the University of Manchester (6), which tops the list, followed by the University of Birmingham and the Centre for Economic Policy Research (3 each), the latter being a non-profit think tank established in 1983. Six more institutions coordinated two projects, all others only one. In total, 34 UK institutions were involved in coordinating social scientific EU research projects in FP7. Next to Manchester, other institutions at the top of the list include the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), which is made up of different national institutions, the University of Utrecht (5), the Universities of Antwerp, Amsterdam and Rotterdam (Erasmus) (4). Universities otherwise dominating the field, such as Oxford or Cambridge, which are also the top two independent institutions coordinating projects (about 400 each) in FP7 overall (see also Massih-Tehrani et al. 2015: 64), are not strongly represented as coordinators in the SSH domain.

Two further insights concerning the institutions involved in coordinating projects can be obtained by going back in time. First, coordination is even more equally distributed amongst participating countries in FP6 than in FP7. In the UK, five institutions host two projects, already the maximum co-ordinations per institution there. Manchester does not coordinate any project at that point and Oxbridge does not take a special position here either. Second, the hierarchy of countries hosting coordinators remains relatively similar over time. Germany, the UK, Italy, France and Austria are the top five nations with ten or more co-ordinations in FP6. In FP5 Italy is sixth and replaced by Belgium in the top five. With the exception of Austria, which only hosted three projects in the first SSH specific programme TSER in FP4, the list is identical there as well.

Institutions participating (as partners or coordinators) in FP7 under the “SSH” programme also diverge from the overall picture. In total, about 2600 institutions were registered as participating (incl. coordinators) in collaborative research projects. A 2013 monitoring report ranks participating institutions. In higher education, this list is topped by the Universities of Cambridge, Oxford, Imperial College London, University College London, the Universität Zürich and the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, followed by the École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, the Denmark

---

17 Unfortunately, the non-standardization of names of institutions within the CORDIS database makes an analysis of participating institutions over the course of several FPs highly problematic.
Teknisk Universitet, the Technische Universiteit Delft and the University of Edinburgh (European Commission 2015: 96). In the overall account, two umbrella organizations, the French CNRS followed by the Fraunhofer Gesellschaft top the list.

In the social sciences (and humanities) the number of participating institutions remains high, with 1200 institutions for 253 projects. 279 institutions are named as participating in three or more projects, 180 in two and about 750 in one project only.

Table 4: Participating Institutions SSH-FP7 (incl. coordinators; own calculations based on CORDIS data; SH-ERC Grants see European Union 2015: 57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katholieke Universiteit Leuven</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London School of Economics and Political Science</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozep-Europai Egyetem</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universiteit van Amsterdam</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondation Nationale Sciences Politiques</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universita Commerciale Luigi Bocconi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Université Libre de Bruxelles</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universiteit Utrecht</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aarhus Universitet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leuven and the CNRS are the only institutions named in both top 10 lists. In comparison, the overall list is dominated by traditionally high-ranking UK institutions, which—with the exception of the LSE—is not the case for the social sciences programme. Involving seven different countries, the geographical distribution of institutions associated with SSH project participants is also more diverse than in the overall trends. Adding the rank of European Research Council grants as a comparative item to the list—which are excellence-based, blue-sky project funds—shows that a large proportion of the Universities regularly involved in clouded-sky research funding are not necessarily successful in acquiring ERC grants in the domain of social sciences and humanities.

Conclusions

This article aimed to investigate the ambitions and formation of EU social science research funding policy. We sought explanations in the complex relationship of overarching policy aims rooted within
the European integration process, legal structures framing the agency of different stakeholders and micromanagement procedures used to formulate calls for proposals.

Within the European Union’s multiannual research framework, the thematic programme dedicated to the social sciences and, to a lesser extent, humanities, continues to have an ambiguous and fragile relationship with these fields. This becomes apparent in the processes shown above leading up to Horizon 2020. Yet, on a long-term trajectory, given the increasing relevance of the FP format for research policy in Europe at all levels of this polity, the overall role of the social sciences programme within the recent FP editions has been significantly raised. In the 1990s, the policy-turn towards a knowledge-economy transformed research-policy into a more central element of European concern. More recently, fresh funds were made available for the sciences, but also for social sciences and humanities in the form of blue-sky funding. At the same time, the design and implementation of clouded-sky research funding dedicated to the social sciences became of greater importance within discussions of austerity programmes and cuts in research funding throughout Europe.

The formation procedures and structure of a dedicated social science funding programme impact those agents interested and able to participate in research projects. As we have shown, institutions involved in the clouded-sky social science programmes of the various FP editions do not (fully) correspond to the overall picture of institutions receiving funds through the FP format. Nor are those institutions dominating the “SSH” programme those with the highest reputation and score on research-oriented rankings. It shows that participation in the social science parts of EU clouded-sky research programmes is (apparently) not as important in the competition for national and international recognition as other parts of the programme. This sets the social sciences and humanities programme aside from the overall trends shown for the Framework Programmes, as well as from funding offered for the social sciences and humanities within the ERC. It can be concluded that research funds are allocated to social sciences according to the watering can principle; only a small number of institutions repeatedly participate in these kind of research projects, which results in a broad distribution of funds amongst possible participants. This produces an inclusiveness and reach that the ERC cannot attain, and, consequently, clouded-sky social science funding serves as a link between more and less research-intensive regions in Europe. Nevertheless, new member states (the “East”) are less likely to coordinate projects than institutions based in countries that have participated in the FP format for a longer period.

From a policy-maker perspective, the acronym label “SSH” seems perfectly suited to make heterogeneous fields of scientific knowledge addressable for certain policies under a single label and to achieve a concentration of possible stakeholders and interested parties. Ironically, however, it has made attempts to make the programme dedicated to “SSH” more complicated. The (self-declared) spokespersons of the various disciplines and fields that are supposedly covered by the label accepted “SSH” as the common denominator in order to claim a stake and ‘get a seat at the table’ when negotiating the distribution of scarce resources. In the forerun of the eighth edition of the FP, they achieved the reinstating of at least a limited SSH focus within the funding programme and diffused the risk of being even further marginalized as an “embedded” supporting measure.18

---

18 Initially, the Commission had planned to discontinue the “SSH” research funding track under the eighth edition of the FP. In December 2010, researchers from HU Berlin mobilized against what they perceived as the “thematic and financial” “downsizing of Social Sciences in the EU” (Börzel et al. 2010). It was followed by an Open Letter to the European Commission by the newly and hastily formatted “European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities” (EASH 2011; Klein 2011). The Open Letter was signed by almost 26,000 people, and the EU research ministers were successfully mobilized to express their concerns “whether the role of social
Tracking alterations in the work programmes supports the claim that specific (disciplinary and policy-related) interests can be lobbied into the programme on a continuous basis. Over time, the label “SSH” has gained some legitimacy as representing diverse fields and activities in the realm of the social sciences and humanities. Interestingly, this has had repercussions on how the Commission handles the social sciences.

Finally, there are also important (unintended) features achieved by the social science programme. As marginal as it might be in relation to the overall scheme, it reunites expert groups, allows for networks of otherwise unrelated institutions to emerge, makes the diffusion of social thought possible on a European level and might even entail a certain feeling of affiliation and concern for this programme in the “SSH” community. Moreover, European research policy has become an entity to which national policy-makers turn, emulate, or at least orient their policies towards. For the French Agence Nationale de la Recherche (see ANR 2013) this is especially true, but other national funding agencies also reproduce strands of the programme. Thus discussing the social sciences at the European level, even under the disputed acronym label “SSH,” not only affects the respective programmes but translates into a trickle-down effect at the national scale.
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Abstract
This contribution, which is part of the collaborative European research project INTERCO-SSH, presents indicators for studying the internationalization of the social and human sciences. Five dimensions are distinguished and for each one of them various indicators are presented. Although neither the dimensions nor the indicators are exhaustive, they capture some of the most significant aspects of internationalization. They pertain to international scholarly associations, international scholarly journals, the flows and meanings of book translations, transnational authorship, and policies of internationalization. In addition to these dimensions, three particular areas of inquiry are presented: changing relations between the North and the South, between Western and Eastern Europe, and between the West and Asia.
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Introduction and Research Question
As has been documented by studies and reports like the UNESCO World Social Science Report (1999, 2010), the social sciences and humanities (SSH) are today practiced in virtually all countries and regions around the world. Since the 1990s, and related to the more general debate about ‘globalization’, the internationalization of the social sciences and humanities has become a defining characteristic of research, teaching and publishing practices. Even disciplines of which the practice was traditionally restricted to specific national and linguistic contexts, such as the study of national languages and literatures, are in the process of becoming more internationally oriented and
organized, although teaching and research remain primarily located at the national level. While the process of internationalization is widely acknowledged by scholars and policy makers alike, its historical development, specific forms and scholarly consequences have, so far, been rarely analyzed systematically.¹

1. Objectives

The collaborative research project INTERCO-SSH (INTERnational COoperation in the SSH: Comparative Socio-Historical Perspectives and Future Possibilities)² contributes to filling this gap by studying the post-war history of the SSH in Europe³. Its Work Package 3 focuses on the internationalization of these disciplines and seeks to fulfill three main objectives:

- to measure and analyze the main patterns of transnational exchange and collaboration in the SSH, both within Europe and between Europe and other regions of the world;
- to produce case studies to exemplify, enrich and refine the understanding of the above-mentioned general patterns;
- to assess the main obstacles to crossing national boundaries and stimulating fruitful transnational relations and exchanges.

2. Tasks

These objectives have been translated into three tasks:

(1) Considering its central position in the global field of SSH, the project pays special attention to the exchanges between European countries and the United States (US).

(2) The project also studies various aspects of the emergence and functioning of the European Research Area, where regional integration in the SSH has been particularly pronounced.

(3) In addition to studying processes internal to the West, the project seeks to capture global dynamics by paying special attention to the West’s changing relationships with the South and the East.

For these three tasks different dimensions have been distinguished, each of which have been broken down into specific indicators. The dimensions that have been identified are not the only ones that are relevant for understanding internationalization. Several other dimensions can be distinguished, and some of them are taken into account into other Work Packages of the project. Thus, national patterns of institutionalization and internationalization are covered in Work Package 2, while the transnational circulation of paradigms, methods and controversies is analyzed


² For more information on this EU-funded project, Grant Agreement n° 319974, see http://interco-ssh.eu/en/.

³ The project studies seven disciplines: anthropology, economics, literary studies, philosophy, political science, psychology, and sociology.
in Work Package 4. Among other dimensions of particular significance for internationalization are, for example, processes of migration, both voluntary and forced (Jeanpierre 2010), or the spread of English as an international language of science and scholarship (De Swaan 2001). In spite of these limitations, Work Package 3 captures five key dimensions of the internationalization of the social sciences and humanities.

3. Dimensions and Indicators

These dimensions capture different aspects of transnational SSH infrastructure, exchange, and collaboration:

1) The development and role of international scholarly organizations;
2) The development and role of international journals;
3) The flows and meanings of book translations;
4) The development of transnational co-authorship;
5) The politics of internationalization.

As outlined above, the dimensions have been used to study both processes internal to the West, and dynamics linked to its changing relations with the Global South, Eastern Europe and Asia.

3.1. International Scholarly Associations

The composition, development, and functioning of international scholarly associations represent an important mode of international exchange and collaboration. The oldest international organizations in SSH date back to the second half of the 19th century (Boncourt and Jeanpierre 2015). After the Second World War, new international SSH associations were established under the auspices of UNESCO; they have more recently been complemented by transnational regional organizations on a continental scale (Europe, Asia, Latin America, Africa). The study of these organizations provides valuable information on the way in which the social and human sciences have become internationalized over time. More specifically, it contributes to answering three questions: What is the balance of power between different national and regional scientific fields, most notably between Europe, the United States, and emerging fields in the South and East? What is the role of political actors (UNESCO, philanthropic foundations, the European Union, etc.) and contexts (before, during and after the Cold War) in shaping these internationalization processes? Can we identify different patterns of internationalization across different SSH disciplines?

International Associations

International associations exist in all SSH disciplines. As they have, for the most part, all been founded in the late 1940s or early 1950s under the auspices of UNESCO, their study is a way of highlighting the connections between international politics and the transnational development of the SSH. As transnational forums that grew in size and became more geographically diverse over time, these organizations also provide comparative information on the changing international

---

4 For the indicators of institutionalization, see Fleck et al. (2016).
5 For historical outlines of the internationalization of the social sciences, see Fleck (2011), Heilbron et al. (2008), Heilbron (2014b).
structure of disciplines. Data on these processes may be gathered through a study of associations' archives and interviews with their founders and officers. While such sources are not always available (not all associations have kept orderly archives, and gaps are frequent), these data are especially valuable when put into historical perspective.

Possible Indicators:

- **Overall membership.** Gathering data on the total number of members of each association provides key information on the quantitative weight of these organizations in different disciplines.

- **Breakdown of membership per country** (absolute and relative to total). Gathering such data shows that these associations vary in their geographical scope and structure, with some of them being more oriented towards certain regions (Western and/or Eastern Europe, North America, etc.) than others. In that sense, these organizations are not all international in the same way. It is worth noting, however, that this distribution tends to fluctuate regularly in connection to the changing location of major congresses: South American membership will, for example, rise significantly when congresses are held in the region, and decrease in the following years.

- **Ratio between North American, South American, European, African, Asian and members from other regions.** Calculating such ratios demonstrates that the place of Europe varies across organizations and disciplines, notably in relation to members from North America and other regions.

- **Location of world congresses over time.** The location of world congresses organized by international associations is more than a strictly scientific matter. It also has organizational and political implications: holding a world congress of political science in Moscow in 1979 had implications that went beyond the scientific field—just like the Moscow Olympics of 1980 (Sarantakes 2010). The comparison of the location of world congresses across disciplines and over time thus provides valuable insight into the evolution of the relationship between national scientific fields, as well as between international scientific associations and politics.

- **Programs of congresses.** The list of participants to world congresses provides information similar to membership distribution. The list of topics that feature in the programs of these congresses shows the themes that emerge out of the interactions of national fields in different time periods. The influence of world politics and, more generally, contemporary events, is also tangible in this list. It also gives a sense of the way in which congresses contribute to the transnational circulation of ideas and the evolution of intellectual power struggles.

- **Organizational structure** (composition of governing bodies, number and themes of research committees). Over time, international associations have sought to institutionalize their research activity in the shape of research committees. A look at this scientific structure provides information on the subdisciplinary structure of each discipline and the degree of institutionalization of each association.

- **Development of activities** (frequency and type of international conferences, existence or not of international prizes) and **publications** (books series, journals). Over time, some international associations have sought to widen the range of their activities in order to become more stable, notably at the financial level. The comparison of the extent of this expansion across organizations provides information on the dynamism of these associations and the competitiveness of their organizational environment.

**European Associations**

Internationalization has more recently also taken the form of transnational regionalization—that is the emergence of international associations, journals, research councils, databases, etc., on a transnational regional level (Asia, Africa, the Arab world, Latin America) (UNESCO 2010).
INTERCO-SSH focuses on Europeanization as a relatively advanced case of this process, as European associations have been founded in most SSH disciplines (Boncourt 2016a). The central questions are how these transnational regional associations have evolved over time in their respective disciplinary context, which main forms of ‘Europeanization’ can be distinguished, and how Europeanization relates to more general internationalization processes (Sapiro 2009a). To answer these questions, several indicators may be taken into account and analyzed through the use of organizations’ archives. While the first five are similar to those used to study international associations, the last one is specific to the case of European organizations.

**Possible Indicators:**

- **Overall membership.** As in the case of international associations, data on the total number of members of each association provides information on the quantitative weight of these organizations, over time.
- **Membership per country** (absolute and relative to total). There are important differences between European associations in terms of the geographical structure of their membership: while some encompass the whole of Europe, others are dominated by specific parts of the continent (be it Western or Eastern, Southern or Northern Europe), or even by extra-European countries, such as the United States. A careful quantitative study of the members of these associations makes it possible to identify different forms and strategies of Europeanization across SSH disciplines.
- **Location and programs of European congresses over time.** As seen above, the study of the location of scientific congresses may deepen our understanding of the interactions between SSH and politics, as well as between national scientific communities.
- **Origins of European associations.** All European associations originated in a given country. The mapping out of these geographical roots across organizations and disciplines may help assess the extent to which Europeanization processes are associated with national power struggles (be they intellectual or institutional), with Europeanization acting as a resource used to gain weight in these struggles (Boncourt 2016a).
- **Organizational structure** (composition of the governing board, number and themes of research committees). As in the case of international associations, this indicator contributes to assessing the subdisciplinary structure of each discipline and the degree of institutionalization of each European association.
- **Development of activities** (frequency and type of conferences, existence of European prizes) and publications (book series, journals). As argued above, this indicator helps us assess the dynamism of European associations and the competitiveness of their organizational environment.
- **Intellectual orientation.** The intellectual rationale behind the foundation of European associations varied across disciplines and organizations. While some set out to emulate the American example, others aimed at promoting European intellectual traditions. The qualitative comparative study of these rationales paves the way to a better understanding of the interactions between European and American scientific fields and ideas, and of the role of ‘American hegemony’ in shaping the internationalization of SSH (Alatas 2003; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1998; Dezalay and Garth 2002; Keim 2011).

### 3.2. European SSH Journals

Journals with the explicit ambition to be international are of particular significance to the international circulation of knowledge. A relatively recent trend has been the establishment of European journals, which nowadays exist in virtually every discipline and research specialty. Several of them have been launched by European scholarly associations. The study of these journals provides a different perspective on the forms of Europeanization at work in SSH disciplines.
Possible Indicators:

- **Development of ‘European’ journals.** A growing number of journals uses the adjective ‘European’ in their title or subtitle. Assessing the pace of this growth over time is a way to identify trends in the rise and fall of ‘Europeanization’ in relation to developments at the national and international level.

- **Editorial policy.** As in the case of European associations, some European journals were founded on the basis of a very specific intellectual rationale. These policies usually revolve around the idea of either promoting European intellectual traditions or importing American standards into Europe. The mapping out of these rationales across journals and disciplines provides a better understanding of the shape of Europeanization dynamics, in particular in relation to American developments.

- **Location of Editor.** The study of the location of European journals’ editors is one of the keys to understanding the relationship between national scientific fields in the context of Europeanization.

- **Composition of editorial board.** As in the case of the membership of European associations, the study of European journals’ editorial boards forms a basis to understand the geographical structure of Europeanization across disciplines.

- **Location and name of Publisher.** This indicator makes it possible to assess the extent to which the publication of European SSH knowledge has been centralized around a nucleus of publishers and countries over time.

- **Impact factor and rank in citation hierarchies** per discipline and research specialty. The study of such indicators is a valuable tool to answer questions about the relative weight of European SSH production in relation to national, international and American publications.

- **Journal authors** can also be studied. Their geographical distribution gives an indication of the scale and form of the Europeanization of journals themselves, and of national fields. Careful qualitative analysis must then determine whether this unequal distribution is linked to the journal’s intellectual orientation, to the uneven and asymmetrical development of disciplines across countries, etc.

- **Topics, methods and case studies published in journals.** Like the topics covered by international congresses, the themes, methods, and case studies that get published in international journals provide an indication of the role played by these journals in the transnational circulation of ideas and the international power relations between different intellectual factions (Boncourt 2008).

### 3.3 Book Translations

The translation of SSH books is an important aspect of the international circulation of knowledge and the accumulation of prestige. Although translation is not a necessary condition for the international circulation of ideas, since a text can be read in the original language as well, and it is not a sufficient condition either, since translation does not necessarily mean appropriation by the scientific community, translation flows are nonetheless a good measure of the unequal circulation of texts (Heilbron and Sapiro 2016). Book translations are also an indicator of the broader interest in a scholarly work, beyond the community of specialists, since a publisher is ready to invest in this costly operation. This is why translation is also an indicator of recognition and thus of symbolic capital for a researcher, as well as a measure of the impact of SSH on society.

Possible Indicators:

- **Translation flows between languages and countries.** Measuring the flows require the construction of reliable databases. Diverse sources exist, though they all need to be checked, sorted out, completed and recoded.
The UNESCO database Index Translationum is the only online database that lists translations from and to all languages since 1979, but it presents some disadvantages: the target country is mentioned, but not the source country (the language is the only given variable); the reliability of the data depends on the quality of national libraries, which is very unequal across countries; the disciplines are not coded separately but in broader categories of “subjects” (“Philosophy, Psychology”, “Law, Social Sciences and Education”, “History, Geography, Biographies”), which do not only include scholarship but also textbooks, touristic guides, biographies and other more commercial types of products. This data thus needs to be sorted out. Furthermore, the UNESCO decided to stop supplying the database, the last year for which data is available being 2008.

National libraries databases can be used to check the data but they seldom allow to sort translated books separately, or to select the source language. Professional databases for bookstores such as the French database Electre have proved much more adequate for the purpose of listing books of SSH translated into French, though it is reliable from 1985 onwards. The variables include source language, source country (though not totally reliable for English), date of publication, publisher in France, and the discipline (Dewey code). Some data has already been collected from this database in a previous research project, for eleven languages and from 1985 to 2002 (Sapiro and Popa 2008). This could be completed to include more languages and more recent time periods. The Argentinian book trade association also provides data on translations.

Some official databases are available: the Centre National du Livre (CNL), affiliated with the French Ministry of Culture, lists translations to which a funding has been granted. It enabled an analysis of the 424 books translated from French into English (US and UK) from 2002 to 2012 which were allocated this aid. The Bureau du Livre Français in diverse countries has also begun building databases. Though incomplete, these databases encompass more translations than the CNL base. Despite their being incomplete, all these official databases present some advantages compared to the other sources: they list not only the publisher in the target country but also the French publisher. This information allows a study of the concentration of translation flows per source publisher and a network analysis of relationships between publishers; it also provides the date of publication of the original book, which allows to calculate the average time-lag for translations to be published. The ratios of flows between countries can be measured based on two sources: the UNESCO database and the statistics provided by the Syndicat National de l’Edition regarding the exchange between French publishers and their foreign homologues. The latter source is restricted to the selling and acquisition of books under copyright (thus excluding the classics) and is incomplete since it depends of the publishers declaration, but has the advantage of showing exchange patterns for contemporary production in the SSH (which constitutes a distinct variable).

- Relative weight of SSH book translations in the book production per country or language group.
  This indicator serves to assess the fluctuations of the market and the relative autonomy of the SSH. To be relevant, this indicator needs to combine two ratios: the ratio of translations in the SSH production of the country per year or period; the ratio of the SSH production in the overall book production. Though the second ratio is usually available in national statistics (for instance those produced by the Syndicat National de l’Edition in France), the first one is much more difficult to obtain, since national statistics seldom differentiate translations.

- The place of SSH translations within these (supra)national publishing fields.
  The place of SSH translations in the national or supranational publishing field varies according to various factors: the position of the language and country in the global market of translations (the dominant languages and countries export many more translations than they import, see Heilbron 1999; 2002); the position of the national disciplinary field in the international disciplinary field (for instance, German and French philosophy occupy a dominant position in this international disciplinary field); the presence of the SSH in
general publishing (as in France, Germany, Italy and Argentina) or its being confined to academic publishing; the visibility of the SSH in the media (which is related to its presence in general publishing but also to the role academics play as experts); political interest in the SSH.\(^6\) Central countries within large linguistic areas usually translate much more than peripheral countries, which partly depend on the former for access to the international scene. Yet in some cases, like Argentina, translating SSH books is a way to counter the domination of Spanish publishers, interested in more profitable categories of books, and to position themselves in the Hispanic area.

- **Intermediaries in the translation process.**
  The circulation of books in translation involves a chain of cooperation among diverse groups of intermediaries: publishers, editors, directors of book series, agents, scouts, academic advisors, referees, translators, state representatives. The role of these actors varies according to several variables: the location of the SSH in general and/or academic publishing; the place of academic publishing in the country or linguistic area; the place and importance of translations in the country or linguistic area (this variable refers to the previous indicator); the social recruitment of translators (professional vs academic). The identification of the main actors in the transfer could help to build networks of intermediaries and compare translation policies of different publishers in the same country (using their catalogues) or of publishers belonging to different countries (central vs (semi)peripheral).

- **Obstacles to the translation of SSH books.**
  Obstacles to the translation of SSH books are of three kinds: economic (the costs of translation), political (censorship) and cultural (Sapiro 2012). The latter category encompasses various aspects such as publishing traditions, linguistic skills, academic traditions, social representations of the “other”, and so on. These obstacles vary across countries and thus require a qualitative study. An interesting perspective would be to study the obstacle to translation from (semi)peripheral countries in the book markets of central countries. The quantitative analysis of translation flows reveals unequal patterns of circulation across countries (Heilbron 1999). This is also true of the specific market of SSH books. This situation is not the simple reflection of the book production in the different countries but is the result of economic, political and cultural factors that need to be identified, using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods.

- **Funding and aids.**
  Among the intermediaries, State representatives often play an important part in the circulation of books in the SSH, by covering part of the translation costs, which are, as mentioned above, a major obstacle to the international circulation of books. These policies need to be systematically mapped. Governmental funding is usually devoted to support the export of the output of researchers working in their countries. In some countries, there exist (or existed) programmes for supporting the translation of classical works from other languages. It is less frequent to find aids to the importation of contemporary works in translation. The French CNL provides such a support to some projects after selection. The EU also funds translations through the Framework Programmes supporting research projects. Data about this indirect funding of translations is not available and would need to be collected (Sapiro 2009b).

- **Distribution and characteristics of most translated SSH authors.**
  Databases of the translated books of the most translated authors in the SSH can be constructed in order to analyze the evolution of the number of translations per language and country and the average time-lag for different books, as has already been done in the case of Pierre Bourdieu (Sapiro and Bustamante 2009). A comparison of these results among several authors from different countries could provide a view of the circulation patterns of books in translation in the SSH.

\(^6\) For an example of the political use of translation, see Hauchecorne (2009).
• **Reception of translated books and authors in the target culture (interpretation and impact).** Reviews and citations in scientific journals provide a measure for studying the impact of translated books. Whereas citations can be extracted from databases like the Web of Science, the reviews need to be collected from publishers, agents or from the authors themselves and require a qualitative analysis. Some relevant case-studies must first be identified. A more thorough investigation could include a study of the “importators” (Joly 2012).

### 3.4. Transnational Co-Authorship

Information about co-authorship of scholars who work in different countries is provided in most SSH journals and part of the standard information stored in bibliometric databases like the Web of Science. This, first, allows analyzing trends in transnational collaboration. The growth or decline of transnational co-authorship is an interesting indicator of increasing or decreasing internationalization. Transnational co-authorship, secondly, allows a more refined understanding of collaborative structures. Patterns of collaboration reveal, for example, that some countries, institutions and authors are more central, while others have a (semi)peripheral position in networks of co-authorship (Gingras and Heilbron 2009; Gingras and Mosbah-Natanson 2010; Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014).

**Possible Indicators:**

- **Development of transnational co-authorship in SSH overall.** How has transnational co-authorship in the social sciences and the humanities evolved since 1980? Special attention will have to be paid to how co-authorships between the US and European countries have evolved?
- **Development of transnational authorship in SSH in the social sciences and the humanities separately.** How do the social sciences compare to the humanities (1980-present)?
- **Development of transnational authorship per discipline.** Are there significant differences across disciplines: do some disciplines have higher levels of transnational co-authorship than others?
- **Development of transnational authorship per country:** are there significant differences across countries?

### 3.5. The Politics of Internationalization

States have traditionally pursued policies to export knowledge to their colonies and other countries, and to import knowledge from what they perceive as the most advanced scientific centers. In the course of the twentieth century private foundations like the Rockefeller and the Ford Foundation acquired a major role in the development of international scholarly exchange as well, and, especially after the Second World War, they were joined by international organizations like UNESCO and by intergovernmental institutions such as the European Union.

A particularly salient example of the policies of SSH internationalization is the policy of the European Union, which has developed in a relatively short period of time, roughly since the beginning of the 1990s, and today represents a structuring factor of considerable importance in all national SSH fields in Europe (Heilbron 2009, 2014a; Kastrinos 2010; Kovács and Kutsar 2010; Kuhn and Remøe 2005).
Possible Indicators:

- Development of funding, research priorities, organizational forms and distribution by country and discipline in the successive European Framework Programs. The Framework Programs were the main source of funding for European SSH research between 1994 and 2013. Since they implied the collaboration of research groups of various countries, they have been a major source not only of research funding but also of European transnational exchange and collaboration.

- Development and distribution per country and discipline of SSH grants of the European Research Council (since 2007). Unlike the Framework Programs the grants of the European Research Council are made without criteria of policy relevance; they are targeted at ‘scientific excellence’ and depend more on the academic reputation of individual researchers.

- Development of European policy with regard to European data bases and data gathering like European social survey (see for example Aldrin 2010). Part of the European funding schemes are targeted at the SSH research infrastructure.

Although not yet very developed, it is worthwhile to consider examining the following domains:

- Development of European policy with regard to European research centers.
- Development of European policy with respect to doctoral education and graduate schools.

4. Areas of Inquiry

While the project pays special attention to Western Europe, it also situates this region in a global perspective by studying its changing relations with the global South, Eastern Europe, and Asia.

4.1. Changing Relations with the Global South

One of the crucial issues about internationalization is the North-South relation of which the case of Latin America is of particular interest. Some studies of international exchange programs in Brazil and Argentina and their impact on the SSH in these countries are already available (Beigel 2013, 2014a, 2014b; Abarzúa Curtoni 2016; Quesada 2016; Gallardo 2015), but need to be completed. Beside the international mobility of Latin Americans favored by national academic and scientific policies, it is possible to observe the mobility of European Researchers and students in Latin America, thanks to programs and policies such as ECOS-Sud and Hermès, and the presence of European institutions in the South.

Related to the political conditions of international exchange is the fact that political exile and migration due to major crises have had a profound impact on the academic and scientific conversion of researchers and academics in the South. Research carried out in this area must thus strive to integrate and compare the dynamics of internationalization generated by scientific and extra-scientific factors.

The detailed study of policies designed to develop the international mobility of scientists from the South provides the means to construct detailed geographies of these scholars’ circulation, as well as their interactions with European scientists, through travel and research projects. The knowledge of such exchange structures corrects simplistic views of one-way relationships (e.g. North-South, Center-Periphery). In the past 30 years there have been cases of peripheral countries that have become central in certain disciplines, as in the case of Argentina in psychoanalysis. Moreover, from
a global perspective, some developing countries such as Brazil have moved to a central position for
graduate training and have become a market place for scientists from Latin American and African
countries.

Possible Indicators (by national or regional institutions and by foreign or multilateral
institutions):

- Type of mobility policy: grants, project funding, exchange programs, etc.
- Morphology of the beneficiary population (disciplines, sex, age, etc.).
- Reception centers (cities, countries, continents) and kind of institution.
- Position of beneficiaries initially and after the mobility experience.

Since the international mobility of scientists has also been shaped by political and economic
conditions, it is necessary to integrate and weigh the relationship between this indicator and
scientific policies as not necessarily antagonistic factors to the autonomization or heteronomization
of SSH disciplines in the South. Two aspects are crucial in this respect:

- The migration of students, professors and researchers abroad due to political or economic
crises.
- The presence of European intellectuals and scientists as migrants in Southern countries.

4.2. Changing Relations with Eastern Europe

For assessing the changing relations with Eastern Europe, the case of Hungary has been selected. A
large number of secondary sources is taken into account to compensate for the weakness or (in
some fields) the lack of direct sources on transnational scholarly relations and the vicissitudes in
recent history of efforts of Hungarian SSH scholars to get integrated into the still fragile European
research area.

For the study of publication patterns various indicators and sources are used for the period
since 1945:

- The language of publication of SSH books (for every 5 years by topical areas), data from
  SSH scholars’ bibliographies and National Statistical Yearbooks since the 1970s
- Translation of books from foreign languages into Hungarian (idem)
- Publications in foreign languages of graduates of the Academy of Sciences (doctors and
  ‘candidates’) for each fifth year since the 1970s
- SSH books (over 100 pages) in foreign languages received by the Budapest Municipal
  Library (1960–2014) broken down by discipline and period
- Publication of Hungarian books into foreign languages received by the Budapest Municipal
  Library (1960–2014)
- Non-public translations and editions of foreign books in the SSH by the State run
  publishing House Kossuth: books distributed confidentially among members of the political

These data will be complemented by various statistical studies of Hungarian scholarly journals
based on the online edition of part or the whole of their published corpus. Different aspects of
foreign publications (language, place of publication, author) will be analyzed for both major
‘generalist’ periodicals and more specialized SSH journals.

- Identification of books and studies in foreign languages reviewed
- Identification of places of publication of foreign books reviewed
• Identification of cities and countries referred to in the corpus of texts (with frequencies over time)
• Identification of the main foreign authors referred to in the corpus of texts

In addition to data pertaining to the reception of foreign work in Hungary, several indicators will be used to study the presence of Hungarian scholars abroad.

• linguistic competences and the experience of studies abroad of SSH students and staff (sources: Who is Who-s published after 1989; 2010 survey of university graduates; the ‘microcensus’ of 1/10 of the 2001 and 2011 nationwide population censuses (including references to university graduates born abroad)
• Foreign and Hungarian public distinctions for SSH scholars (prizes, medals, etc.)
• Publications in foreign journals as mentioned in the bibliography of Hungarian SSH scholars by disciplines and time periods
• Presence of the most reputed SSH scholars in Hungarian as well as in non-Hungarian encyclopedia’s (Brockhaus, British Encyclopedia, several Romanian and Hungarian encyclopedia published since 1945)
• Special study of emigration (as signalled by places of death abroad) of SSH ‘reputational elites’ from several Eastern and Central European countries cited in various encyclopedia and biographical dictionaries.

4.3. Changing Relations with Asia

Assessing the internationalization of the social sciences in South Korea and Japan has become an important question due to the growing role Asia is playing in the global academic field (Barshay 2004; Kim 2009; Sasaki 2011; Shin with Sang-jin 2010). Methodologically speaking, this does not call for tools very different from the ones used to grasp these very circulations in the American or European contexts. Indeed the Asian scientific spaces can be easily compared with their Western counterparts for several reasons: Asian scholars set up universities based on the German model at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries; they imported European (and later American) disciplines and references, and they also sent numerous scholars to the West. They have, furthermore, developed encompassing statistical apparatus that make sound international comparisons possible. This makes it possible to easily collect various data. For instance, the international circulation of students can be accurately described, with the Korean Ministry for Higher Education maintaining a database with the universities from which countries Korean scholars have obtained their PhD, It shows the undisputed influence of American universities. It is also possible to trace back the translation and diffusion of scientific concepts in each of these nations (as with Bourdieu’s habitus, the early Japanese transliteration of which as ハビトウス and its recent occurrences appear in bibliographical and statistical databases). Yet it should be noted that international data systems, such as the Web of Science, provide a very incomplete view of the situation outside of the West and especially outside of the English-speaking world, even in Japan and South Korea where the referencing has been made with great accuracy. To bypass this obstacle, it is necessary to complement the statistical analysis with qualitative and empirical information coming from fieldwork. A prosopography of the scholars and translators, for instance, allow for a better understanding of their positions, as well as of the structural oppositions between local universities or publishing houses. This is crucial to better assess how Korean and Japanese scholars have used Western references. If the American social sciences are statistically dominating, then, the European ones remain in a strong position. This is because the latter have a political and critical dimension that only a more refined empirical analysis of the academic field could reveal.
Conclusion

As emphasized in the introduction to this paper, the indicators listed here are by construction insufficient to fully grasp all of the multiple and complex layers of the internationalization of the social sciences and humanities. More exhaustive and systematic inventories would have to pay closer attention to, for example, scientific migrations, the national and international structures of scientific labor markets, and the diffusion of paradigms, theories, and methods. Any such inventory would, however, have to accept that some dimensions of internationalization processes in the SSH remain by nature intangible: the incremental circulation of knowledge in international conferences, the socialization of scientists in such international settings, the emergence and disappearance of informal transnational networks, the diffusion of ideas in routine transnational correspondence, etc., are all dynamics that leave little objective traces for the observer.

In spite of these limitations, the indicators listed in this paper cover key aspects of the internationalization of SSH: they provide valuable insight into power relationships between national scientific fields and languages, the influence of political factors on transnational scientific development, and the diffusion of scientific ideas. They are also, to a certain extent, relevant for understanding internationalization processes in other social spheres. Similar data may of course be gathered to study the internationalization of the natural sciences, which has also been structured by international scientific organizations and journals, transnational coauthorships, citation networks, and science policies designed to foster the transnational mobility of researchers and ideas. Beyond scientific fields, the internationalization of other types of professions has also been fuelled by the development of international professional associations, changes in national and international regulations, the translation of key documents, and the transfer of professional norms (Allsop et al. 2009). Internationalization in these other professional spheres retains, of course, specific dimensions—such as, in the natural sciences, the forms of internationalization associated with scientific expeditions and the setting up of major scientific facilities (Schulte Fishedick and Shinn 1993, Simoulin 2016) and, in other professional fields, the circulation dynamics linked to the globalization of markets, and the existence of international units of employments, such as multinational firms and international organizations (Boncourt 2016b, Faulconbridge and Muzio 2012, Hooghe 2005)—but it still relies partly on mechanisms common to many internationalizing professions.
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