



HAL
open science

European Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) in a Global Context Preliminary findings from the INTERCO-SSH Project

Johan Heilbron, Thibaud Boncourt, Rafael Schögler, Gisèle Sapiro

► **To cite this version:**

Johan Heilbron, Thibaud Boncourt, Rafael Schögler, Gisèle Sapiro. European Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) in a Global Context Preliminary findings from the INTERCO-SSH Project. 2017. halshs-01659607

HAL Id: halshs-01659607

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01659607>

Submitted on 8 Dec 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

European Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) in a Global Context

Preliminary findings from the INTERCO-SSH Project¹

Johan Heilbron, Thibaud Boncourt, Rafael Schögler, Gisèle Sapiro

February 2017

1) The SSH form an increasingly global field of research and training

As documented by reports like the UNESCO *World Social Science Report* (2010), the social sciences and humanities (SSH) are today practiced in virtually all regions and countries in the world. The basic units of this global field are the *SSH disciplines* as they are practiced in national academic systems worldwide.

Not only have the SSH spread across the globe, the production of SSH articles and books has over the past decades increased considerably almost everywhere (the Russian Federation being the only exception).

Transnational exchange and collaboration have, furthermore, become more frequent and more significant almost everywhere as well. In all regions, the share of self-citations has gone down: references to producers in the same region have diminished, references to producers outside of the region have increased. This is the case especially in Asia, Africa and Latin America, but a slight decrease of self-citations has also occurred in the dominant regions of North America and Europe (Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014). Most international SSH professional associations, which used to be centered on Europe and North America, have diversified their membership, and have now held congresses on all continents (Boncourt, forthcoming).

English has become the lingua franca in the social sciences. In the 1950s and 1960s nearly half of the publications registered in the *International Bibliography of the Social Sciences* were in English; by 2005 this share had gone up to over 75 %. The proportion of all other languages declined – the most important of them, German and French, to a level of about 7 % each (Ammon 2010; De Swaan 2001a, b). As a medium for international communication no other language can compete with English.

At the same time national languages as well as local and national publication practices subsist. Research into the specificities of local and national developments has retained its value, since the functioning, consequences, and meanings of social mechanisms depend much more on the context in which they operate than is the case in most of the natural sciences. Patterns of internationalization in the SSH therefore differ from internationalization in the natural sciences (Heilbron, Sorá, Boncourt eds. Forthcoming).

2) Western dominance exhibits a duopolistic structure

The predominant characteristic of this increasingly global SSH field is its *core-periphery structure*. The research capacity and research output are concentrated in a relatively small number of core countries. North America (United States and Canada) and Europe together produce more than 80 % of articles registered in the world's leading Citation Indexes (Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014).

Together North America and Europe account for about three quarters of the registered world's social science journals. Four countries only (US, UK, Germany, Netherlands) publish two-thirds of the registered social science journals (Gingras and Mosbah-Natanson 2010).

Bibliometric studies have shown that the SSH as academic institutions have spread to almost all countries and regions in the world, but that beyond the global presence and general growth of SSH, globalization of research has mostly favored the already dominant regions of North America and Europe. The autonomy of the other regions has diminished and their dependence on the dominant centers, North America and Europe, has increased (Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014).

When in addition to publications, prestige is taken into account (citations, prizes), the global distribution becomes even more uneven. The most cited social scientists nearly all work in North America and Europe. In the year 2007, 37 scholars in the SSH were cited more than 500 times. Some of these citation stars are classical authors (Kant, Marx, Freud, Weber, Durkheim). Most of them, however, produced their work after the Second World War. With a single exception – Edward Said – all are from western countries.² The same applies to the winners of international prizes like the 'Nobel Prize' for economics, the Amalfi Prize for sociology and the social sciences, and the Holberg Prize for the human and social sciences of the Norwegian Parliament. Among the more than 70 laureates of the 'Nobel prize' in economics so far, only one was born outside of the western hemisphere: Amartya Sen. The Amalfi and Holberg Prizes have been an exclusively European-North American affair.

The globalizing field of the SSH is thus strongly dominated by "Western" countries displaying a duopolistic structure, with a North American-European core, various semi-peripheral and multiple peripheral countries (Heilbron 2014b).

3) Globalization and transnational regionalization

On the basis of existing studies it can be argued that the most remarkable institutional change in the internationalization of the SSH has not so much occurred at the global, but rather at the transnational regional level, i.e. at the level between that of national states and the global field (Heilbron 2014 a, b). The UNESCO *World Social Science Report*, for example, provides brief but suggestive information about such transnational regional structures in Africa, Asia, Europe, and Latin America. These include research councils like the Arab Council for the Social Sciences (ACSS), the Association of Asian Social Science Research Councils (AASSREC), Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLASCO), and the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA).


The global field of the SSH can thus be seen as a core-periphery structure on four levels (Heilbron 2014 a, b). In addition to the local and national level, transnational regional as well as global structures have gained increasing importance.

While these transnational regional initiatives on a continental scale (research councils, professional associations, journals, data bases) have developed in most parts of the world, Europe represents the most advanced case of this process.


4) Increasing global presence of European SSH

The most significant change during the past three decades globally is in all likelihood that Europe has significantly increased its centrality in terms of articles and citations. It currently has a position that in terms of output seems more or less comparable to that of the United States (see Figures 1 and 2). The share of social science articles in the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) that are produced in Europe (European Union member states plus countries like Norway and Switzerland) has risen most strongly. The only other region with a substantial increase is Asia, but its production is much smaller than that of Europe. As consequence of the growth of Europe and, to a lesser extent Asia, the proportion of articles produced in North America has decreased (Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014).

Figure 1: Production of social sciences publications by region



Source: Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras (2014)

Figure 2: Proportion of social sciences publications production by region

Note: The sum of the percentages given is superior to a hundred, because some articles are produced by authors from more than one region, see Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras (2014).

5) European science policy as a factor of SSH growth

The transnational regionalization of research in the SSH is also reflected in specific EU research policies. Two strands of research policies entailing the SSH are particularly relevant. First, since 1994 collaborative research projects with predefined thematic foci within SSH research areas are being funded through the services of the European Commission, and second, with the creation of the European Research Council (ERC) in 2007, research that is independent of specific policy objectives has also found its place on the European level. The former only account for a minor percentage of overall EU research funding (Table 1), however, they have contributed to forming novel collaboration practices amongst SSH researchers, research institutions and national funding bodies throughout Europe and beyond. The latter increasingly becomes a relevant factor in defining research “excellence.”

EU research funding schemes are bundled in so-called “framework programmes” (FPs), which comprise a multiannual budget and define funding instruments as well as strategic priorities. The overall legitimization of EU research policy currently lies within the Union’s innovation policy, which since the Lisbon strategy (2000), is directed towards developing a knowledge-intensive economy. Within these FPs specific programmes are directed towards funding research on a thematic or “mission-oriented” basis. The scheme relies on funding international collaborative research consortia selected through a call for proposals, which provides preliminary restrictions on methodological and thematic aspects. These “mission-oriented” research programmes in the SSH were developed to provide European policy-makers with expert knowledge on European matters of social, economic and technical relevance. See the ex-post evaluation of FP7 for further evidence on that matter (European Commission 2016).

One novel form of collaboration emerged through the establishment of a rather complex negotiation process leading to new framework programmes and used to define thematic priorities and the texts used for calls for project proposals. In the domain of the SSH this triggered debates among interested SSH-researchers, certain academic associations, and funding institutions. The engagement with topics, budgets, and the functioning of funding instruments led to the creation of new actors specializing in these issues. This is manifest for example in the creation – and/or reshaping – of associations and coalitions such as the European Alliance for the Social Sciences (EASSH), or the Initiative for Science in Europe (ISE) but also the efforts of the network of national contact points, Net4Society. Individual SSH researchers have also participated actively in answering consultations, and taking part in workshops and conferences related to EU research policy (see Table 1 for a list of consultations that took place during the preparation phase of the EU funding scheme for the 2014-2020 period, named “Horizon 2020”). Also, SSH researchers are involved in various official Expert Advisory Groups that help to assist the European Commission in shaping EU research policy from a micro to a macro level, i.e. from the call texts to the grand lines of argument used to organize the multiannual programmes.

Table 1: Horizon 2020 (selected) consultations

Consultation name/topic	n	Scope
Consultation on Green Paper – towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU research and innovation funding (February-May 2011)	1,303	Academia, industry, others
Stakeholder meeting on a Common Strategic Framework for EU research and innovation funding (March 2011)	-	
You name it! (March-May 2011)	-	Wide; finding name for programme
Conference on the Common Strategic Framework for EU research and innovation funding (June 2011)	-	
Stakeholder workshop: Towards more inclusive, innovative and secure societies challenge (SSH priority) (June 2011)	60	Academia
Workshop with Member States and Associated States: Towards more inclusive, innovative and secure societies challenge (SSH priority) (July 2011)	-	National delegates
Consultation on the ERA Framework: Areas of untapped potential for the development of the European Research Area (ERA) (September-November 2011)	590	Academia, industry, others
ERAC Stakeholders’ Seminar (September 2011)	-	Academia
Consultation on the state of the Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities (SSH) in Europe (April-July 2013)	306	Academia, funding institutions
Horizons for Social Sciences and Humanities; Vilnius (September 2013)	445	Academia, EU and national policy-makers

Source: INTERCO-SSH database (Schögler)

Within the boundaries of the thematic programs of the various Framework Programmes, the SSH increased their relative importance from FP4 to FP7. This is, however, maybe not so much the result of an active SSH research policy but rather a consequence of the diversification of funding instruments, such as the ERC and the Infrastructure program. Under Horizon 2020 the situation has become more complex. Although the official budget for the section including SSH research projects looks considerably larger than any previous SSH program (1309 million EUR for Societal Challenge 6 called “Inclusive, Innovative and Reflective Societies”), this budget actually covers many different research programs beyond SSH research. This is the first time since FP4 that the SSH do not have a specific thematic research program and this remains a specific political situation if one considers that all other thematic programs, such as health, energy or transport, have been maintained between FP7 and Horizon 2020. According to the work programmes 2014-2017, the budget allocated to “standard” SSH topics under Societal Challenge 6 for the first four years was 242.5 million Euro³. Extrapolated to the whole period of Horizon 2020, it means that the budget allocated to SSH collaborative research would be around 424 million Euro, considerably below the 623 million Euro allocated to Theme 8 of FP7. This means that the remaining budget of Societal Challenge 6 is used for other actions such as COST, ICT, international cooperation and different kinds of innovation programs. At the same time SSH research continues to be supported by Marie Curie actions (individual or network training) and most importantly by the European Research Council. The latter devotes 17% of its budget to SSH research.

Cutting the budget for SSH thematic research to about 0.55% of the overall funds made available in Horizon 2020 is a strong indication for a lack of trust by European policy-makers in this kind of research funding. This stands in contrast to reports showing that the rate of rejected – qualitatively high – projects is comparatively high in the SSH, which would justify keeping or even increasing funding of this kind of SSH research (see for example Fresco, Martinuzzi, Wiman et al. 2015, 25).

Table 2: SSH budget share of overall budget and of thematic priorities budget.

	FP-budget (in million ECU/EUR, current prices)	Thematic Priority Budget	SSH-thematic priority (in million ECU/EUR)		% budget for thematic priorities	% of budget for SSH priority		% of thematic priority budget for SSH priority	
FP4 1994-1998	13,215	10,946	147		82.83%	1.11%		1.34%	
FP5 1998–2002	14,960	11,987	165		80.13%	1.10%		1.38%	
FP6 2002–2006	19,256	13,316	247	335*	69.15%	1.28%	1.74%*	1.85%	2.52%*
FP7 2007–2013	55,806	32,743	623	953*	58.67%	1.12%	1.71%*	1.90%	2.91%*
Horizon 2020	77,028	29,700	1309 (424)	1771*	38.56%	1.7%	2.23%*	4.40%	5.96%*


* including Science in/and Society actions. These actions are specifically directed towards framing research in the fields of science & technology. Nevertheless, this kind of research is primarily undertaken by SSH researchers.

Source: INTERCO-SSH database (Schögler)

Collaboration of researchers and institutions within the thematic, collaborative projects is best depicted by the number of participating partner institutions per project. The number of funded projects fluctuated between 160 and roughly 250 per Framework Programme (Figure 3), the average number of partners between six and fourteen (Figure 4). As mentioned above these partner institutions are dispersed throughout the EU and partnering countries within each project. The total number of SSH researchers involved in mission-oriented SSH projects fluctuated between one thousand in the 'FP6' programme and two thousand in the 'FP7' programme. The peak in the average number of partner institutions in FP6 is related to the funding of so-called networks of excellence. These networks were set up to start or support the integration of specific fields of research with the aim of achieving such a high level of integration that these networks would persist after funding had ended.⁴ The use of this funding instrument was heavily restricted in FP7. On a more general note patterns of collaboration in FP7 show that the participation of new member states is particularly high in the SSH domain (Fresco, Martinuzzi, Wiman et al. 2015, 35) compared to other thematic parts of the programme and especially the European Research Council.

The marginalization of the SSH in mission-oriented funding programmes is partially countered by other forms of support on the EU level. Within broader funding schemes SSH research continues to be supported by researcher bound programmes such as the Marie Curie actions and, most importantly, the European Research Council (ERC). Between 15 and 17% of the budget of the ERC is allocated to the SSH. In absolute terms this results to about 120 million EUR per year. Compared to other fields, however, the ratio of 'researchers/grants allocated' remains negative (see Hönig forthcoming). In terms of collaboration practices the functioning of the ERC also entails other consequences than the mission-oriented funding programmes. ERC funds are allocated to an individual based on the criterion of 'excellence', whereas funding of collaborative research projects includes other criteria such as a certain number of – geographically diverse – partners or the adherence to the topic defined in the call for proposals. This thrive for excellence reproduces certain established patterns of renown. In the first five years (2007-2011) 63% of grants were transferred to the UK, the Netherlands and France. Adding Germany and Italy to that list results in a concentration of 84% of grants received by five host countries (see Hönig forthcoming). On the level of host institutions this picture is replicated, where places such as the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge or the Max Planck Society dominate the rankings of host institutions (see for example annual report for 2015).⁵ Collaborative research projects do not attract the attention of these research-intensive institutions to such a great extent (although they are also strongly represented as partnering institutions; see König/Schögler forthcoming).

Figure 3. Number of European “Framework” projects in SSH targeted funding programmes



Source: INTERCO-SSH database (Schögler), data provided by CORDIS

TSER = Targeted Socio-Economic Research


FP5-HUMAN POTENTIAL = Improving the Human Research Potential and the Socio-Economic Knowledge-Base

FP6-CITIZENS = Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge-based Society

FP6-SOCIETY = Science in Society

FP7-SIS = Science and Society

FP7 SSH = Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities

Figure 4. Number of partners per FP project

Source: INTERCO-SSH database (Schögler), data provided by CORDIS (FP7 is incomplete).

SSH funding through mission-oriented, collaborative research projects has had an impact on the disciplinary development and research practices of SSH research in Europe. The decrease in funding or even the disappearance of thematic, truly European collaborative SSH research may thus have the following consequences:

- The interaction between policy-makers and SSH researchers on SSH research related matters may decrease, notably in key European policies such as migration, security, youth, unemployment, new growth, education, but also for fundamental political principles of the EU, such as, human rights, democracy, a free economy, equality and freedom, due to a lack of advisory groups, SSH specific consultation efforts and last but not least a lack of SSH specific projects, project-reports and policy-briefs. The importance of cross-disciplinary, international research on European issues in the SSH may decrease. The calls for proposals were an incentive for several groups of researchers to draft project ideas. As a consequence, for every funded project several project proposals were prepared that may have received (partial) funding elsewhere.
- The selection criteria of collaborative projects guaranteed the participation of peripheral European countries, which are underrepresented in ERC programs.⁶ The possibility to include Southern non-European countries also provides an opportunity to slightly correct the North-South inequalities in the production and circulation of knowledge. The ex-post evaluation of the 7th EU Framework Programme (Fresco, Martinuzzi, Wiman et al. 2015) shows that participation of new member states in FP7 were relatively high in the thematic, collaborative research programme dedicated to the SSH. In contrast to that the ERC did not fund many proposals of individuals from these countries nor did it receive a proportionate amount of proposals.
- By the same token, the selection criteria of collaborative projects guaranteed the participation of peripheral and semi-peripheral institutions. Merely “excellence” driven funds, such as those provided by the ERC, are more difficult to direct towards such institutions. Thus, acquiring funds for international collaboration may become increasingly difficult for less research-intensive areas of Europe and their institutions.

- As a consequence of decreased funding and integration of peripheral and semi-peripheral institutions it may become even more difficult for young researchers that have not been trained at renowned institutions to integrate into the international academic field. Usually collaborative projects consist of a small number of senior researchers coordinating the efforts and a large number of young researchers involved in the project in one way or another. Especially for young researchers from less well connected institutions these collaborative networks provide easy access into an international network of established researchers working in a specific field of interest. This is true for full projects members as much as for associated researchers. In other words, researchers and students of “elite” institutions might not suffer from a disappearance of collaborative projects but their less central counterparts most certainly would.
- The very existence of thematic priorities, policy-papers discussing these priorities and work programs defining more specific calls for projects have sparked a reflection on what SSH research is, what topics are relevant, what the function of SSH research can be for the European construct. Thematic priorities are visible, easy to communicate and in some cases, controversial. This makes their very existence important for the internationalization of SSH research. The lack of mission-oriented research will impact the interest of associations, individual researchers and maybe even national funding bodies.
- The last impact of a disappearance of thematic programs for the SSH is hypothetical and would need further research to be argued strongly. As several studies show, most leading journals in the social sciences (but also in parts in the humanities) are based in the USA and thus have a strong bias towards US-American developments (theoretical, methodological but also concerning the content). Collaborative EU projects – by their very nature – focus on European issues and interests, thus functioning as a driver for European-centered research contributing in building a counter balance to the dominance of US-American research institutions (journals, databases, associations, Universities etc.) in the global academic field.

6) SSH journals in Europe


Part of the above-mentioned growth in European SSH articles is related to the absolute and relative growth of SSH journals in Europe. Whereas more social science journals (without the humanities) were registered in North America (US and Canada) during the years 1980-1989, journals published in Europe now seem to outnumber those produced in North America (51.5 % against 36.5 % for the years 2000-2009) (Table 3).

Table 3: Geographical origins of social science journals in the WOS / SSCI database (1980-2009)

Journals	1980-1989		1990-1999		2000-2009	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
North America	375	49.7%	399	48.5%	398	36.5%
Europe	308	40.8%	365	44.4%	561	51.5%
Asia	31	4.1%	21	2.6%	46	4.2%
Oceania	17	2.3%	17	2.1%	27	2.5%
International	12	1.6%	10	1.2%	11	1.0%
Latin America	8	1.1%	5	0.6%	31	2.8%
Africa	3	0.4%	4	0.5%	12	1.1%
CIS	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	3	0.3%

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 this journal growth includes journals that specifically use the adjective ‘European’ in their title or subtitle. Since the 1980s the number of these ‘European’ SSH journals (including the humanities) has increased. This growth was particularly strong in the 1990s, i.e. after the fall of the Berlin wall and the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, but it has continued on a slightly lower level after 2000 (Figure 5).

Figure 5: Number of newly created ‘European’ journals in SSH in the English language (1920-2013)

Source: INTERCO-SSH database (Bedecarré-Heilbron).

7) European SSH Associations

Key aspects of the development of European SSH are linked to the creation of regional disciplinary organizations. These developments are not, however, evenly distributed across disciplines: while such associations have been created in all the social sciences (e.g. the European Economics Association, the European Consortium for Political Research, etc.), European groupings in the humanities have mostly been founded on a subdisciplinary level (e.g. the European Association for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies, the European Association for the Study of Literature, Culture, and the Environment, the European Network for Comparative Literary Studies, etc.).

In the social sciences, global disciplinary associations came first and were created under the auspices of UNESCO in the late 1940s and early 1950s (Tables 4 and 5). European-wide organizations were created only from the 1960s onwards with some variation across disciplines. The European Association for Experimental Social Psychology was founded in 1966, while the first European sociology organization was created only in 1991. Some disciplines number one association (economics, anthropology, psychology) and others up to three (political science). The creation of these organizations appears to have often been stimulated by the actions of philanthropic foundations (mostly in the 1960s and 1970s) and the European Union (mostly in the 1990s). These developments signal a clear Europeanization of the social sciences (Boncourt 2016).

Membership of the European organizations has increased spectacularly over the years and has also become more diversified. While they were all founded in Western Europe, they all sought to attract members from Eastern European countries after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Some associations have also set out to establish trans-regional bridges by admitting members from other continents – mostly North America (see Figure 6).

Table 4. Creation of main international and European social science organizations (1930-2014)

	Pol. sci.	Socio.	Econ.	Anthrop.	Psycho.
1930-1939			ES (30)		
1940-1949					
	IPSA (49)	ISA (49)		IUAES (48)	
1950-1959			IEA (50)		IUPsyS (50)
1960-1969					EAESP (66)
1970-1979	ECPR (70)				
1980-1989			EEA (84)		
				EASA (89)	
1990-1999		ECSR (91)			
	EpsNet (96)	ESA (92)			
2000-2009					
2010-...	EPSA (10)		WEA (11)		

Source: Database INTERCO-SSH (Boncourt)


Legend	
ECPR (70)	European organization
IPSA (49)	International organization

Table 5. Names and acronyms of international and European organizations

Acronym	Name
EASA	European Association of Social Anthropologists
EAESP	European Association of Experimental Social Psychology
ECPR	European Consortium for Political Research
ECSR	European Consortium for Sociological Research
EEA	European Economic Association
EPSA	European Political Science Association
EpsNet	European Political Science Network
ES	Econometric Society
ESA	European Sociological Association
IIS	International Institute of Sociology
IPSA	International Political Science Association
ISA	International Sociological Association
IUAES	International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences
IUPsyS	International Union of Psychological Science
WEA	World Economics Association

Source: Database INTERCO-SSH (Boncourt)

Figure 6. Geographical breakdown of the membership of European social science organizations in 2013 (percentages)



Source: Database INTERCO-SSH (Boncourt)

8) Patterns of Europeanization

These new institutional arrangements – funding programs, journals, professional associations – represented a widening range of opportunities for transnational collaboration. Articles registered by citation indexes indicate that transnational co-authorship in Europe in the SSH has gone up from about four percent of the registered articles in 1980 to 16 percent in 2006 (Gingras and Heilbron 2009).⁷ Considering the expanding European collaboration in more detail, three general patterns may be observed (Heilbron 2014b). The first concerns differences across countries, the second across disciplines, and a third pattern is related to the global context in which Europeanization takes place.

a) Country differences: the centrality of Britain

The degree to which countries participate in European research projects depends roughly on the size of their research system. Countries like the UK, Germany and France, which house the largest number of researchers and research institutes, profit most from European programmes. But among them the UK has a privileged position. Scholars who work in Britain – they need not have British nationality – have coordinated the largest number of European research projects, and they have been more often involved in such undertakings than scholars from any other country. Germany and France come in second and third place, before Italy and the Netherlands: of the 529 research projects funded by the three Frameworks programmes between 1994 and 2006, 110 were coordinated in the UK, 88 in Germany, 76 in France, 44 in Italy and 40 in the Netherlands (Kovács and Kutsar 2010: 107).

The leading role of the UK is even more apparent in networks of transnational co-authorships. British researchers have the most central position, a centrality that has increased slightly over the years (Gingras and Heilbron 2009). The predominant role of Britain is related to its linguistic advantage, to the related fact that the country houses many more international publishers and scholarly journals than any other European country, and to particular incentives for scholars in Britain to participate in European endeavors.

The weight of the UK is also visible in the case of European SSH associations, as most of these organizations were initially founded in Britain. The UK and Germany also appear to be systematically among the top three most represented countries in European associations (Table 6).

Table 6. Four most represented countries in each organization (2013)

EEA (econ.)	ECPR (pol. sci.)	EPSA (pol. sci.)	ECSR (socio.)	ESA (socio.)	EASP (psycho.)	EASA (anthropo.)
Germany	UK	United States	Germany	UK	Netherlands	UK
UK	Germany	UK	Netherlands	Germany	UK	Germany
United States	United States	Germany	UK	Italy	Germany	France
Italy	Italy	Suisse	Norway	Russia	Italy	Italy

Source: database INTERCO-SSH (Boncourt)


Although European networks are dominated by the largest countries, smaller countries, including those of Central and Eastern Europe, have become more involved as well. As a whole, the European research field in SSH has become larger, more inclusive, more dense as well as slightly more centralized.

b) Variation across disciplines: internationally vs. nationally oriented disciplines

European collaboration patterns vary across disciplines. Collaborative research is more frequent in the social sciences than in the humanities (history, languages, literature, etc.), where it is relatively rare and has a slower rate of increase than in the social sciences.⁸ In addition to the lower levels of co-authorship and the lack of European disciplinary associations, the humanistic disciplines are more strongly bound to national languages and national publication systems. Some of the differences between disciplines can be clarified by considering the example of the human sciences in France. On the basis of citation patterns in the leading journals, the human sciences can be compared along two dimensions: their degree of international openness (or closure) and their degree of openness (or closure) to other disciplines. The two dimensions can be visualized by a diagram in which seven disciplines are represented (see Figure 6)

The citation profile of the top journals in these disciplines indicates that there are three types of disciplines. In economics and management, and to a lesser extent political science, a high proportion of the cited literature is non-French, but cited articles tend to be restricted to the discipline in question. A high level of ‘international’ openness is thus accompanied by a high degree of disciplinary closure. Law has a strong monodisciplinary citation profile as well, but is, unlike economics and management, strongly oriented toward other national journals. Sociology represents a third type of discipline, since it combines a fairly pronounced national citation pattern with a high level of references to journals from other disciplines.

Figure 7. Degree of international and disciplinary openness of the SSH in France (1992-2001)



Source: INTERCO-SSH (Heilbron 2015b)

c) Intra-European and extra-European collaboration

The practices of collaboration and citation cannot be properly understood without taking the broader context into account. Here as in other domains, the most important factor to consider is the pre-eminent position of the US. Typically, more than two-thirds of the extra-European co-authorships in Europe are with North American scholars. While intra-European co-authorships have increased significantly, they have only grown at the same rate as co-authorships with scholars from the US. In other words, while European collaboration has become more frequent and more extensive, this growth is similar to the growth of collaboration between European and US scholars (Gingras and Heilbron 2009).

An assessment of the scholarly significance of European SSH journals provides a more nuanced picture. Citation patterns indicate that European collaboration is still relatively weak, not only in comparison with the supremacy of the US, but also with regard to the continuing importance of the national level. Returning to the case of a larger country such as France, the most cited journals in virtually all disciplines turn out to be either American or French, with few exceptions to this bi-national citation pattern.⁹ German, Italian or Spanish journals are rarely if ever among the most cited SSH periodicals in France, and roughly the same applies to journals that call themselves ‘international’ or ‘European’. These are still few in number and do not rank prominently in the citation hierarchies. In disciplines like philosophy, history and law, there is in France not a single ‘European’ title among the 50 most cited journals. In sociology and anthropology there is one explicitly called European journal among the 50 most cited; in political science and economics there are two (Heilbron and Bokobza 2015b).

European journals are also weakly represented in American journals’ citation charts. All fifty journals most cited by the two flagship journals of US sociology, the *American Journal of Sociology* and the *American Sociological Review*, are in English and the vast majority (88 %) consists of US journals, that is journals with a clear majority of editors working in the US (Heilbron 2009). The three journals among the top fifty that on the basis of their self-presentation can be considered ‘international’ invariably have strong links with the US. Three other journals among the top fifty most cited are non-American journals, but they are in the lower regions of the citation hierarchy: two are British (*British Journal of Sociology* and *Sociology* in 41st and 45th position), one is European: the *European Sociological Review* (36th position).

Although European journals, associations and networks have come to form a transnational European field of research and publication, it still appears to be relatively weak as compared to both the hegemony of the US and persisting national structures in the largest European countries.

9) Translation

The hegemony of English and Anglo-American journals would be less problematic if the most significant works published in other languages were regularly translated into English and published in Anglo-American journals. But the reality of translation and journal publication is a different one: translation flows tend to reproduce rather than correct the core-periphery structure. There are many more books translated *from* English than *into* English, whereas for all other languages the reverse holds true. About sixty percent of all book translations worldwide are made from English, while book translation into English represents two to three percent of the national book production in both the US and the UK, which is among the lowest translation rates in the world (Heilbron, Sapiro 2016). The practice of translation is in this respect similar to that of citations: the more central the scientific production of a nation or region is worldwide, the more it has a chance of being cited and translated, and the lower the translation or citation rate is *into* this language (Heilbron 1999, 2002).


Analyzing the annual data provided by the French Syndicat national de l'édition (publishers' union) on the number of contracts signed between French and foreign publishers for acquiring and selling translation rights of SSH books between 1997 and 2006 reveals this core-periphery structure and the uneven exchange patterns above mentioned. American hegemony is visible in the high number of acquisition contracts compared to the low number of selling contracts signed by French publishers with American publishers (see Figures 8 and 9). On the other hand, one can note the quasi-exclusion of the African continent from these exchanges, due to the dominance of the colonial languages and the weak development of academic publishing in African countries. However, Europe appears to be the core of the international academic book market: between 1997 and 2006, more than one half of the acquisition contracts (54%) and almost two thirds (60%) of the selling contracts signed by French publishers were with publishers located in Europe (Sapiro, 2009; for a study of the kind of SSH books translated into French between 1990 and 2003, see Sapiro and Popa, 2008 and Sapiro forthcoming).

Figure 8. Number of contracts signed by French publishers with foreign ones for acquiring the rights of SSH books, per country (1997-2006)



Source: Sapiro 2009: 292.

Figure 9. Number of contracts signed by French publishers with foreign ones for selling the rights of SSH books, per country (1997-2006)



Source: Sapiro 2009: 293

Looking at book translations in other linguistic pairs, like for example translations from German to French, the core-periphery distinction can be taken to another level. Book translations in the timespan of 2003-2013 between German and French show that mainly classical authors have several works being translated in this ten year period (Table 7; for the previous period, see Sapiro and Popa 2008). Also, the names of the authors provide us with a first indication that book translations – in this language pair – are primarily a tool for the circulation of ideas in more general and theoretical fields such as philosophy and sociology.

Table 7. Most translated book authors from German to French, 2003-2013

Author	N	Lifetime
Freud, Sigmund	9	1856-1939
Heidegger, Martin	8	1889-1976
Husserl, Edmund	7	1859-1938
Sloterdijk, Peter	6	1947-
Adorno, Theodor W.	5	1903-1969
Engels, Friedrich	5	1820-1895
Marx, Karl	5	1818-1883
Schmitt, Carl	5	1888-1985
Blumenberg, Hans	4	1920-1996
Luhmann, Niklas	4	1927-1998
Schelling, Friedrich W. J. von	4	1775-1854
Steiner, Rudolf	4	1861-1925
Arendt, Hannah	3	1906-1975
Beck, Ulrich	3	1944-2015
Honneth, Axel	3	1949-
Lukács, György	3	1885-1971
Mannheim, Karl	3	1893-1947
Simmel, Georg	3	1858-1918
Voegelin, Eric	3	1901-1985

Source: Database INTERCO-SSH, data provided by Electre (calculations Schögler)

10. Conclusions

The SSH form an increasingly global field of research and training. Research output has during the past three decades expanded considerably in almost every part of the world, transnational connections and collaborations have gained more weight, and English has become the lingua franca of international communication.

This globalizing field of the SSH is strongly dominated by Western countries in terms of research capacity and publication outlets, and even more so with regard to scholarly recognition and prestige (as measured by citations and prizes). At the global level the SSH display a duopolistic structure, with a North American-European core, various semi-peripheral and multiple peripheral regions and countries.

One of the most important changes in this global system has been the rise of Europe, which in terms of research output (articles, books) and research organizations (networks, journals, professional associations) is on a level that is roughly comparable to that of North America. In a relatively short period of time, mainly since the 1990s, a European infrastructure has emerged (funding programs, journals, professional associations) that has reshaped the research and publication process in the SSH in the region. The EC Framework programmes played a structuring role in fostering intra-European collaboration involving smaller countries and their institutions.

In the global context the rise of Europe represents a particular and often neglected form of internationalization, *transnational regionalization*, which - on a much lower level of activity - is observable for other major regions and continents as well; North America being the major exception to this global trend.

As a consequence of both 'globalization' and 'transnational regionalization,' research in the SSH forms a four level structure: in addition to the local and the national level, both the transnational regional and the global level have become significantly more important.

This multi-level structure is all the more important to take into account, since - unlike in most of the natural sciences - locally and nationally oriented SSH research has not lost its significance. Since the subject matter of the SSH is far more context dependent than in the natural sciences, research in the SSH will continue to take place and be published on the local and the national level as well.

The relationship between these different levels varies across disciplines and countries. The social sciences are more internationally oriented than the humanities (in term of citation practice, international co-authorship, and international research ventures). But within each group of disciplines the variation is considerable: some disciplines are more international (economics, management), others tend to be more nationally oriented (law, sociology). Smaller countries hosting less internationally renowned institutions, furthermore, tend to be more internationally oriented than large and scientifically dominant countries.

Transnational collaboration within Europe has increased significantly since 1980, but in several respects not more than transatlantic collaboration with scholars from North America. Within Europe collaborative networks are dominated by the largest countries, and in particular by the United Kingdom, which occupies the most central position. Smaller countries, however, including those of Central and Eastern Europe, have become more involved as well. As a whole,

the European SSH research field has since 1980 become larger, more inclusive, more dense as well as slightly more centralized.

Although European journals, associations and networks have come to form a transnational European field of research and publication, it still appears to be relatively weak as compared to both the hegemony of the US and persisting national structures in the largest European countries. So-called ‘European’ and ‘international journals,’ for example, have multiplied but are still relatively few in number as compared to national journals. With few exceptions, furthermore, they do not rank very high in the citation hierarchies, which tend to be dominated by American journals and by the most prestigious national journals in individual European countries.

National closure and the international hegemony of English and Anglo-American journals would be less problematic if the most significant works published in other languages were regularly translated into English and published in Anglo-American journals. But the reality of translation and journal publication is that translation flows tend to reproduce rather than correct the core-periphery structure. Many more books are translated from English than from any other language. Book translations, furthermore, tend to be concentrated in certain disciplines (philosophy, history, sociology), and are far more infrequent in most other disciplines. Europe, however, does appear to be the core of the international academic book market for SSH translations.

End Notes

¹ INTERCO-SSH, standing for “International Cooperation in the SSH”, is a collaborative project funded by the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/20072013) under grant agreement n°319974. The project was coordinated by the CNRS (Gisèle Sapiro), and involved six other partners: the University of Cambridge, the University of Rotterdam (Johan Heilbron), the University of Graz (Christian Fleck), the University of Bologna (Marco Santoro), Wesley Theological College in Hungary (Victor Karady) and CONICET (Gustavo Sorà).
<http://interco-ssh.eu/en/>

² The citation study is based on the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) and the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (AGCI); it was published in the *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 26 March 2009.

³ This calculation is based on the addition of budgets of topics in “standard” fields of SSH research in the work programmes 2014-15 and 2016-17. The calculation includes the calls EURO (41 Meuros), YOUNG (24.45 Meuros), REFLECTIVE (36.5 Meuros), INT (25 Meuros), REV-INEQUAL (49 Meuros), ENG-GLOBALLY (32.5 Meuros) and CULT-COOP (34 Meuros). It should be noted that the budget for SSH research in “standard” fields is 126.95 Meuros in 2014-2015 and 115.5 Meuros in 2016-2017. See the Work Programmes 2014-15 and 2015-17 at: <https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/europe-changing-world-inclusive-innovative-and-reflective-societies>.

⁴ For a more detailed report on NoE see the Horvath report:
http://ec.europa.eu/research/reports/2008/pdf/expert-group-on-the-future-of-noes_final-report.pdf

⁵ The first rank in host institutions is taken by the French CNRS, which constitutes an overarching structure for a large number of research institutions. To a lesser extent the same argument could be used for the Max Planck Society. For an article on the dominance of certain regions and institutions see also:
<http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20151113155204222>.

⁶ From 2007 to 2013, 26% of the ERC funding went to the UK; 17.6% to Germany; 15% to France; 10.7% to the Netherlands. In the SSH, Britain concentrates one third of the grants.

⁷ The databases referred to are the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) and the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (AHCI).

⁸ The definition of the social sciences and the humanities varies significantly across academic systems; in this passage we have followed the definition of the two databases that were used: the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) and the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (AHCI). For a comprehensive view on the European intellectual field see Sapiro (ed.) 2009.

⁹ Although journal submissions do not depend on the nationality of the authors, virtually all major social journals remain national in the sense that a large majority of the editors work in a single country. In that sense one can still speak of British, German, or American journals.

References

Ammon U (2010) The hegemony of English. In: UNESCO *World Social Science Report 2010*, Paris: UNESCO publishing, 154-155.

Boncourt T (2011) *L'Internationalisation de la science politique. Une comparaison franco-britannique (1945-2010)*. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Bordeaux.

Boncourt T. (2016) La science internationale comme ressource. Genèse et développement comparés des associations européennes de sciences sociales. *Revue française de sociologie* 3, 529-561.

Boncourt T. (Forthcoming) Roles, Fields, and Internationalism in the History of the Social Sciences. A Comparison of the International Political Science and Sociology Associations. In: Heilbron J, Sorá G and Boncourt Th, eds., *The Social and Human Sciences in a Global Perspective*. London/NY: Palgrave McMillan.

De Swaan A (2001a), *Words of the world*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

De Swaan A (2001b) English in the social sciences. In: Ammon U (ed), *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

European Commission (2016) *Ex-Post Evaluation of the Seventh Framework Programme. Commission Staff Working Document*.

https://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=fp7 (accessed February 14 2017)

EU (2010) *Evaluation of the Impact of the Framework Programme Supported Social Sciences and Humanities Research: A Bibliometric Approach*. Brussels: Directorate-General for Research http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/reports_en.html; accessed 30 December 2012).

Fourcade M (2006) The construction of a global profession: The transnationalization of economics. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112 (1): 145-194.

Fresco L, Martinuzzi A, Wiman A, et al. (2015) COMMITMENT and COHERENCE essential ingredients for success in science and innovation. Ex-Post-Evaluation of the 7th EU Framework Programme (2007-2013).

https://www.ffg.at/sites/default/files/downloads/page/fp7_final_evaluation_expert_group_report.pdf (accessed January 4 2017).

Gingras Y (2002) Les formes spécifiques de l'internationalité du champ scientifique. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 141-142: 31-45.

Gingras Y and Heilbron J (2009) L'internationalisation de la recherche en sciences sociales et humaines en Europe (1980-2006). In: Sapiro G (ed.) *L'espace intellectuel en Europe, XIX^e-XX^e siècles*. Paris: La Découverte, 359-388.

Gingras Y and Mosbah-Natanson S (2010) Where are social sciences produced? In: UNESCO *World Social Science Report 2010*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 149-153.

Heilbron J (1999) Toward a sociology of translation: Book translations as a cultural world-system. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2 (4): 429-444.

Heilbron J (2002) Echanges culturels transnationaux et mondialisation : quelques réflexions *Regards sociologiques*, no. 22, 2002, 141-154.

Heilbron J (2009) La sociologie européenne existe-t-elle? In: Sapiro G (ed) (2009) *L'Espace intellectuel en Europe, XIX^e-XX^e siècles*. Paris: La Découverte, 347-358.

Heilbron J (2014a) European Social Science as a Transnational Field of Research, in: Sokratis Koniordos & Alexander Kyrtis (eds), *Handbook of European Sociology*, London, Sage, p. 67-79.

Heilbron J (2014b) The Social Sciences as an Emerging Global Field, *Current sociology*, 62 (5) 2014, p. 685-703.

Heilbron J (2015a) *French Sociology*, Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.

Heilbron J and Bokobza A (2015b), "Transgresser les frontières en sciences humaines et sociales en France," *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, no. 210, 2015, pp. 109-121.

Heilbron J, Guilhot N, Jeanpierre L (2008) Toward a transnational history of the social sciences. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 44 (2): 146-160.

Heilbron J and Sapiro G (2007) Outline for a sociology of translation: Current issues and future prospects. In: Wolf M and Fukari A (eds) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 93-107.

Heilbron J and Sapiro G (2016) Translation: Economic and Sociological Perspectives. In: V. Ginsburgh et S. Weber (eds), *Palgrave Handbook of Economics and Language*. London/New York, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 373-402.

Heilbron J, Sorá G and Boncourt Th, eds. (Forthcoming), *The Social and Human Sciences in a Global Perspective*. London/NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hönig, B (forthcoming) Competing for Status: Dynamics of Scientific Disciplines in the European Transnational Field. *Serendipities, Journal for the Sociology and History of the Social Sciences* 2 (1).

Kastrinos N (2010) Policies for co-ordination in the European Research Area: a view from the social sciences and the humanities. *Science and Public Policy* 37 (4): 297-310.

König T and Schögler R (forthcoming) European Union Research Funding Programmes: Shaping SSH knowledge-making. *Serendipities, Journal for the Sociology and History of the Social Sciences* 2 (1).

Kovács IP and Kutsar D (eds) (2010) *Internationalisation of Social Sciences in Central and Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge.

Kuhn M and Remøe SO (eds) (2005) *Building the European Research Area: Socio-Economic Research in Practice*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kuhn M and Weidemann D (eds) (2010) *Internationalization of the Social Sciences*. Bielefeld: Transkript Verlag.

Mosbah-Natanson S and Gingras Y (2014) The Globalization of Social Sciences? Evidence from a quantitative analysis of 30 years of production, collaboration and citations in the social sciences (1980–2009),” *Current Sociology*, 62 (5), p. 626-646.

Sapiro G (2009), L’Europe, centre du marché mondial de la traduction, in Sapiro G (ed) *L’espace intellectuel en Europe: De la formation des États-nations à la mondialisation XIXe-XXe siècles*, Paris: La Découverte, 249-297.

Sapiro G (Forthcoming), “What Factors Determine the International Circulation of Scholarly Books? The example of translations between English and French in the era of globalization,” in J. Heilbron, G. Sorá and Th. Boncourt, eds., *The Social and Human Sciences in a Global Perspective*, London/NY: Palgrave McMillan.

Sapiro G and Popa I (2008), Traduire les sciences humaines et sociales: logiques éditoriales et enjeux scientifiques, Sapiro G (ed) *Translatio. Le marché de la traduction en France à l’heure de la mondialisation*. Paris : CNRS Éditions, 107-138.

Sapiro G ed. (2009) *L’espace intellectuel en Europe: De la formation des États-nations à la mondialisation XIXe-XXe siècles*, Paris: La Découverte.

UNESCO (2010) *World Social Science Report 2010*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.