INTERCO-SSH project   INTERnational COOperation in the Social Sciences & Humanities

Handbook of Indicators of Institutionalization of Academic Disciplines in SSH

WP2: Patterns of institutionalization of SSH

Workpackage Leaders
University of Graz (Austria)
& John Wesley Theological College (Hungary)

Grant Agreement n°319974

INTERCO SSH

Table of Content

Introduction

In work package 2 the aim is to develop a concise set of indicators for the comparative analysis of the development of the social sciences and the humanities (SSH) in Europe since 1945. Mapping the recent history of the SSH in various European countries with reference to their main intellectual partners outside the continent is indispensable to envisage its future prospects. The objectives are:

1) to identify **national patterns of institutionalization** which might explain the **relative isolation** of national traditions in the SSH but also the operating patterns of **crossed influences** and **international cooperation** (competition, national self-assertion, efforts to 'catch-up', etc.);

2) to assess the importance of the disciplinary **division of labour** within the SSH in order to reflect upon the historically changing **power relations** between branches of study, processes of professionalization of new disciplines, the reshaping of traditional forms of scholarship and the potentials of new mechanisms of intellectual and institutional **collaboration** and exchange with or without consequences in terms de-disciplinarisation of disciplines concerned;

3) to find out to which extent the **varying institutional (or academic) division of labour** within the SSH is an **obstacle to cooperation among actual research branches** and in which way its transformations can be a source of scientific innovation.

Tools and methods for a global sociology and history of the SSH have to be established, by identifying major social factors – including political ones – of their level of development as measured by **objective empirical indicators**. While a comparative approach is necessary in order to interpret the institutional and morphological aspects of diverging national traditions, a transnational approach combining entangled and connected history is required to account for the role of supportive agencies such as the UNESCO, public national foundations and private funds of sponsorship (such as philanthropic foundations) in processes of institutionalization and professionalization, as well as in the exchange and circulation of research achievements and scholars, including the forced or strategic (market oriented) migrations of the latter.

The aim in this part of the project is essentially to collect data and analyse this data to produce indicators for the comparative study of the development of SSH disciplines, including the social and intellectual characteristics of their research staffs, their dominant topics and study targets, the technicalities and methods applied as well as their preferential forms of both scholarly and popular communication in various periods. This is to bring about systematically designed and well-structured overviews per country. The sources to be exploited range from available monographic studies to university statistics, administrative archives and a variety of policy statements and reports issued by ministries, national academies, professional associations and international agencies (OECD, UNESCO, European Science Foundation, etc.), the combined evaluation of which has never received serious academic attention.

3

To reach this aim this handbook of indicators should lead every partner in their efforts to collect as much comparable data as possible for their country and all the disciplines selected for this project. It will not be possible to gather all the data for all disciplines in every country as the degree of differentiation and detail of data available on the national scale differs considerable. The structure of the handbook mirrors the data collection and organisation process. The handbook includes information on every set of data to be collected including a short description of the rationale of the indicator. Also, the kind of data to be gathered and the different descriptors/variables are defined. For qualitative indicators questions that should be answered in reports are detailed. Finally, the handbook provides information on templates that were or will be provided by the coordinators of the work package and a short notice on the repartition of work between the partners and the coordinators.

Generally speaking, the indicators are organized along five horizontal pillars and one cross-cutting dimension. The five pillars are:

1. **Research** focuses on research institutions, professional associations and other research institutions in the different disciplines and their historical development.
2. **Teaching** deals with academic curricula and degrees awarded in the different disciplines, the conditions of access to higher education training in these and the representation of different disciplines in secondary education.
3. **Output** concentrates on academic output, which is obviously closely linked to the research dimension, and non-academic/popular science output and the roles as public intellectuals etc. of representatives of the different disciplines. Common practices of publishing will be contrasted to quantitative measures of publishing in journals, books and other media.
4. **People** includes numbers on personnel and their social background, the development of student numbers in tertiary education and some basic information on the job market for academics in the fields under study.
5. **Recognition** deals with awards, rankings and other forms of public and academic evaluation.

The vertical dimension **funding** is dealing with national systems/procedures leading to funding for research, academic teaching and publishing as well as the development of salaries of academic staff on the one hand, and lager financial indicators for research and innovation on the other hand.

The Formation of a Discipline

Research	Teaching	Output	People	Recognition
academic institutions	tertiary education: curricula / Degrees	publication practices	research/teaching personnel	prizes and awards
non-academic institutions	accessibility of disciplines	academic publication (quant)	student numbers	evaluations
professional associations	student numbers	non-academic publishing	social background of researchers	
	secondary education	media coverage	job market for graduates	
Funding – funding schemes and financial indicators				

Practical Information

All partners should take into account the following information for data-gathering and organisation:

- This Handbook understands itself as a maximalist framework and we cannot expect to fill in all the demands for every national case, therefore the coordinators of WP2 are in close contact with the partners to adjust templates, to find alternative measures and to make sure that a great deal of the data is internationally comparable.
- The data will be gathered and organised **separately for every discipline** (economics, sociology/demography, political science, anthropology, philosophy, (national) literature and psychology/psychoanalysis) and **every country**, i.e. in separate Excel/Word files.
- The **timespan covered** by the indicators depends on the type of data gathered. In the case of numerical/timeseries data the standard procedure is to capture annual data if available. Where this is not possible the sample taken should proceed at least in ten year steps starting in 1950. However, depending on the efforts necessary to gather the data, five year steps are preferred:
  - cover all "0" years, i.e. 1950…1960…n…2010 or, where possible in five year steps.
  - Other indicators either only deal with the current situation or offer qualitative reports of historical developments taking into account important milestones. What is "important" might differ from one country or discipline to the next and can not be pre-defined.

- Three levels of priority for data gathering are defined (**high, medium** and **low**). Data with **high** priority should be gathered by **September 2014**, data with **medium** priority by **December 2014** and data with **low** priority by the end of **March 2015**. [Deliverable II: Mid-term workshop in May 2015 with data-presentation]

- To organize the data, **templates** (tables and structures or sample reports) will be provided by **April 1st 2014** for the data of high priority and until **May 1st 2014** for all the remaining indicators.

- Next to the availability of time-series and specific datasets for every discipline the comparability and interpretability of the data is closely linked to the understandings of boundaries of disciplines implicitly or explicitly stated in the sources used by the project. As a consequence it is of utmost importance that in the report on "the formation of a discipline" an **explanation** is given describing the **borders of disciplines** in the different national contexts over time. On top of that the spread-sheets should contain memos describing issues of institutional boundaries, changing boundaries, etc. that are necessary to interpret the data.

Repartition of Tasks

Task 2: SSH in Great Britain (UCAM)	Task 6: SSH in Northern Europe: the Netherlands (EUR)
Task 3: SSH in France (CNRS)	Task 7: SSH in Eastern European Countries: Hungary (WES) [with references to Romania and Slovakia]
Task 4: SSH in Germany, including GDR (GRAZ)	Task 8: SSH in Latin America: Argentina (CONICET) [with references to Brazil]
Task 5: SSH in Southern Europe: Italy (UNIBO)	Task 9: SSH in the US in comparative perspective (CNRS)

Disciplines to be covered

Anthropology, Economics, Literature, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology/Psychoanalysis, Sociology/Demography.

1   The formation of a discipline (qualitative report) (HIGH)

Rationale and descriptor

The short reports on the formation of a discipline should serve two purposes: 1) it should be used as an internal report for the contextualisation of the data gathered for work package two; and 2) it should serve as a basis for an introductory chapter on every country and discipline for the final report and analysis of work package two.

The short report on the formation of every discipline should take into consideration the milestones in the institutionalization of a discipline and go back beyond 1945 and take into consideration initiatives not necessarily bearing the name of any of the disciplines under scrutiny, i.e.:

a) First institutional affiliation of university departments;

b) first professors;

c) first journals;

d) first professional associations;

e) names of important forefathers, and;

f) descriptions of phases of expansion of the discipline in terms of institutions, students and/or public recognition;

g) descriptions of the degree of centralization of decisions concerning the academic institutionalization with special attention to the influence of political players/institutions on disciplines (formal vs. actual influence taken by these institutions, i.e. did ministries interfere in academic matters when they were formally part of decision-processes?)

This report can be as long as necessary for internal use, i.e. include all kinds of particularities that might be important to know to interpret all the other data later on. For the final report of the project a short version will be used to introduce the data on indicators of every country and discipline, the remaining information will then be used to contextualize the data of the indicators.

Template

Report.

Organisation of Disciplines (Research + Teaching)

2   Research

The aim of this set of indicators is to show patterns of institutionalization of SSH research in different disciplines. It deals with the creation of institutions of research reaching from research departments, non-academic institutions to publication outlets and the organisation in professional associations.

2.1   Academic/university entities (HIGH)

Rationale

Ideally this part of the indicator should show whether and when disciplines became independent from other disciplines on the institutional level and under which larger institutional arrangement the SSH disciplines are categorized (e.g. faculty). The aim is to gather data on the institutional development of disciplines and to show when and how they became independent entities on the organisational level. The most interesting timeframes in this context are the first years of institutionalization of a discipline and the developments taking place in phases of massive educational expansion (from 1960s). Whereas the data for the first period should be comprehensive, the study of the second timeframe can concentrate on pointing out changes and/or important developments in the organisational arrangement. At a later stage or as a spin-off project, data could be gathered for newer disciplines or sub-disciplines like Gender Studies, Cultural Studies or European Studies.

This indicator captures the degree of independence of a discipline in universities and faculties on an institutional level.

Descriptor/Variables

1) List of first disciplinary institutions
   a. Institutional arrangement at the creation of SSH unit going as far back in the history of a discipline as necessary;
      i. type of unit: faculty, school, department, "Lehrstuhl";
      ii. date of creation of the institutional unit.
   b. institutional arrangement in the timeframe of 1945-55 & during educational expansion:
      i. type of unit: faculty, school, department, "Lehrstuhl";
      ii. date of creation of the institutional unit.
2) Report dealing more generally with the institutional arrangements of SSH disciplines and their categorization in universities (i.e. of what faculties are they part). Also report on major changes that occurred over time.

If the boundaries of disciplines are unclear the focus should be on the "core" of a discipline, i.e. only when a discipline can be identified easily through their nominal designation (for example in the World of Learning).

Data-gathering method / Sources

Literature, i.e. institutional histories of disciplines. "World of Learning" contains division of universities. For more recent periods it is more important to describe significant changes than to enumerate all university departments.

Templates

Timelines; i.e. Excel table + visualisation.

Tags for literature

"academic entity"

2.2 Professional associations / learned societies (MEDIUM)

Rationale

The goal of this indicator is to show the degree of professionalization of a discipline and its community. It captures the number of professional associations, their date of creation, their membership rules, the number of members and their activities. The different partners should focus on the national associations as information on international/European associations will be gathered centrally (especially by Thibaud Boncourt). The aim of the indicator is to show what kind of funding was available for the creation of a professional association and whether or not these associations contribute to an internationalization of a discipline.

Variables/Descriptor

1) Table of (national) professional associations (see World of Knowledge data)
   a. date of creation;
   b. place of creation (country/university);
   c. founder(s)/first president;
   d. funding for initial creation and currently (if available);
   e. internal organisation (i.e. sections like "sociology of culture, economic sociology");
   f. disciplines covered.
2) Table of membership numbers (5 year steps from creation of association to present).
   a. total n;
   b. % women;
   c. % non-national members (countries where available).
3) Selectivity of association laid out in short report (2-3 sentence per association)
   a. membership rules;
   b. changes in membership rules.

4) Checklist and report on activities of professional associations [Comment: Checklist will be provided by coordinators]
   a. academic activities (summer schools/training courses, academic journals, national annual/bi-annual conferences, awards, funding of young research, own research, job market tools);
   b. political representation (is the organisation part of a political representation group (e.g. initiative for science in Europe), are members of the association representing the political interests of their members on the political level ("taking the role of trade unions"; licence to do a certain job; protection of profession);
   c. Science2Public (adult education, counselling/expertise, press conferences, presence in media as association, exhibitions);
   d. other non-academic activities.

Data-gathering method

Team Austria provides a list based on "Handbook of learned societies"/World of Learning
Partners check (with 'expert') if the list is complete.
Partners complete missing information (websites, experts, archives?).

Templates

Excel table.

Tags for literature/files in Zotero & online workspace

"professional associations"

2.3 Research institutions and arrangements (MEDIUM)

Rationale

The aim of this indicator is to show the arenas of social knowledge making of the different disciplines other than traditional universities. That can be networks of organisations like CNRS, Max Planck or Academies of Science, or single institutions like museums or think tanks. In the context of institutionalization processes it is necessary to know when these organisations were created, which disciplines are covered in these organisations and what role they play on the national (or also international level). In contrast to a mere list of organisations the chosen descriptors should provide information on the degree of interdisciplinary interweavement of these organisations. This indicator should also show when and where hybrid arenas of knowledge-making, positioned between the academic, public and economic/cultural/… sectors, were created in the social sciences and humanities.

Variables/Descriptor

Relevant institutions are defined as those that have some kind of **research activity** and produce a (perceivable) output of their research (which must not necessarily be disseminated

in academic journals etc.) i.e. the output can also be museum exhibits, economic forecasting reports etc.

1) List of current national non-university institutions that make SSH knowledge on the national level [Comment: also name important institutions that do not exist anymore. Concentrate on nationally visible entities; ignore local institutions]

2) Table with profile of national institutions
   a. date of creation;
   b. disciplines/research areas covered (one/pluri-disciplinary);
   c. type of institution: for example consultancies, corporations, think tanks, NGOs, etc.;
   d. weight in national context (large, medium, small);
   e. full-time equivalent of research and development personnel (where available);
   f. short description of activities (mission statement);
      i. research projects;
      ii. journals associated;
   g. key figures (if known);
   h. funding (public, private, foundation etc.).

3) List of non-national institutions, i.e. institutions founded (and funded) by international organisations, a number of different national organisations/institutions or national states. [Comment: examples would be the IIASA (International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis), UNESCO sites, the EUI (European University Institute) in Florence etc.]

Data-gathering method

Partners should make lists based on METRIS country reports and own research.

Templates

Table.

Tags for literature/files in Zotero & online workspace

„research institutions"

3 Teaching (secondary & tertiary education)

This set of indicators deals with the development of curricula, conditions of access to PhD research and the interweavement of disciplines in secondary education.

3.1 Academic curricula/degrees (HIGH)

Rationale

The aim of this indicator is to identify when and where academic curricula/degrees were first introduced and how the situation looks now. Next to showing the process of institutionalisation, also the beginning of a diversification of curricula (after Bologna) will be highlighted. However, the data gathered for this indicator captures only the main disciplines

covered by this project in detail. Disciplines and sub-disciplines connected to these will not be taken into account here, however, future studies could gather data for these more specialized fields using the indicators developed in the INTERCO-SSH project. This indicator shows how the institutionalisation process takes place on the level of teaching a discipline in higher education institutions.

Variables/Descriptor

1. Table of academic curricula/degrees per university
    a. date of creation of academic curricula and or degrees per university;
    b. undergraduate;
    c. master;
    d. graduate (specific graduate schools or doctoral programmes).
2. Number of universities where a discipline is taught
    a. number of teaching vs research departments;
    b. number of departments offering doctoral degrees.
3. Report on the development of disciplines, the situation at the start and when the degrees/courses started to diversify, i.e. to form sub-disciplines like for example "Peace Studies, Social Policy, Criminology, Gender Studies or Cultural Studies"
4. Report on the procedures leading to new courses/degrees to be created
    a. what is the procedure on the national level?
    b. who controls the accreditation of degrees?

Data-gathering method

Partners research the data.
Interviews with ministry officials.

Templates

Table.

Tags for literature/files in Zotero & online workspace

"curricula"

3.2 Conditions of access to the discipline (MEDIUM)

Rationale

This indicator captures selection procedures for PhD students that want to take courses of a specific discipline. Connected to that is the selection/formation of elites that are often selected through PhD affiliation. If the selection procedures for PhD courses and/or elite building of a discipline take place at an earlier stage these mechanisms of selection should also be described in the reports. The indicator aims at identifying the selectivity of a discipline.

The report should deal with different mechanisms regulating the access to PhD education in a certain discipline. The mechanisms leading to hierarchical structures inside a discipline and

12

also in-between disciplines are not necessarily imminent to PhD education, i.e. the choice of university at an earlier stage might be of larger importance to having access to elite PhD education than passing an entry-exam for example. Still, these processes should be taken into account.

Variables/Descriptor

1) Report describing access to disciplines with special focus on PhD level
   a) competition for access (i.e. numerus clausus; entry exams, limited number of spaces);
   b) tuition fees;
   c) elite schools vs. "ordinary" schools (incl. list);
   d) effects of selection procedures on hierarchical structures inside and in-between disciplines, i.e. are there specific career-paths that are dependent on early educational choices (e.g. elite universities/schools enhancing the chances to become professor in certain institutions or more generally the reproduction of elite structures in a discipline);
   e) other selection procedures.
   f) Selection for access to research / discipline…
2) Qualitative report on the value of a PhD in a discipline answering the following questions:
   i) What is the value of a PhD in a country; in a discipline etc.?
   ii) Who has the right to deliver a PhD (e.g. universities vs. Grandes Écoles)
   iii) Are there differentiations between doctorates (official or unofficial doctorates)?
   iv) Are there professional PhD programmes (like professional MA-programmes)
   v) When does an academic career start?

Data-gathering method
Interviews with experts (partners). Database by coordinators based on "The World of Learning".

Templates
None.

Tags for literature/files in Zotero & online workspace
"distinction"

3.3 Secondary education (LOW)

Rationale

This indicator captures whether disciplines are present in upper secondary education (ISCED 3; approx. starting age 16) and to what degree they are implemented in secondary curricula. The aim is to evaluate the differing implementation of SSH disciplines in upper secondary education in Europe and beyond. On top of the apparent information this gives on the institutionalization of a discipline beyond academia, this data can also be used to contextualize student numbers, the development of university curricula etc. Also conclusions on the status and the 'public understanding' of a discipline might be drawn from this data.

Variables/Descriptor

1) Report on inclusion of disciplines in upper secondary education (ISCED 3)
    a. Yes/No;
    b. target age group or level of secondary education;
    c. status/profile;
        i. intensity of inclusion in curricula (the curricula taken into account should cover at least 50% of students leaving school with the entitlement to study at an institution for higher education/university);
            1. number of years a disciplines is taught;
            2. number of hours/week a discipline is taught;
                a. part of school leaving examination (entitling to tertiary/university education) & whether it is an optional/compulsory part of that exam;
            3. optional: scope/extent of inclusion in curricula;
        ii. arrangement: are disciplines taught in combination with others? (i.e. are there subjects at school that deal with several SSH?);
    d. level of professional qualification necessary for teaching on the upper secondary level; including a report on the organisation of teacher training;
        i. are teachers trained in the same courses as students studying these disciplines not leading to a career in upper secondary teaching?
        ii. do teachers in upper secondary education need training in the disciplines they teach or not?
        iii. other specificities of teacher training.

Data-gathering method

Partners gather data. Mainly for the present (only for the past if there were very significant changes).

Template

None.

Tags for literature

"secondary education"

4   Output

This set of indicators deals with different forms of research output. Next to aspects of institutionalization of a discipline the qualitative work on reputation of different forms of output per discipline and country will give insights into national developments of a discipline, borders of a discipline and rules of disciplinary cultures that are often ignored in rankings of universities and/or researchers. Finally, also communication with and for a larger public, the roles as public intellectuals for example, will be dealt with in the context of producing (research related) output.

4.1   Reputation of publication outlets (qual.) (MEDIUM)

Rationale

The aim of this indicator is to describe the publication practices of SSH researchers. The production of (textual) academic output remains the most important measure of reputation in the SSH. It is less obvious, however, what forms of output are preferred and most highly renowned in a discipline. The report can and should highlight differences inside a discipline, i.e. concentrating on epistemic cultures, adherents to certain theories, methods etc. Again, the aspect of national/international development/institutionalization of a discipline should be treated here by taking into account the degree of internationalisation of the media used by researchers (linked to later indicators) and the issue of translation. All this should be presented in form of a qualitative report.

Variables/Descriptor

Report answering the following questions:

1) What types (monographs, journal articles, co-authored texts etc.) of publications have the highest reputation in a discipline (timespan: today)?
   a) Is there a strong bias towards a certain type of publication or not ? Are there dominant publishing practices?
   b) Are there important exceptions to these 'rules'? (i.e. is there a psychologist that publishes books and is renowned?)
   c) What are the normative expectations to young researchers that aim at a research career?
   d) What are the most highly renowned national and international journals/publishers in a discipline?
      i) journals;
      ii) publishing houses.
2) Report on the major changes/events that occurred since 1945.
   a) What were the changes? (language, medium etc.)
   b) Specification of year/timespan of when changes occurred if possible…

Data-gathering method

Interviews. Reports and existing literature?

Data format

Qualitative reports taking into account national peculiarities and table with some basic information for comparative purposes.

Tags for literature

"publication practices"

4.2 Publishing landscape (timespan: today) (HIGH)

Rationale

The aim of this indicator is to provide for an overview of the key actors on the publication market of a country/discipline. The production of academic output is organized on the national and the international level by different kinds of publishers and the size, number and disciplinary affinity towards these publishers differs considerably from one country to the next. The procedures leading to an academic book publication and the general diversity/homogeneity of the publishing market can provide for valuable information concerning the organisation and reputation of different kinds of publishing in a country/discipline.

Variables/Descriptor

Report (+ table/list) answering the following questions:
1) How does the publishing landscape on the national level look like?
    a) Who are the main actors (publishing houses, journals, book series, editors…)
    b) Are there university presses? (what is their reputation)
    c) What are the differences between trade and academic publishing?
2) What is the procedure leading to an (academic) book publication?
    a) Are there review processes? How do these look like? Who is responsible for these?
    b) Who is paying for the publications? Are there subventions?
    c) Who is taking the (financial) risk? (publisher, editor, author…)

Data-gathering method

Interviews. Reports and existing literature?

Data format

Qualitative reports taking into account national peculiarities + table with some basic information for comparative purposes.

Tags for literature

"publication practices"

4.3 Academic journals (timespan: 1945-2015) (HIGH)

Rationale

This indicator aims at showing when journals were created, when (how?) they internationalized, when thematic journals were introduced in the different disciplines and how the prestige of journals changed over time. The indicator also deals with existing categorizations/rankings of journals in the different disciplines and countries. The data of this indicator will be combined with the data on organisational institutionalization and the creation of degrees/curricula to form a general indicator of academic institutionalization.

Also, this data will provide information on changes in the publication practices and the availability of knowledge through open-access, the concentration and specialization of disciplines through thematic journals and special issues and finally, the internationalization of disciplines.

Variables/Descriptor

1) List of nationally rooted journals + profile table
    a. Date of creation / End year;
    b. Profile of the journal:
        i. thematic/general;
        ii. national/International (link to WP3; international is defined as having editors from different countries);
        iii. review practices;
        iv. periodicity (monthly, bi-annual, annual…);
        v. circulation numbers;
        vi. ISSN;
        vii. open access (see for example http://www.wiso-net.de/download/SOLI.pdf).
2) Analysis of internationalization of national journals (based on previous work done by Thibaud Boncourt)
    a. Selection of journal samples based on list of nationally rooted journals
        i. affiliation of editors;
        ii. affiliation of authors;
    b. Analysis of a five-year period (x2)
        i. content analysis of articles (if possible);
        ii. background interviews with editors and past editors on the development of their journal (to be specified).
3) Report on rankings/ratings of journals in disciplines/countries:
    a. List of national/international systems of journal rankings/ratings;
    b. rules/methodology used for ranking/rating.

For rankings of business journals see: http://www.harzing.com/download/jql_subject.pdf → a A+ category of "world elite" journals seems to make sense next to normal high-quality journals); for a humanities ranking based on expert advice see http://www.esf.org/index.php?id=4813.

Data-gathering method

Team Austria provides a list of journals. Partners are responsible to cross-check whether these lists are correct (i.e. is the categorization of disciplines correct, is the date of creation correct, are there no important journals – especially historic perspective – missing?

For international journals: Basis will again be the Ulrichs database. Partners will receive list and check this list for accuracy.

Templates

None

Tags for literature in Zotero and files in workspace

"journals"

4.4 Content of journals (LOW)

Rationale

This indicator captures thematic trends in (major) academic journals. The goal of this indicator is to develop a methodology to capture thematic trends in the SSH and to contextualize historical trends with other developments. By using national journals of "general nature" (i.e. British Journal of Sociology) it will be possible to make statements about trendsetters, followers, interdisciplinary salient topics etc. Furthermore, a contextualisation with public debates in newspapers or thematic priority programmes like the EU framework programmes would be interesting.

Variables/Descriptor

1) List of titles of major (general) journals from 1945-2015
   a. list of abstracts of these journals (according to availability);
   b. articles (PDF) where available.
2) Journal profile from indicator 4.3.

Data-gathering method

The journals will be selected following the lists of journals provided by the partners/coordinators for indicator "4.3 Academic journals (timespan: 1945-2015)". Following this informed selection the coordinators of the work package establish a database of abstracts and articles. Where access is restricted the help of the partners will be sought to gather this data. The analysis will be restricted to articles of scientific nature, i.e. essays, scientific reports and full academic articles. This would exclude any reviews or conference reports.

Data analysis: The data will be analysed quantitatively either using some form of automated quantitative text analysis (wordscores etc.) and/or thematic coding of topics.

Possible databases are IBSS, JSTOR, UNESCO, Sociological Abstracts (etc.).

Templates
None.

Tags for literature in Zotero and files in workspace
"journals"

4.5 Handbooks (MEDIUM)

Rationale

This indicator aims at showing when the first handbooks of a discipline were published, what these were and when there were phases of expansion. Handbooks are defined as publications aiming at providing an overview over a field of study. In contrast to textbooks,

handbooks do not (necessarily) take into account the educational needs of students. Handbooks consider current research. The project excludes handbooks dealing with specialized subareas of a discipline or a specific method. The indicator does not take into account dictionaries, lexica, encyclopaedias, textbooks or readers.

The early handbooks of a discipline will provide information on the process of institutionalization of a discipline by showing the disciplinary background of the authors and the institutions they were adhering to. At later stages the process of internationalization of disciplines can be highlighted by considering the background of the authors on the one hand and whether handbooks are translated from other languages or not.

The last step of this analysis will be a report on the most widespread international handbooks used in a discipline in a country. This report will make use of union library catalogues to track these handbooks and deal with the degree of internationalisation of a discipline but also of local university courses etc.

Variables/Descriptor

1) List of general handbooks of a discipline
    a. date of publication;
    b. publisher;
    c. authors/editors;
    d. academic affiliation of authors;
        i. country;
        ii. university;

Conclude from the information of point 1.d) whether a handbook is international or national.

2) Did, and if yes, at what point did the number of handbooks increase considerably?
    a. Are there major increases in handbook publications during, after phases of educational expansion? (e.g. after the introduction of new curricula)
3) List of translated handbooks (if applicable)
    a. list of translated handbooks (incl. information as above);
    b. source language;
    c. translator;
    d. publisher;
    e. date of publication.
4) Report on the most used international handbooks in a discipline in a country (LOW)
    a. use union library catalogues (i.e. worldcat.org for individual countries);
    b. number of (university) libraries holding the handbooks;
    c. recording date into database/library catalogue (if available) [will be compared to the number of universities hosting a discipline].

Data-gathering method

In a first step the partners only provide for the information of points 1-3. Point 4 will only be relevant at a later stage (LOW). Include national and international handbooks in the list. If the number of handbooks exceed 10 per discipline please contact the coordinators.

Templates

A document with examples will be provided.

Tags for literature in Zotero and files in workspace
"publication practices"

4.6 Non-academic output (science to public) (MEDIUM)

Rationale

This indicator deals with the publication practices with regard to broader intellectual and cultural journals, newspapers and other media. It identifies (major) arenas of public communication and the most important figures of a discipline present in these arenas. The identification of arenas for this indicator will concentrate on television programmes on the one hand, and arenas for commentaries in major national newspapers on the other hand. The third measure that will take into account the disciplines as a whole are popular book publications of SSH researchers that are listed in bestseller lists. The second part of this indicator will concentrate on samples of 1-3 researchers out of the top 10% of researchers of a discipline and track the science to public communication chosen by these researchers. In combination this should provide for a rather comprehensive picture of the arenas of communication between SSH research and society.

Variables/Descriptor

1) Qualitative report an the arenas for commentaries on research/current issues in major national newspapers by SSH researchers active in the academic sphere (timeframe: now)
2) Content analysis of two/three daily newspapers preceding the European Parliamentary elections taking place in May 2014.
   a. selection of two/three daily quality newspapers (criteria to be defined);
   b. gather contributions made by SSH researchers;
      i. discipline;
      ii. institution;
      iii. gender;
      iv. topic;
      v. research/non-research relevancy of article.
   c. report on these including an explanation/assessment of the sample of newspapers made for the content-analysis.

Data-gathering method

Literature on the topic. Research by partners.

Template

Detailed instructions for the content analysis will be provided by the coordinators of WP2.

Tags for literature
"Science2Public"

5 People (tertiary education & research)

5.1 Personnel (HIGH)

Rationale

This indicator captures the number of professors/tenured research staff per discipline, the proportion of women and foreign professors/tenured research staff and numbers of other research and administrative staff per disciplines since 1945. It also includes typical career-paths and changes in these since 1945. The aim is to gather as much existing data as possible and, where necessary, highlight deficiencies in centralized datasets available for research and the evaluation of research.

These numbers will be compared to developments of student numbers/graduates/doctoral students etc.

Variables/Descriptor

Tables (HIGH)

1) Number of professors (head count) per disciplines since 1945
    a) % of women;
    b) % of foreigners;
    c) if available also add numbers of full-time equivalent professors.
2) Number/percentage of tenured faculty members per discipline
    a) % of women;
    b) % of foreigners.
3) Number of other personnel, administrative staff if easily available.

Report/flow-diagram (MEDIUM)

4) Typical career path(s) to reach tenure/full professorship:
    a) See LERU hyperlink for general university career paths-diagrams for: Belgium (Flanders), Finland, France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England)
       http://www.leru.org/index.php/public/extra/careermapseurope/ [Comment: Argentina/Hungary are missing]
        i) make these kind of graphs on the level disciplines taking into account more peculiarities where necessary;
        ii) make these kind of graphs for 1950, 1970 and 2010 (now)
            (1) Highlight the most important changes in a comment;
            (2) If there are only very minor changes only add a comment to the initial graph.
    b) average age of staff when reaching tenure (5/10 year steps if available);
    c) average age of students when reaching PhD (5/10 year steps if available).

Data-gathering method

Research by partners.

Concerning the report/flow-diagrams closer cooperation with the coordinators of the work package is necessary.

Templates

Table. Flow diagram (low priority).

Tags for literature

"personnel"

5.2 Social background of professors/research staff (MEDIUM)

Rationale

This indicators captures literature and existing surveys on the social background of professors and other academic personnel in general and provides a table of data available in census statistics. Some of the data from these existing studies will be used for the contextualisation of the data on professors. The partners should try to find social surveys amongst professors/university staff/researchers save the datasets to the project intranet where possible and make a short report on the types of variables found in the datasets with special consideration of the variables listed below. Also, the lack of more comprehensive studies of this kind in Europe should be highlighted for different national contexts.

Variables/Descriptor

1) List of social surveys amongst professors/researchers at the national level.
   a) Examples for the USA would be:
      i) HERI Faculty Survey (UCLA, CIRP Freshman), 1989-2013, 3-year intervals (n 20000 – 25000); http://www.heri.ucla.edu [Comment: includes a lot of information on teaching practices etc. that would not be of interest here]
      ii) National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NCES), 1984-2004 (n 20000 – 350000); https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/nsopf/
   b) Examples for Europe would be:
      i) EUROAC: http://euroac.ffri.hr/en/?page_id=17
      ii) Hochschullehrerstudie (German): http://www.uni-kassel.de/wz1/pdf/BMBF_Hochschullehrerstudie2011_Druck.pdf
   c) Interesting variables:
      i) occupation of parents;
      ii) education of parents;
      iii) migration of professors/parents;
      iv) religious affiliation;
      v) career path/mobility;
      vi) sources of income: primary/secondary employment.
2) list of literature using these surveys/analysing their data;
3) short report of the contents of these surveys.

The aim is to make a repository of these (national) reports and try to find relevant data that could be compared between disciplines and countries.

Data-gathering method

Research by partners.

Templates

None. A folder in the intranet will be provided to save reports, (available) datasets and literature.

Tags for literature

"personnel"

5.3 Student numbers (in tertiary education) (HIGH)

Rationale

The aim of this indicator is to show the evolution of student numbers over time in the different disciplines at a national level. The tables should include numbers of enrolled students, graduates and freshers where possible. The number of graduates should be differentiated between BA, MA and PhD level (at least since Bologna). To explain trends a contextualisation of the graphs with institutional changes like for example the creation of new curricula or even larger reforms like the Bologna process.

Variables/Descriptor

1) Table of student numbers per discipline and level – according to Bologna classification (BA/MA/PhD) (1945-present; timespan as available from national statistics)

    For all levels/numbers:

    % women (for all levels/numbers);

    % of foreigners (for all levels/numbers).

    a) Undergraduate students (stock value);
    b) Graduate students (stock value);
    c) PhD students (stock value);
    d) number of graduates (flow value);
    e) number of fresher's (flow value);
    f) gross enrolment ratio (see UNESCO definition)
    g) number of students enrolled.

Data-gathering method

National statistics.

Data format

Tables.

Tags for literature/files in Zotero & online workspace

"students"

5.4 Job market (LOW)

Rationale

This indicator captures the share of students recruited in (academic) research and can/could be combined with data from indicator 5.2. By taking into account larger datasets like for example census data a broader picture of the job market for students of certain disciplines should be given and possibly also changes that occurred over time should be highlighted. Furthermore, this should also show how the attractiveness of academic professions changed over time.

Variables/Descriptor

1) Cross-tables of people classified as part of a discipline according to ISCO and economic sector (as detailed as possible)
   a. % women;
   b. % born in another country.
2) What is the share of students from the disciplines recruited in research or higher education?
3) What are other professional paths taken by PhDs?
   a. Use census data, ISCO classification, IPUMS database (by coordinators) – make cross-tables of people with degrees in certain disciplines and work sectors.

Data-gathering method

Step 1: centrally gathered data by coordinators and Paris team through Eurostat and OECD statistics as well as the IPUMS database for census data comparisons. (LOW)
Step 2: partners contact national organisations that could provide for missing data. (LOW)

Templates

Data details for contacting national and European statistical associations.

Tags for literature

"personnel"

6 Public and academic evaluation and distinction

6.1 Prizes, recognition and excellence (MEDIUM)

Rationale

This indicator will report on mechanisms of evaluation and distinction for research and researchers of different disciplines in different countries. The list of awards will comprise its date of creation and the type/height of reward attached to it. For a sample of the most important awards the winners will also be listed. The second part will consist in reporting on practices concerning honorary degrees in every country and discipline. More important than

the actual number of honorary professors will be a description of the procedure leading to such an honorary degree. The third part is a report on "further" forms of evaluation/rankings etc. that exist on the national level and that help structure the hierarchy inside and in-between disciplines. Finally, the functioning of academies of science and their membership rules will be examined.

Variables/Descriptor

1) List of prizes, awards etc. for SSH researchers (and institutions?)
    a. Awards for life work (i.e. awarding the person not a specific project etc.)
        i. date created;
        ii. amount monetary reward.
    b. Awards funding research more specifically
    c. Categorization of awards according to "visibility"
        i. national (is the prize only awarded to members of the national scientific field);
        ii. international (is the prize also awarded to international members of the scientific field).
    d. List of award winners (only for a sample of the most important prizes of a discipline in a country)
    e. Link to award websites
2) Report on practices concerning the award of honorary degrees per discipline
    a. Number of honorary professors;
    b. Procedure leading to honorary degree (who decides on the award of the degree, who awards the degree etc.).
3) Report on other forms of evaluation/ranking existing on the national level that (help) structure the academic landscape of SSH disciplines
    a. 'excellence' vs. rest?
    b. Ranking of institutions inside a country (e.g. newspaper rankings, excellence funding schemes, etc.)
4) Functioning of academies of science
    a. % SSH members in ordinary/full-members;
    b. Report on functioning (how are members elected, what are the main tasks of the academies).

Data-gathering method

Partners gather data for the national sphere. Only very important prizes/awards are to be taken into account, i.e. not prizes for "best dissertation" at a certain University or by a professional association. Coordinators gather data for international sphere.
Use interviews and METRIS reports for most important prizes.

Templates

File with examples of prizes that are relevant.

Tags for literature

"distinction"

7   Funding

7.1 Funding schemes for people and projects (timespan: today) (MEDIUM)

Rationale

The indicator captures funding schemes for university departments, (young) researchers and research projects running on the national scale. Based on existing reports like the METRIS reports the importance and availability of the different types of funding (public, private, mixed) that are available in different disciplines should be described. The underlying theoretical assumption is again that a change in the organisation of research has been taken place and that these changes have also affected the sources of funding available for research and doctoral/post-doctoral education.

Variables/Descriptor

1) Report on funding schemes for university departments
    a. Unit of funding: (i.e. school, department, faculty, professor (Lehrstuhl))?
    b. public vs private;
    c. secure vs call-based;
    d. role of public procurement;
    e. role of evaluations of the institutions on (public) funding;
    f. role of teaching v research in funding research institutions.
2) Report of funding schemes for doctoral students (per discipline)
    [Comment: **not** a list of funding institutions/programmes]
    a. Types of funding;
    b. sources of funding (public/private/national/international etc.).
3) Report on (third-party) project funding
    a. Public v private;
    b. targeted funding schemes i.e. funding programmes with calls on specific thematic areas such as family, education, poverty etc.;
    c. functioning of third party funding for basic research of the most important national funding organism (like the NSF) using the case of a standard two year project with two full-time PhD positions:
        i.   Type of programmes;
        ii. functioning of application procedure;
        iii. functioning of decision-making procedure (who decides and on what basis).
4) Report taking into account the major events that changed the funding schemes for research on the national level.

Data-gathering method

Use METRIS data. Contact EURAXESS for doctoral/post-doc researchers.

Templates

None.

Tags for literature

"funding"

7.2 Remuneration (MEDIUM)

Rationale

This indicator captures data on the remuneration of academics (professors/researchers) in the different disciplines over time and compares these numbers average/mean incomes and the income of other leading positions in public services. The data on remuneration will not necessarily be gathered first hand, but can also consist of tables/data found in previously published reports (like for example the German Hochschullehrerstudie). Whereas data on the minimum earnings of professors/researchers should be available in many countries, information on the actual income and other/additional sources of incomes of researchers/professors will probably only be available through existing studies.

At a later stage of the project the remuneration of academics will be compared to the income of other public service officials of high rank like federal ministers or the highest civil servant in central administration.

Hochschullehrerstudie: http://www.uni-kassel.de/wz1/pdf/BMBF_Hochschullehrerstudie2011_Druck.pdf

Variables/Descriptor

1) Statistics on remuneration of academics from 1945 to the present
    a. Professors (minimum 1950, 1970, 2010);
    b. other researchers;
    c. (adapt to national groups/data available).
2) Table with comparative data
    a. Average/mean income (OECD data);
    b. income of federal ministers (minimum 1950, 1970, 2010);
    c. income of highest civil servant in central administration (e.g. ministry) (minimum 1950, 1970, 2010).

Data-gathering method

Table of average/mean income provided by coordinators. Data for **professors**, researchers (if available), **ministers** and **civil servants** is to be gathered by project **partners**.

Template

None.

Tags for literature

"remuneration"

7.3 National research and development/innovation indicators (LOW)

(timeframe: 1950, 1970, 2010-2014)

Rationale

This indicators captures national research and development expenditures in general (i.e. not only in the social sciences and humanities) and for the social sciences and humanities in particular. For the current situation (2010-2014) it uses the reports published by the METRIS project and the references made therein. The data of this indicator will offer a broader contextualisation of the SSH specific data gathered in the other parts of the project. It will be used to form relative numbers that can then be compared between countries and disciplines. On top of that specific data about EU funding for SSH research per discipline will be analysed based on the numbers available through the European Union E-CORDA database.

Variables/Descriptor

1) OECD indicators for research and development (not SSH specific)
    a. Gross Domestic Expenditures on R&D (GERD);
    b. total R&D Personnel;
    c. women researchers;
    d. total researchers.
2) METRIS indicators on funding in the SSH
3) Table with amount of EU funding for SSH research per discipline (by university/departmental affiliation):
    a. Use E-CORDA database (get access through European Commission):
        i. Contact persons of funded projects + project details + affiliation etc.;
        ii. contact persons of non-funded projects + affiliation etc.;
        iii. call-ID of funded project/project proposals.

Data-gathering method

OECD data, E-CORDA data gathered by coordinators. OECD will be asked to disaggregate the data where possible to get specific data on the SSH where it can not be extracted from the METRIS reports.

Specific funding for SSH in the national context should be based on the METRIS reports. Some of that data will be extracted by the partners. METRIS will be contacted by the coordinators to receive access to data in tabular format instead of PDF files.

Templates

None.

Tags for literature

"funding"

8 Misc (LOW)

This last section draws attention to two further dimensions that should remain salient throughout the data-gathering process and be reported to the work package coordinators. First, any structural setting that help elites, or those already doing well, should be highlighted and existing literature included in the online repositories. Second, information on recruitment strategies gathered that could, for example, also be relevant to understand internationalization processes.

1) Are there structural settings that help those that are already doing well (Matthew effect) or are there structures supporting newcomers/change
   a) literature on the issue; report to coordinators.
2) Recruitment strategies in national universities
   a) i.e. codes of conduct; EU code:
      http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/rights/codeOfConduct
   b) literature on the issue; report to coordinators
3) The academic field of SSH and their elites: Elites and counter-elites since 1945 based on:
   a) editorships of major disciplinary journals;
   b) memberships in national academies of science;
   c) membership in national encyclopaedias; biographical dictionaries etc.;
   d) counter elites (e.g. in Hungary or Argentina).