The EU and the social sciences

A fragile relationship

Kropp, Kristoffer

The EU and the social sciences: a fragile relationship

Abstract

The position of the social sciences within European Union (EU) research policy is fragile. The social sciences have been entangled with the EU integration process throughout the organization's trajectory; still, social sciences have only lately been integrated into EU research policy in a marginal position. Drawing on Bourdieu's generic field analysis, this article analyzes the struggles over the position of the social sciences within EU research policies from the early 1990s until today. First, the analysis shows how the social sciences were included in EU research policies with the simultaneous establishment of the European field of social science through the formation of scientific associations, journals, and European research infrastructures. Second, it focuses on the struggle over the position of the social sciences in Horizon 2020. This analysis shows how social-science researchers mobilized social and political capital in the efforts to organize and implement the H2020 to ensure the presence of social-science issues and researchers in the program despite the dominance of other sciences and political issues. Overall, the analysis is a reminder of the generally subordinate position of the social sciences, particularly in EU research policies, but it also shows that well-organized social sciences can participate in organizing research funding and ensure representation of otherwise marginalized research fields.

Introduction

The position of the social sciences in the European Union's (EU) research policies has been challenged over the last three decades due to the increasing Europeanization of social-science knowledge production. Since the 1950s, social-science knowledge has been closely entangled with European political integration (Adler-Nissen & Kropp, 2015). Still, in EU research funding, the social sciences play only a minor role. This article analyzes the marginalized position of the social sciences as well as how social-science knowledge production risks being subjugated by the logics and principles of vision and division from other sciences and from the European bureaucratic field, with possible effects on social-science knowledge production throughout Europe. Using Bourdieu's generic field analytical approach, the article analyzes the last 30 years of struggles over the position of the social sciences in EU research policies and the links between an emerging European field of social science and a European bureaucratic field. Understanding how these efforts are connected to social-science knowledge production requires recognition of the historical relationship between the social sciences and nation states (e.g., Lepenies, 1988; Wagner, 2001).

Institutionally, the social sciences developed within state-sponsored institutions, such as universities and statistical bureaus, educating civil servants to operate within the growing state bureaucracy and private enterprise. Simultaneously, the problems of the state and the societies in which the social sciences were embedded became the problems that the latter tackled. Thus, the social sciences contributed empirical and theoretical knowledge about problems ranging from growth and inflation to relations with other countries and their colonies, as well as problems of social cohesion, poverty, and education. However, this historical entanglement between the social sciences and the European nation states seems to be changing. Over the last 30 years, social-science knowledge production has become increasingly internationalized, and concepts, techniques, and researchers increasingly circulate internationally, albeit with a strong US dominance (Fourcade, 2006; Heilbron, 2013; Mosbah-Natanson & Gingras, 2014). In the internationalization process, social-science knowledge production in Europe seems to be at the forefront, with a high degree of research collaboration across national boundaries (Heilbron, Boncourt, & Timans, 2018). Research argues that increasingly cross-national social-science knowledge production in Europe is closely linked to the EU's research policies. The EU distributes substantial funds through its framework programs (FPs), and research policies in Europe are increasingly being coordinated and homogenized (Heilbron, 2014). The local impact of these changes varies hugely throughout the union (Fleck & Hönig, 2014). Still, it seems that no parts of Europe are left untouched by European integration (Kovács & Kutsar, 2012). This article provides a critical analysis of political structures and struggles pertaining to the position of the social sciences in EU research funding, and offers an opportunity to understand the constraints and possibilities within this funding and to take a position within it.

The article proceeds as follows. First, I discuss the field analytical approach. Next, the empirical section offers an analysis of the historical relations between the social sciences and both EU integration and struggles over the position of the social sciences in Horizon 2020 (H2020). In the conclusion, I discuss the empirical findings and their implications.

A generic sociological approach

The analysis draws on Bourdieu's generic approach for understanding contemporary structures, institutional arrangements, and practices using core notions from field analysis. As Bourdieu (2000) remarks, following Durkheim: "The unconscious is history—the collective history that has produced our categories of thought, and the individual history through which they have been inculcated in us" (p. 9). Hence, the neutrality and social stability of institutions and practices often derive from the fact that their history has been either forgotten or hidden. This is true on the national level, but it is even more important to recall and take seriously when analyzing transnational institutions and

practices (Go & Krause, 2016). Drawing on this generic sociological perspective, this article analyzes the trajectory of political struggles and social-science institutions in Europe to show changes in the position of the social sciences within EU research policies.

The analysis builds on Bourdieu's field analytical concepts—field, habitus, and capital, but also illusio, doxa, and the principles of vision and division—as they have been used in exploring the sociology of the EU. Here, scholars have called for the field theoretical approach as a challenge and extension to more institutionally focused political science analyses in EU studies (Cohen, 2011; Kauppi, 2018; Mudge & Vauchez, 2012). Following these insights, I understand the field of European social science as a heterogeneous, transnational configuration of actors and institutions struggling over scientific authority and resources that has been gradually institutionalized at the European level. Simultaneously, the field of European social science is closely linked to the bureaucratic and political fields, both at the European and national levels, allowing for various forms of relations between fields (Bourdieu, 1996a; Mudge & Vauchez, 2012). Fields are defined as relatively autonomous social spaces structured by their own logics, interests, and struggles over the recognition and distribution of capital—in this case, scientific capital (Bourdieu, 1988). Hence, fields can be more or less autonomous and in a more or less dominated position vis-à-vis other fields and, in particular, the field of power (Bourdieu, 1996b).

Empirically, the article focuses on social science in consecrated disciplines, including sociology, political science, and economics, but also education, business studies, and the humanities. As with scientific fields, by European bureaucratic field I mean the relatively autonomous social space of institutions and agents struggling over forms of European capital and, specifically, the right to control and define European—especially EU—politics and policies (Georgakakis, 2013; Mudge & Vauchez, 2012). Empirically, the field comprises EU institutions, national institutions such as ministries of science in this case, and lobby groups—all of which actively engage in struggles over the principles of vision and division in the field. The literature argues that, in addition to the generic properties of fields, European fields tend to share specific properties connected to the history and institutional struggles of European integration after 1945 (Georgakakis, 2013; Kauppi, 2005, 2014; Mudge & Vauchez, 2012). Central to the article's empirical analysis, the field theoretical approach suggests that the field of European social science serves as a linkage for actors seeking to participate in wider struggles over symbolic capital in the European political and bureaucratic fields (Bourdieu, 1996b, 2005). This raises questions about how this relationship is historically constituted and what it means for social science in Europe. Literature on the history of European integration shows that social-science knowledge has played an important role throughout the history of the EU. This includes the role played by a legal scholar in building up the EU legal framework, and of an

economist in organizing the Single Market and the EURO (McNamara, 1999; Rosamond, 2015; Vauchez, 2008). However, similar connections exist for fields such as education, statistics, and information policy (Aldrin, 2010; Deem, 2015; Penissat & Rowell, 2015). Still, at the level of scientific knowledge production, the field of European social science is still relatively heterogeneous and dominated by other national and political fields (Fleck & Hönig, 2014; Heilbron et al., 2018).

The article draws on documents and interviews with 20 researchers and civil servants from the European Commission (EC). The documents include official reports from the EU and European scientific associations, as well as speeches and other papers. The interviewees were selected using the snowball sampling method and identified relevant names reading the documents. To gain a multifaceted view, I interviewed actors involved in different parts of the process, representing different disciplines and viewpoints in the field. For each interview, I created a specific interview guide informed by the trajectory and position of the interviewee. The documents were selected through searches of the EU's official homepage and based on the interviews. All participants were granted anonymity. The transcribed interviews and documents were analyzed using NVivo. In the analysis, I used both theoretically informed codes and more inductive coding to understand the historical process and the positions in the field.

Social science and European research policy

Social-science knowledge and European political-integration processes have been intertwined since the late 1950s. The following analysis shows how the European social sciences have interacted with EU institutions. Theoretically, the analysis sketches out the historical development of the field of EU research policies and of the European field of social science, even though it must be considered a rather weak field (Vauchez, 2008), and their relations.

Early institutionalization of social science in EU policies

The relationship between social-science knowledge and European integration processes goes back at least to the 1950s and 1960s during the earliest attempts to integrate Europe—or at least Western Europe—politically and economically. Here, we find a close dialogue between bureaucrats in the newly established EC and scientific researchers; furthermore, social-science ideas were used both to guide actions and to legitimize the EU (Rosamond, 2015; White, 2003). However, it was not until the 1970s that social-science knowledge production was institutionalized in relation to "European politics." In 1973, the EC launched the Eurobarometer; the European Science Foundation (ESF) was established in 1974, and in 1976 the European University Institute (EUI) in Florence was

created. These three institutions arose from different constellations of interests, but all three were set up as "side projects" to the EU. The Eurobarometer was designed by the marginal DG Communication, and the EUI and ESF were established as intergovernmental institutions despite their close relationship with the EU and their clear purpose of promoting European integration both scientifically and politically (Aldrin, 2010; Boncourt & Calligaro, 2017; Guzzetti, 1995). Still, all three came to play important roles in the social sciences in Europe.

The early 1980s marked a change in EU science policy. Since the first treaties in the 1950s, science had occupied an ambiguous position within EU policies. On the one hand, science was not a central policy area for the EU, and on the other, it had been part of the European integration process since the 1950s, and the different Directorate-General (DG) supported research related to their policy area. In the early 1980s, the EU established the FPs for Research and Technological Development to coordinate the various scientific activities funded by the EU to support central policy areas, especially industry and agriculture (Guzzetti, 1995). The few social-science issues that were funded in the EU's first FP included technology forecasting and risk assessment. Hence, from the establishment of a field of EU research policy, the social sciences were included but in a subordinate position, dominated by an economic- and industrially oriented doxa.

Establishing European social-science institutions

The creation of European social-science institutions occurred not only in close collaboration with EU political institutions, but also "from below" (Georgakakis & Weisbein, 2010). Since the 1970s, and increasingly from the late 1980s, social scientists have formed associations, launched scientific journals, and set up Europe-wide projects (Heilbron et al., 2018). Since the late 1980s, social-science disciplines have established European scientific associations. These associations were created with different scientific goals, are marked by different epistemic cultures, and attract scholars from different parts of Europe. Still, they constitute important institutionalized forums for scientific interaction and the distribution of scientific capital in the form of, for example, prizes, offices, and platforms from which to speak and build an academic career (Boncourt, 2017). In the same period, the number of journals with a European scope increased. In the second half of the 1980s, 17 new journals were launched; 60 were established in the 1990s and 42 in the 2000s (Heilbron, Bedecarré, & Timans, 2017). These journals offer spaces for European scholars to publish and gain recognition, and they are increasingly important in competition for positions and research funding as well as in national research audits. Since the 1980s, social scientists have also established Europe-wide social surveys, such as the EVS, ISSP, ESS, and SHARE. This has led to the increasing use of standardized

European data sources and a homogenization of methods and criteria for data collection and analysis across Europe (Heath et al., 2005; Kropp, 2018).

In summary, since the 1980s, social scientists have increasingly involved themselves in scientific struggles and institutions at the European level. These activities have achieved symbolic recognition, reinforcing the importance and possible gains of participating in struggles over scientific capital in European social-scientific fields (Fleck & Hönig, 2014). Stable scientific institutions have been established that facilitate the exchange of ideas and the circulation of knowledge and, as a consequence, an increasing homogenization of knowledge-production practices across Europe. European social scientists have, in other words, recognized (and built) a European field for social science as an important locus for struggles over scientific legitimacy and forms of scientific capital.

Integration and growth of the social sciences in EU Framework Programs

The focus on industry support and technology dispersion has been the doxa in EU research policy, but with the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, the position of the social sciences changed. The EU extended its scope, and central issues for social-science research—such as social cohesion and solidarity, democracy, social welfare, and living standards—began to be seen as "European problems." In 1994 with the FP4 (1994–1998), social-science issues were included on their own terms and not only as support for technological or natural-science issues (Schögler & König, 2017). The social-science themes taken up in FP4 were: the evaluation of science and technology, education research, and research on social integration and social exclusion. Looking at the work programs for the social sciences—and, after 2000, increasingly also subjects from the humanities—both the funding allocated and the topics included increased from FP4 to H2020 (2014–2020) (Kastrinos, 2010). Hence, in the 20 years since the launch of FP4 to the launch of H2020, the EU's funding became increasingly important, both as a source of core research areas in the social sciences and for structuring national social-science research policies. Major themes from political science and sociology, such as migration, education, demographic change, citizenship, and political participation, and from economics, such as growth, technological innovation, and international trade, were included in the programs (Kastrinos, 2011).

The 2000s were marked by important changes in EU science policy, affecting the position of the social sciences. In 2001, the European Council of Ministries formulated the Lisbon strategy with the ambition of turning the EU and Europe into "the leading knowledge economy." This political ambition moved research policies to center stage (Chou, 2012). With the Lisbon Strategy, the EU allocated more funding to the FPs and launched the goal of integrating research in the EU into a

European Research Area (ERA)—the scientific equivalent to the Common Market. The ERA was intended to ensure the free movement of researchers and knowledge and to strengthen the EU's research contribution to economic growth. Hence, the ambition of integrating European sciences through the ERA made the social sciences legitimate agents in EU research policy and provided institutional structures for researchers to build up European institutions closely associated with the EU. Two initiatives illustrate this.

In the early 2000s, research councils, primarily from Northwestern Europe, came together to form HERA (Humanities in the European Research Area) and NORFACE (New Opportunities for Research Funding Agency Cooperation in Europe).[1] Both initiatives aimed to present the social sciences and humanities in relation to the EU's FPs, to integrate national research councils in FPs and the ERA, and to fund European projects informed by concerns and themes emerging from the disciplines. Hence, we find that the ambition of establishing a European-scale platform for scientific knowledge production through the creation of social-scientific institutions occurred simultaneously with a set of political ambitions and initiatives from the EU that created inroads and possibilities for social scientists to indulge their ambition to create a "European social science."

A heterogeneous and heteronomous European field of social science

Since the late 1980s, social scientists have established associations and launched journals and surveys, thereby slowly creating the institutional structure of a European field of social-science knowledge production related to processes in the field of EU research policy. Even though it is a heterogeneous structure, social scientists have still succeeded in creating a European-level field-like structure for struggles over scientific legitimacy and allocating scientific symbolic capital in the social sciences. Related to this, the EU increased its support for the social sciences beginning in the 1990s, thus creating political and bureaucratic structures for social scientists. Here, though, the EU indirectly contributed to the structuring of struggles in the European social sciences. What we see, in other words, is the establishment of two fields—a field of European social sciences and a field of European research policies—related to, but also hierarchically organized as, the European field of research policy dominating the field of European social science.

Horizon 2020: struggling for social science in a market-oriented research policy

Social scientists looking to the future in the late 2000s would probably have thought that the position of the discipline in the EU's FPs was well entrenched. The social sciences and humanities stood for only a small portion of the EU's growing research budget, but in the previous 20 years a

niche had been carved out and the budget for the social sciences had grown (Kastrinos, 2010). However, the past decade had witnessed new contestations of the position and purpose of the social sciences in the field of EU research policy.

Following the 2008 economic crisis, the EC focused primarily on economic growth; however, the Barroso Commission also spoke about sustainability, job creation, and protection of the "European social model." To social-science researchers, this sounded like a larger role for the social sciences in the EU's research program, since themes like democracy, social justice, and welfare seemed to be central to the forthcoming FP.[2] Things did not go that way, however. As the following analysis shows, the social sciences have, to an increasing extent, been assigned a subordinate position in the field of EU research policy as providers of knowledge to other scientific areas and to specific political and bureaucratic problem areas, thus reinforcing their heteronomous position in relation to the European bureaucratic field.[3] The following section analyzes three instances over a ten-year period that show how social scientists have mobilized and formed a social group, building on the capital accumulated in the past 20 years, and engaged in political and bureaucratic struggles over the principles of vision and division in the field of EU research policy and, hence, over the relation between the social sciences field in Europe and a European bureaucratic field.

The METRIS report: the last coalition between the social sciences and the EC?

In preparing for the FP to follow FP7 (i.e., what would become known as H2020), the EC wished to chart the social sciences and humanities in order to find new and emerging fields of research. Hence, the DG for Research and Innovation commissioned a small group of social-science and humanities scholars to produce the METRIS report. Members were selected using "ordinary" EU procedures.[4] However, different from earlier expert groups on the social sciences and humanities, the majority of its members were not closely related to the EU, either through institutional affiliations or through research projects. Instead, they had a national trajectory in less prestigious academic intuitions. The chair of the expert group, Professor Poul Holm, embodied the qualities of the scholars in the group. As Chair of the Danish Research Council for the Humanities, Holm had advocated for humanities research in the EU's research policy throughout the 2000s, and was involved in the creation of the HERA. In Denmark, he had been a senior researcher at the Fishery Museums and, for a short period, Rector of Roskilde University, both minor national institutions. The rest of the members had likewise been involved with European and national research funding agencies and had a trajectory in managing research institutions that bridged scientific institutions and politics (EC, 2009).[5] Still, few if any of them came from prestigious universities, formally represented social-science disciplines, or could muster any particular scientific recognition. On the contrary, the working group represented

institutionalized academic capital (Wacquant, 2013) in the form of, for example, managerial positions, and social capital in the form of relations with national and EU research bureaucracy.

These structural properties of the working group can help us understand the content of the report. As one of the participants in the group reported, they were given freedom to formulate a report about emerging trends in European social science and the humanities as they perceived it.[6] Still, the themes structuring the report were the same as those found in the FP7—adding a few catchwords relating to themes, such as the "iconic" turn, neuroscience, and big data. More substantially, the report recommended strengthening the monitoring social-science and humanities research in Europe, and hence the institutions indirectly represented in the group. The primary recommendation from the group was to continue funding the themes from FP7, but with an increased budget (EC, 2009). The report was, in the eyes of the expert group members, a solid analysis of emerging issues in the social sciences and humanities that pointed the way for the commission and research councils, but also for social-science and humanities associations to use in advocating for funding and recognition. However, the recommendations from the report were overtaken by processes dominating EU political fields.

Negotiating Horizon 2020: marginalizing the social sciences

In February 2011, the EC published the first short Green Paper, titled "From Challenges to Opportunities: Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation Funding." If social scientists and humanities scholars following EU research policies were encouraged by the approach adopted in the METRIS report, they were equally disappointed and astonished when the EC started the process of formulating the new FP. As one of the scholars involved in the following mobilization of the social sciences and humanities described:

> *I read it a couple of times just to ensure it didn't say anything about the social sciences. Nothing about the humanities. . . . But that is just how it is, isn't it? . . . So we thought we had to do something about it.[7]*

The 15-page Green Paper briefly sketched out the EC's view on the major challenges that the coming FP should address as well as its organization. The paper started out by addressing central themes in the social sciences, from the demographic changes in Europe, to problems with employment and trust, to changing security challenges (EC, 2011a, p. 3). However, the operationalization and solutions imagined by the EC focused on turning research and science into a means of production to spur economic growth. As the Green Paper stated: "Europe needs to step up its performance in creating impact from research and innovation funding. Obstacles remain in

transferring research outcomes from the laboratory through to the development, commercialization and application phases" (EC, 2011a, p. 9).

In the following public consultation, interest organizations submitted their views on the upcoming FP. The conclusion the EC drew from the consultation reinforced this market-oriented perspective on research policies. The EC wrote:

> *In terms of creating more innovation, there is support for including more close to the market activities, such as applied research, demonstration projects, large-scale trials, technology transfer or test beds. Several respondents argue that more emphasis should be placed on economic impact and market uptake. (EC, 2011b, p. 10)*

Seeing science and research mainly as economic forces was not surprising. The FPs were initially established to promote industrially oriented research related to the EU's policy areas (Guzzetti, 1995), and the social sciences had always been marginal. Still, throughout the 1990s and 2000s, initiatives such as the Marie Curie Program (1996), the European Research Council (2007), and, more broadly, the ERA, provided opportunities for the social sciences (Kuhn & Remøe, 2005). However, with the proposal for the H2020, the position left to the social sciences became even more marginal, despite the centrality of the discipline in addressing so-called "societal challenges." In other words, the EC saw the social sciences as an "add-on" to problems and questions emerging from the fields of medicine and the natural and technical sciences—and, not least, their related industries. Throughout the social sciences and the humanities, there was a sense that social-science researchers had to get involved if the field was to have a place in the coming FP.[8]

Mobilizing for the social sciences

An important difference between the branches of science in Europe is their level of organizational resources and their integration into and social capital in the European bureaucratic field, and by extension their ability to represent themselves and their interests (König, 2017). In the 1990s and 2000s, the ESF's Standing Committee for the Social Sciences had, to some extent, acted as the representative of the social sciences in Brussels, but in the early 2010s the ESF was incapacitated due to large-scale changes in its organization.[9] Unlike previously, in 2011 the social sciences were able to mobilize their own associations and organizations representing European universities, learned societies, and the sciences more broadly. Many of these organizations had previously focused on the consequences of European politics for the "hard" sciences and education, but now used their social and political capital to represent the social sciences and humanities in the European political and

bureaucratic field, advocating for the integration of these disciplines in the coming FP (LERU, 2012).

Following these initiatives, a group of associations from the social sciences and humanities wrote an open letter to the commissioner in October 2011. In the letter, they demanded that a section in the upcoming FP be designated for social-science and humanities issues, with a budget of at least 5 billion Euros. More than 25,000 scholars and institutions signed the letter. The coordinated effort had political effects (Schindler-Daniels, 2014). In her address to the British Academy in November 2011, the EU Commissioner for Research and Innovation, Maire Geoghegan-Quinn, used most of her speech to tackle these critiques. She said:

> *We have heard the concerns expressed by this Academy and others about the place of the Social Sciences and Humanities in future European funding for research and innovation. Let me assure you that the European Commission shares the goals of the British Academy to inspire, recognize and support excellence in the social sciences and humanities and to champion their role and value. (p. 2)*

More substantially, she pointed to the establishment of a new "societal challenge" that would address social-science topics that could support "more inclusive, innovative and secure societies" (p. 3). By establishing a clearly designated program for the social sciences, the EU commissioner accommodated the initial critique from the scientific community. However, built into this new "societal challenge" was also the germ of the next struggle. The new societal challenge lumped together the "social sciences and the humanities" and "security studies"—a field dominated by industries involved with surveillance and military technologies that had profited from the last 15–20 years' increasing focus on counter-terrorism and national security. Furthermore, the challenge included a number of smaller, unrelated programs, diluting the profile and draining the budget. In the social-science community, this was perceived as a signal that the pressure on the Commission had to be kept up, and through the European Parliament and social-science and humanities organizations, representatives kept arguing for a more social science-specific challenge[10]. Following the pressure, in late spring 2012, security studies and the social sciences were separated into two distinct challenges (Schindler-Daniels, 2014):

- Europe in a changing world: Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies, and
- Secure societies: Protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens.

The struggle over the position of the social sciences in H2020 shows that the social sciences had become organized on a European level and had become an effective agent in the field of the EU's research policies; moreover, despite their subordinate position, social-science researchers were able

to use their social and organizational capital in these struggles. At first, it looked as though the social sciences had ensured a space in H2020. However, this was only half true. First, the question of the budget loomed. Obviously, the lion's share of the budget would go to industrially oriented scientific fields; still, the small difference in the percentage of the allocation would mean a lot. Second, the DG presented interdisciplinarity and the integration of the social sciences and humanities as a chance for social-science researchers to take up important positions in the other challenges.[11] Following this, the integration of the social sciences and humanities became a "cross-cutting issue" in H2020 (EC and European Parliament, 2013; König, 2019). However, social-science researchers feared that this de facto arrangement would sideline their research, problems, and approaches. The perception among social-science advocates was that, even though they had been successful in ensuring a space for the social sciences in the upcoming H2020, there was still a long way to go before the social sciences would be included in the same way that other scientific areas were (European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities [EASSH], 2014, 2016).[12]

Implementation of Horizon 2020: bureaucratic marginalization of the social sciences and humanities

To mitigate the critique that the social sciences were being subjugated, the EC agreed to a yearly evaluation of the integration of the social sciences into H2020. As is often the case, the devil is in the details, and analyzing the practical implementation of H2020 illustrates how social-science research was subordinated to the interests and problems of other scientific fields and EU research policy doxa through the bureaucratic practices of the EU bureaucracy. The evaluation reports from 2017 and 2018 show three properties that characterized the practical implementation of H2020 (Directorate-General for Research and Innovation [EC], 2017).

The first was, not surprisingly, the applied and instrumental nature of H2020. Reading through the "best practices" case in the reports, we find that the social sciences were largely assigned the task of mitigating potential social resistance or working out "business plans" for private and public projects. As the 2018 evaluation states: "although research in technologies can provide technical solutions to major challenges, Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) can help make them accepted, understood and appropriated by the general public" (EC, 2018, p. 6). Social-science research was, in other words, assigned an instrumental role in providing solutions to problems defined by other scientific fields or societal interests, typically private enterprises or public institutions.

Second, the disciplines that were historically closely related to the state and to the governance of "the social" and "the market" dominated. Hence, economics and public administration, accounted for 26% and 17% of social-science researchers, respectively, followed by business studies and

sociology, with 11% and 10%, respectively (EC, 2018, p. 23). Other social sciences and the humanities were only present in very small numbers.[13] Third, the reports show a very marginal involvement of social science even in projects that were defined as having a social-science or humanities component—or were "SSH flagged," as it was called in the Brussels lingo. Across the program, approximately 20% of projects with a designated social-science and humanities component included a social-science or humanities element, when excluding the designated social sciences challenge (Societal Challenge 6; EC, 2018). All in all, the EC channeled bureaucratic resources toward mainstreaming SSH across the H2020 and to document its success to promote the agenda for the dominant fields of EU research policy and to legitimize the H2020 social-science advocates.

However, social-science and humanities organizations disagreed, pointing to a number of problems that were not addressed in the evaluations, which led to the bureaucratic exclusion of social-science issues and researchers. Most importantly, they highlighted two properties of H2020 that shaped its intellectual microstructures and led to a marginalization of social-science and humanities research in terms of people and issues. As one social scientist following the process described:

> *[for projects] flagged for social science and humanities, it is expected that there is a contribution from that community. So, you do need a social science and humanities evaluator who says, "yes this is a good component," or "sorry this is a completely missing component, so you can't be scored." . . . As a matter of fact, 30% of the projects are awarded in the flag topics that do not have any SSH component.[14]*

The EASSH lamented the "systemic" exclusion of specific disciplines and modes of knowledge production though bureaucratic routines in the EU commission. Specifically, the EASSH pointed out that, in the Expert Advisory Groups assisting the EC in writing its work programs, and among the evaluators, there was a lack of social-science and humanities scholars (EASSH, 2017). In other words, scientific points of view from the social sciences were excluded from the very start through the composition of the Expert Advisory groups[15] (see also König, 2019). Perhaps most importantly, seen from the point of view of the social scientists, the organization and instrumental focus on "societal challenges" dominated by other parts of the field of sciences and industrial interests resulted in the unintended exclusion of social-science and humanities perspectives related to fundamental questions about democracy, the rule of law, social in- and exclusion, and critical reflections on political and social decisions and processes (EASSH, 2018, 2019).

Summing up: the bureaucratic domination of the social sciences in EU research policy

The struggles over the organization and implementation of the H2020 show both the doxa of the field of EU research policies and the subordinate position of the social sciences with in it. The

analysis also shows the dynamics of the field and the limits and possibilities of challenging doxa through mobilization. More concretely, the analysis illustrates how the industrial and impact-oriented doxa of the field of EU research shaped the H2020 and led to an exclusion of the social sciences both in the form of subjects and problem and as an organized scientific community. However, it also shows the mobilization of social scientists who organized and how they used institutional openings and the bureaucratic logics dominating the field of EU research policies to ensure at least nominal representation of social scientists in the H2020. Still, central issues of social sciences were subjugated to the political and economic logics of the field of EU research.

Conclusion: the fragile relations between the social sciences and EU research policy

The position of the social sciences in EU research policy is still fragile. Since the early 1990s, the social sciences have fought for a position in EU research policy with limited success and, as this article shows, during the preparation of H2020, the social sciences were almost excluded from the EU's strategic research program. These findings bring to light important structural historical conditions for social-science knowledge production in Europe. Drawing on Bourdieu's generic field approach, this article analyzes changes in EU research policies related to the social sciences and the formation of the social-science field in Europe over the last 30 years. The first section explores the emergence of a loosely integrated European field of social science and its relation to the emergence of a field of EU research policies and European political integration at large. On a scientific level, social scientists established a number of stable scientific institutions from the 1980s onwards that served as European arenas for struggles over scientific recognition and capital, and as platforms for interacting with a European bureaucratic field. In the European political field, scientific knowledge and research policy has been a central but paradoxical component of EU policy and European political integration since the 1950s. In this field of European research policy, the social sciences were assigned a subordinate position even after changes were made to the Maastricht Treaty and the introduction of the ERA. Still, the social sciences managed to create a space within EU research policies by linking themselves to the EU's changing agendas.

The second part focuses on political and bureaucratic struggles in relation to the H2020 program. It shows how social scientists mobilized academic institutions at the European level in order to defend the position of the social sciences in EU research policy when the EC suggested effectively excluding the social sciences from H2020. In addition, the analysis demonstrates how the dominating industrial and economic doxa of the European field of research policy subjugated and excluded social-science subjects and researchers, despite the engagement of social-science

organizations. The analysis hence shows the relatively heteronomous position of the social sciences in relation to the European bureaucratic field and in the field of European research policies.

Taking a larger perspective, the article raises essential questions for social scientists about the relationship between political institutions and social-science knowledge at a European level and its possible effects on social-science knowledge production throughout Europe. With the growing importance of European structures in research policy, these relationships are highly important for the social sciences in Europe, and social scientists should devote time and attention to analyzing the relations and their effect on social-science knowledge production. As the analysis shows, mobilizing requires well-organized scientific publics that can engage with political and bureaucratic fields on a European level to ensure pluralist and inclusive research policies. The challenge is: How can social scientists engage in struggles over the principles of vision and division in European research politics, both for the benefit of the social sciences and to ensure pluralist participation in European social-science knowledge production?

References

Adler-Nissen, R., & Kropp, K. (Eds.). (2015). *A sociology of knowledge of European integration: The social sciences in the making of Europe*. Routledge.

Aldrin, P. (2010). From instrument to instrumentalisation of 'European opinion': A historical sociology of the measurement of opinions and the management of the public space. In J. Rowell & M. Mangenot (Eds.), *A political sociology of the European Union, reassessing constructivism* (pp. 206–224). Manchester University Press.

Boncourt, T. (2015). The transnational circulation of scientific ideas: Importing behavioralism in European political science (1950–1970). *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, *51*(2), 195–215.

Boncourt, T. (2017). The struggles for European science. A comparative perspective on the history of European social science associations. *Serendipities*, *2*(1), 10–32.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1996a). *The rules of art*. Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1996b). *The state nobility - Elite schools in the field of power*. Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*. Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2005). *The social structure of the economy*. Polity Press.

Chou, M.-H. (2012). Constructing an internal market for research through sectoral and lateral strategies: Layering, the European Commission and the Fifth Freedom. *Journal of European Public Policy*, *19*(7), 1052–1070.

Cohen, A. (2011). Bourdieu hits Brussels: The genesis and structure of the European field of power. *International Political Sociology*, *5*(3), 335–339.

Deem, R. (2015). What is the nature of the relationship between changes in European higher education and social science research on higher education and (why) does it matter? *Journal of European Integration*, *37*(2), 263–279.

Directorate-General for Research and Innovation (European Commission). (2017). *Integration of social sciences and humanities in Horizon 2020*. European Commission.

European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities. (2014). *Letter to the European Commission ITRE Committee*.

European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities. (2016). *Letter to MEP Christian Ehler from EASSH*.

European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities. (2017). *Integration of social sciences and humanities in Horizon 2020: Second report published by the European Commission: A response from the European Alliance for SSH*.

European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities. (2018). *Horizon 2020: Struggling with interdisciplinarity. The 3rd SSH Integration Monitor Report reveals the truth about top down interdisciplinarity.*

European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities. (2019). *Interdisciplinary perspectives for Horizon Europe: Lessons from the 4th SSH Integration Monitor Report.*

European Commission. (2009). *METRIS Report - Monitoring European trends in social sciences and humanities.* European Commission.

European Commission. (2011a). *From challenges to opportunities: Towards a common strategic framework for EU research and innovation funding.* European Commission.

European Commission. (2011b). *Green paper on a common strategic framework for EU research and innovation funding analysis of public consultation.* European Commission.

European Commission. (2018). *Integration of social sciences and humanities in Horizon 2020: Participants, budget and disciplines. 3rd monitoring report on SSH flagged projects funded in 2016 under the Societal Challenges and Industrial Leadership Priorities.* European Commission.

European Parliament and European Commission (2013) Regulation (EU) No 1291/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing Horizon 2020—The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) and repealing Decision No 1982/2006/EC Text with EEA relevance, Pub. L. No. 32013R1291, 347 OJ L (2013). http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2013/1291/oj/eng

Fleck, C., & Hönig, B. (2014). European social science as a transnational field of research. In S. Koniordos & A. Kyrtsis (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of European sociology* (pp. 40–66). Routledge.

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

Geoghegan-Quinn, M. (2011, 11). *European Commissioner for Research, Innovation and Science 'The future of Social Sciences and Humanities in Horizon 2020'* [Text]. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/SPEECH_11_741

Georgakakis, D. (2013). Conclusion: The field of Eurocracy: A map for new research horizons. In D. Georgakakis & J. Rowell (Eds.), *The field of Eurocracy* (pp. 226–247). Palgrave Macmillan.

Georgakakis, D., & Weisbein, J. (2010). From above and from below: A political sociology of European actors. *Comparative European Politics*, *8*(1), 93–109.

Go, J., & Krause, M. (2016). Fielding transnationalism: An introduction. *The Sociological Review Monographs*, *64*(2), 6–30.

Guzzetti, L. (1995). *A brief history of European Union research policy.* Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Heath, A., Fisher, S., & Smith, S. (2005). The globalization of public opinion research. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *8*(1), 297–333.

Heilbron, J. (2013). The social sciences as an emerging global field. *Current Sociology*, *62*, 0011392113499739.

Heilbron, J. (2014). European social science as a transnational field of research. In S. Koniordos & A. Kyrtsis (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of European sociology* (pp. 67–89). Routledge.

Heilbron, J., Bedecarré, M., & Timans, R. (2017). European journals in the social sciences and humanities. *Serendipities*, *2*(1), 33.

Heilbron, J., Boncourt, T., & Timans, R. (2018). The European research area in the social and human sciences: Between national closure and American hegemony. In J. Heilbron, G. Sorá, & T. Boncourt (Eds.), *The social and human sciences in global power relations* (pp. 153–182). Springer.

Kastrinos, N. (2010). Policies for co-ordination in the European research area: A view from the social sciences and humanities. *Science & Public Policy (SPP)*, *37*(4), 297–310.

Kastrinos, N. (2011). Bringing EU social science and humanities into policy: Experiments and Prospects. In G. Papanagnou (Ed.), *Social Science and Policy Challenges, Research & Policy* (pp. 211–244). UNESCO Publishing.

Kauppi, N. (2005). *Democracy, social resources and political power in the European Union*. Manchester University Press.

Kauppi, N. (Eds.). (2014). *A political sociology of transnational Europe*. ECPR Press.

Kauppi, N. (2018). *Toward a reflexive political sociology of the European Union, fields, intellectuals and politicians*. Palgrave Macmillan.

König, T. (2017). *The European Research Council*. Polity Press.

König, T. (2019). SSH-impact pathways and SSH-integration in EU research framework programmes. *Fteval Journal for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation*, *48*, 12–27.

Kovács, I. P., & Kutsar, D. (2012). *Internationalisation of social sciences in Central and Eastern Europe: The "catching up"–a myth or a strategy?* Routledge.

Kropp, K. (2018). The European Social Survey and European research policy: Homological structures and conjunctural alliances. *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, *5*(3), 295–319.

Kuhn, M., & Remøe, S. O. (2005). *Building the European Research Area: European Socio-economic Research in Practice*. Peter Lang.

Lepenies, W. (1988). *Between literature and science*. Cambridge University Press.

League of European Research Universities (LERU). (2012). *Social sciences and humanities: Essential fields for European research and in Horizon 2020*. LERU.

McNamara, K. R. (1999). *The currency of ideas: Monetary politics in the European Union*. Cornell University Press.

Mosbah-Natanson, S., & Gingras, Y. (2014). The globalization of the 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), 626–646.

Mudge, S. L., & Vauchez, A. (2012). Building Europe on a weak field: Law, economics, and scholarly avatars in transnational politics. *American Journal of Sociology*, *118*(2), 449–492.

Penissat, E., & Rowell, J. (2015). The creation of a European socio-economic classification: Limits of expert-driven statistical integration. *Journal of European Integration*, *37*(2), 281–297.

Rosamond, B. (2015). Performing theory/theorizing performance in emergent supranational governance: The 'live' knowledge archive of European integration and the early European Commission. *Journal of European Integration*, *37*(2), 175–191.

Schindler-Daniels, A. (2014). Den Horizont Gestalten—Sozial- Und Geisteswissenschaften Im EU-Rahmenprogramm Horizont 2020. [Shaping the horizon: Social sciences and humanities in the EU Framework Programme "Horizon 2020"]. *Zeitschrift Für Erziehungswissenschaft*, *17*(6), 179–194.

Schögler, R. Y., & König, T. (2017). Thematic research funding in the European Union: What is expected from social scientific knowledge-making? *Serendipities*, *2*(1), 107.

Vauchez, A. (2008). The force of a weak field: Law and lawyers in the government of the European Union (for a renewed research agenda). *International Political Sociology*, *2*(2), 128–144.

Wagner, P. (2001). *A history and theory of the social sciences*. SAGE Publication.

Wacquant, Loïc. 2013. 'Bourdieu 1993: A Case Study in Scientific Consecration'. Sociology 47(1):15–29. doi: 10.1177/0038038512472588.

White, J. P. J. (2003). Theory guiding practice: The Neofunctionalists and the Hallstein EEC Commission. *Journal of European Integration History*, *9*(1), 111–131.

---

[1] Interview with researcher, February 2019.

[2] Interview with members of METRIS (Emerging Trends in Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities in Europe) expert group, January 2018 and February 2019.

[3] At large, the increasing emphasis on interdisciplinary and policy-oriented research policies is not unique to EU research, but a trend seen throughout the world. EU research policies might just be one of the most prominent places where it is observed (e.g., Benner, 2018).

[4] Interview with EC policy officer, December 2019.

[5] interview with EC policy officer, December 2019.

[6] Interview with member of the group, February 2019.

[7] Interview with researcher, February 2019.

[8] Interview with social sciences researchers involved with setting up EASSH, February 2019 and October 2019.

[9] Interview with EFS officer and member of the Standing Committee for the Social Sciences, February 2019.

[10] Interview with social sciences researchers (January 2019) and EU civil servant (November 2019).

[11] Interview with former EU civil servant, March 2019.

[12] Interview with social science researchers involved with setting up EASSH, February 2019 and October 2019.

[13] This pattern is also found in the Horizon 2020 Advisory Panels, where 17 out of the 25 social scientists were economists (König, 2019).

[14] Interview with a member of EASSH, March 2019

[15] Interview with a member of EASSH, March 2019.