



EUROPEAN  
COMMISSION

Community research

## European Research Advisory Board



## The Social Sciences and the Humanities in the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme

## **Interested in European research?**

**RTD info** is our quarterly magazine keeping you in touch with main developments (results, programmes, events, etc.). It is available in English, French and German. A free sample copy or free subscription can be obtained from:

European Commission

Directorate-General for Research

Information and Communication Unit

B-1049 Brussels

Fax (32-2) 29-58220

E-mail: [research@cec.eu.int](mailto:research@cec.eu.int)

Internet: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/rtdinfo/index\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/rtdinfo/index_en.html)

## **EUROPEAN COMMISSION**

Directorate-General for Research

Directorate C — Science and society

Unit C.2 — Scientific advice and governance

Contact: *Isidoros Karatzas*

*European Commission*

*Office SDME 7/46*

*B-1049 Brussels*

*Fax (32-2) 29-84686*

*E-mail: [isidoros.karatzas@cec.eu.int](mailto:isidoros.karatzas@cec.eu.int)*

*[evelyne.ruttens@cec.eu.int](mailto:evelyne.ruttens@cec.eu.int)*

*Web: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/eurab/index\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/eurab/index_en.html)*

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

**European Research Advisory Board**

**The Social Sciences and the Humanities  
in the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme**

***Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers  
to your questions about the European Union***

**Freephone number:  
00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11**

**LEGAL NOTICE:**

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information.

The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the Europa server (<http://europa.eu.int>).

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication.

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2005

ISBN 92-79-00804-8

© European Communities, 2005

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

*Printed in Belgium*

PRINTED ON WHITE CHLORINE-FREE PAPER

# EURAB

*“The unique feature of EURAB’s experience has been the close collaborative patterns which emerged between members coming from academia and industry.”*



The European Research Advisory Board (EURAB) began its work of advising the European Commission on the design and implementation of EU RTD policy in November 2001. EURAB's main focus is to help shape, support and implement the European Research Area (ERA). It consists of forty-five members of whom half come from academia and half from industry, with five having been nominated by the Commission. EURAB's Bureau consists of eight members, assisted by its Scientific Secretary and the secretariat provided by the European Commission.

There is unanimous consensus that the challenges posed by ERA can only be met through close co-operation between academia and industry, that the enlarged Europe is an added resource for the European Research Area and that the social sciences and humanities must have their place within ERA as well.

While insisting on its independence, EURAB is equally committed to working closely with the Commission services. The aim is to produce results as expediently and efficiently as possible in the form of useful, if sometimes provocative, recommendations. Towards this end Working Groups and Task Forces have been established to examine issues either raised by the Commission or by EURAB itself. After thorough discussion, which often includes consultation with the Commission services, each Working Group or Task Force prepares a set of recommendations that are submitted to the Plenary where the final decision is taken. Subsequently, the recommendations are forwarded to the European Commissioner for Research.

The unique feature of EURAB's experience has been the close collaborative patterns which emerged between members coming from academia and from industry, and all Working Groups have always carefully attempted to achieve a good mixture of the relevant expertise and experience. Within the Plenary meetings, mutual respect has also characterised the discussions. Through a productive learning process, EURAB has consistently striven to come up with strategic recommendations which are targeted at whom they address (mainly, but not exclusively the Commission) and which reflect both academic and industrial perspectives. The overall objective is to confront what we see as one of the most urgent challenges for ERA: to promote research and innovation in Europe in the overall context of global competitiveness.

Within the various national contexts, there has been growing interest in EURAB's work. EURAB members have been asked to present EURAB's views and recommendations in national and international fora. We will endeavour to continue in our efforts to make EURAB visible throughout Europe.

EURAB continues to receive responses from the Commission concerning the uptake of its advice. This dialogue should become a continuous one. In the future, EURAB will concentrate on consolidating its recommendations in a joint effort to turn ERA into a European success story and to assist in the shaping of the next Framework Programme. In June 2004 with half of its members renewed, EURAB 2 was constituted. It has a solid base to build upon and high ambitions for the next three year period.

Helga Nowotny  
Chair of EURAB

## EURAB BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

1. Commission Decision of 27 June 2001 on establishing the European Research Advisory Board (<http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/eurab/pdf/eurab.pdf>)
2. Commission Decision on the nomination of the members of the European Research Advisory Board, dated 1 August 2001 ([http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2001/c\\_268/c\\_26820010922en00020004.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2001/c_268/c_26820010922en00020004.pdf))
3. EURAB, Rules of Procedure (<http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/eurab/procedure-rules.html>)



# Foreword

With the start of FP7 shortly to begin, EURAB has judged it opportune and timely to come forth with a new set of recommendations on the social sciences and humanities (SSH). The reasons are twofold. For the first time the humanities are acknowledged in more than merely a symbolic way, although a more extended inclusion may be hindered by the legal framework which privileges contributions that promise to 'strengthen the (economic) competitiveness' of Europe. On the side of the humanities the relation to the EU framework programmes has up till now been marked by a certain distance. This is to some extent rooted in the humanities' dispersed way of working - predominantly, but not always, in small teams located inside universities where humanists often feel relegated to the margins. The widespread perception of institutional weakness contrasts starkly, however, with the substantive content of the actual contributions that the humanities have and continue to make. Among these manifold contributions, "Europe" as an imagined and idealized, as well as a vibrant, sometimes tormented, but living, and extremely diverse entity, figures strongly in humanistic scholarship. In our recommendations we attempt to address the actual situation. We are convinced of the value which the humanities have to offer, and we identify ways and means how bridges to and from the humanistic European community might be built in the future.

The second opportunity which FP7 offers is for a stronger integration of the social sciences in all areas where science, technology and innovation are the focus of sustained research efforts directed to shaping the future. Increasingly, research and innovation are expected to meet more or less explicit expectations, shared by policy-makers and the general public that they will automatically lead to economic growth and employment. We understand that a knowledge-based society and economy cannot content itself with producing knowledge that is detached and separated from its context. Rather, knowledge must be 'translated', and constructively put to use in different contexts of application. It must become embed-

ded, for instance, in how we educate the young and how the next generation will be prepared for work and careers which in turn will undergo redefinition and continuing change. Moreover, knowledge cannot be contained and will continue to cross national boundaries with greater ease and speed than ever before. Science and scholarship have always prided themselves to be international. Now the production of new knowledge has become truly globalized. Further, we are aware that science and technology not only unite the world but also have the potential to create new divides.

The social sciences and humanities have an important role to play at the heart of these changing human circumstances. They help us understand how the 'future generating machinery' which is so successfully and efficiently fuelled by science and technology, will actually work, what kind of economic and social impact it will have and how it will transform our societies. Accordingly, EURAB's recommendations propose both that SSH should have their own proper space within FP7, but we also argue for a much stronger and more deliberate integration of SSH into the whole scope and objectives of FP7. We acknowledge how much has already been achieved in the past. At the same time we appeal to the individual and collective creativity of all of us to make full use of what is already known and at hand. It will be up to individual scholars and researchers in the SSH as well as to institutions, including the Commission and national and European organizations, to seize the next Framework Programme as a truly innovative opportunity for the social sciences and humanities. The future is inherently unknown but there is much we can do together to help prepare for its uncertainties.

It is in this spirit that the recommendations concerning the SSH in FP7 are offered.

Helga Nowotny  
Chair of EURAB





# Table of Contents

## EURAB

### Foreword

<b>1. Executive Summary and Recommendations</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>2. Preamble: Mandate and approach</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>3. Progress on the EURAB recommendations of January 2004</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>4. The debate since January 2004</b> .....	<b>11</b>
4.1. Converging Technologies – Shaping the Future of European Society	
4.2. European Universities: Enhancing Europe’s Research Base	
4.3. Mid-term Synthesis Report on the Integration of Socio-economic and Foresight Dimensions in FP6	
4.4. Frontier Research – the European Challenge	
4.5. Looking ahead to SSH in FP7	
<b>5. The Humanities in FP7</b> .....	<b>14</b>
5.1. Scope and description of the Humanities	
5.2. The Humanities in Theme 8	
5.3. The Humanities’ contribution to S&T led Themes	
5.4. The need for enhanced dialogue	
<b>6. The Social Sciences in FP7</b> .....	<b>15</b>
6.1. Scope and description of the Social Sciences	
6.2. The Social Sciences in Theme 8	
6.3. The Social Sciences in S&T led Themes	
<b>7. Theme 8: Socio-Economic Sciences and the Humanities</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>8. SSH elsewhere in FP7</b> .....	<b>17</b>
8.1. Marie Curie and Institutes of Advanced Study	
8.2. SSH Infrastructures	
8.3. Science in Society	
<b>9. Institutional creativity in support of new, innovative SSH contributions</b> ...	<b>19</b>
<b>10. Conclusion: SSH and the ERA</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Annex 1 List of Working Group 8 Members</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Annex 2 List of acronyms</b> .....	<b>25</b>

# 1. Executive Summary and Recommendations

1.1 Over the last twenty years, the European Union's Framework Programmes have become a central feature of our research funding landscape. They have generated important new knowledge and built up a vital capacity for research co-operation across national boundaries. They have sustained continuity of funding in key areas, but not been afraid to innovate in others. One positive example of the Framework Programme's capacity for innovation was the inclusion of the Social Sciences under the FP4 Targeted Socio-Economic Research heading. Social Sciences were late starters in European research, and the Humanities are being brought on board even more recently. With FP7, the critical importance of the issues which Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) research tackles, has been recognised by their establishment as a key element of Framework Programme design.

It might then be reasonably asked why EURAB has chosen to make a second intervention on the contributions of SSH in FP7. There are several reasons for this. Firstly, significant new research design challenges follow from the Commission's recognition that the contributions of the Social Sciences to the European Research Area and to Europe's knowledge base cannot sensibly be separated from the contributions of Europe's researchers in the Humanities. Inclusion of new fields requires new capacities and fresh thinking. These new contributions need to come not only from the Commission but also from the research communities and their leaders. EURAB has a role to play in catalysing these contributions.

A second FP7 challenge comes with the increasing permeability of the boundaries between Social Sciences and the research traditionally discussed under a separate 'Science and Technology' label. EURAB believes this challenge is particularly significant because of the longer term ambitions of FP7, reaching as it does into the middle of the next decade of the 21st century. Though the actual directions and specific issues are hugely uncertain, we can be reasonably sure that by 2013 scientific and technological advances will offer possibilities for major transformations in European society. Europe's citizens will expect to be

well informed of the issues and to be assured that choices and impacts are well researched and understood. The new expectations require new synergies and new complementarities and new movements across old disciplinary boundaries. SSH research has large contributions to make to meeting those needs, but this cross-boundary work presents special challenges, which EURAB can help to address.

A third driver of EURAB's concern with SSH in FP7 is the exceptional imbalance between European capacities for SSH research and the modest allocation of resources within Framework Programmes. For example, national research councils spend a much larger proportion of their funds on Social Science and Humanities than the 1% or so proposed by the Commission for SSH in FP7. The SSH proportions are also much higher in terms of active researchers and student numbers. These disparities point to the capacity for SSH to make a larger contribution to the needs of European policy, provided the opportunities can be described in ways which will attract the best European minds, and that the SSH communities are willing to respond to these policy challenges.

From this analysis, EURAB concludes that FP7 should not be seen as 'business as usual' for SSH research. Much has been achieved by the competence and professionalism of the Commission and its advisers. But in a fast-changing research landscape, it is not surprising that there are still institutional barriers to be overcome and opportunities which risk being missed. Processes which suited well in the last millennium now need a fresh look. EURAB offers a wide-ranging set of suggestions. They are intended to help the Commission make the best use of its skills and competences in the creation of a genuinely innovative final version of the Programme, attractive to the best researchers across Europe. EURAB also hopes they will provide new opportunities for the engagement of SSH researchers and organisations with these issues.

EURAB's recommendations are summarised below, and also set out alongside the relevant arguments.

## 1.2 The Recommendations in this Report build on those in the 2004 Report<sup>1</sup> :

### **SSH & technology**

- 1) Framework Programme 7 (FP7) should support exploratory research on the ambitious Converging Technologies for the European Knowledge Society (CTEKS) agenda<sup>2</sup>, including the recommended SSH contribution.
- 2) In parallel with this, Constructive Technology Assessment (CTA)<sup>3</sup> should be explored by the Commission as a potential tool for upstream

engagement between scientists and technologists and other social actors, within Technology Platforms as well as within S&T led activities within FP7.

- 3) The Commission should urgently pursue the proposal for development and implementation of a broader concept of 'technology' in which human actions, values and choices play an integral part. This approach should then be embedded within internal and external FP7 guidance.

#### The Humanities in FP7

- 4) The Commission should adopt a common terminology and understanding of the scope of the Humanities, and to that end include these questions in its dialogue with the Humanities.
- 5) For Theme 8, there is a pressing need to identify and include priorities for high quality research in the Humanities in the upcoming Work Programme, so as to achieve a good balance between Social Sciences and Humanities content, and attract contributions from the best Humanities researchers.
- 6) The Commission should review and improve its contacts with leading European researchers in the Humanities and prioritise further consultation about the Humanities content in Theme 8. At the same time, European and national Humanities associations, academies and research councils, should also prioritise giving advice on the upcoming FP7 Work Programmes.

#### The Social Sciences

- 7) Consistent and inclusive terminology for the Social Sciences should be adopted within DG Research, distinguishing explicitly between research in these fields and more general consideration of the socio-economic dimension(s) and impact.
- 8) Qualitative analysis should be commissioned of the projects where integration of Social Science research in FP6 is claimed, to look for positive examples and lessons, in addition to forming a view of the extent of integration.
- 9) Care is needed to ensure those Social Science contributions which are planned in S&T led Themes, are properly resourced and connected. Additionally the development of FP7 Work Programmes in S&T led activities should include analysis (and inclusion) of the areas where the understanding of human behaviour and choices will contribute to the effective translation of S&T research into social and economic benefit. This should be a joint effort between the Commission and interested social scientists.

#### The Social Sciences and Humanities

- 10) In any revision of the budget for FP7, care must be taken to ensure sufficient funds for the significant contributions needed from SSH for the effective delivery of the Programme's goals.
- 11) Within Theme 8, incentives for research which crosses SS & H boundaries, should be built into the Work Programme and the evaluation criteria.
- 12) Within the 'People' part of FP7, the 'Lifelong Training and Career Development' Work Programme should ensure the participation of Institutes of Advanced study, and of the leading European researchers who are invited there.
- 13) The FP7 Science in Society programme should explicitly support a programme of research in STS (Science and Technology Studies), to expand knowledge about the interfaces between scientific research and societal institutions, giving priority to research which engages directly with policy makers, scientists and other stakeholders.
- 14) To strengthen the impact of the investment in Science in Society activities, dialogue workshops should be built in to the activities of each of the FP7 Themes.

#### Institutional creativity

- 15) The Commission should as a matter of priority collect together and act upon the key recommendations and arguments in the Horvat Report<sup>4</sup> and the antecedent documents to which it refers, and publish its reflections and responses.
- 16) A process should be instituted for more systematic internal discussion of reports commissioned by DG Research and for responses on the actions taken, to be published.
- 17) Ways need to be found of reducing the barriers to integration of SSH in other Framework Programme areas. An annual meeting should be held for SSH evaluators from across the whole Programme, to compare experiences and make recommendations.
- 18) The effective integration of SSH research should be seen to have leadership support, and to be a clear responsibility at both Cabinet and Directorate levels.

## 2. Preamble: Mandate and Approach

In January 2004, EURAB published its Report 'Recommendations on the ERA and the Social Sciences and Humanities', which made nine detailed proposals relevant to the final phases of the Sixth Framework Programme (FP6), but primarily pointed to the development of the upcoming FP7. A brief update was published in October 2004<sup>5</sup>. A new inquiry into the proposals for Social Sciences and Humanities in the new Programme was begun early in 2005. The Commission's plans for FP7 have now been published, including the Specific Programme texts<sup>6</sup>, and these have provided much of the material for this inquiry, together with a number of recent reports.

This inquiry was led by a EURAB Working Group, whose membership is listed at Annex 1. Its Mandate was to:

- **Review the progress made on the recommendations in the 'ERA and the SSH' Report (EURAB 03.076) and the Follow-up Report (EURAB 04.069).**
- **Comment and make recommendations on the potential for integration of Social Sciences and Humanities across the Thematic Priorities 1-7 and 9 in FP7.**
- **Comment and advise on the content and delivery of Thematic Priority 8, Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities, including operations and instruments.**
- **Make recommendations on other areas of the draft FP7 where SSH may have a significant interest and / or a contribution to make, for example the proposals on Ideas, People and Capacities.**
- **Take particular account in the above of any special needs of the Humanities, due to their newly enlarged place within this Framework Programme.**

The Working Group has taken as a starting point that SSH have an important and legitimate part to play in European R&D, and particularly in the upcoming Framework Programme. The reshaped Lisbon Action Plan focuses on employment, and knowledge and innovation for growth, but it also recognises the need for an underpinning of 'sound macro-economic conditions', including social,

environmental and welfare policies to make Europe a more attractive place to live, invest and work.<sup>7</sup> These are central agendas for SSH research. Secondly, the intertwining of advances in science and societal change seems now widely understood, along with the need for complementary development of research in SSH, natural sciences, engineering and medicine. This concept of complementary development of SSH with other fields of inquiry underpins this Report and its recommendations.

The Working Group has had the benefit of four important policy reports which have been produced since January 2004:

- **Converging Technologies – Shaping the Future of European Societies** (*European Commission, op.cit., 2004*)
- **European Universities: Enhancing Europe's Research Base**<sup>8</sup>
- **Mid-term Synthesis Report on the Integration of Socio-economic and Foresight Dimensions in FP6** (*Horvat, op.cit., to be published December 2005*)
- **Frontier Research – the European Challenge**.<sup>9</sup>

We briefly consider the implications of each of these Reports for the role and value of SSH at the European level, and draw on them for our recommendations.

EURAB has recently published three Reports which bear on the SSH remit, on "Interdisciplinarity in Research" (EURAB 04.009), on the "Financial Perspective for FP7" (EURAB 05.015), and on "Science and Society" (EURAB 05.035). This Report has benefited from also drawing on those documents.

Based on the material now available, EURAB has identified some opportunities for SSH research contributions which are still being overlooked, as well as some barriers to realising the full SSH potential within FP7. Because explicit inclusion of the Humanities is new in FP7, the Commission's proposals for this field are at an early stage of development, and this inquiry gave them particular attention.

# 3. Progress on the January 2004 EURAB Recommendations

The Seventh Framework programme and its Specific Programme include several positive responses to the nine recommendations on SSH which EURAB made in 2004. EURAB welcomes the Commission's proposal for an FP7 Theme on 'Socio-economic Sciences and the Humanities', which addresses the call for SSH to be valued in their own right within EU R&D. The underlining of SSH contributions to 'growth, employment and competitiveness'<sup>10</sup> makes the point that research in these fields will make a large contribution to the Lisbon goals. EURAB also welcomes the recognition of the strength of the European SSH research base, and the potential for high added value from collaborative SSH research on key areas of European policy<sup>11</sup>.

EURAB also welcomes the inclusion of more forward-looking perspectives in the Theme 8; the more flexible approach to the smaller instruments which are often appropriate for SSH research<sup>12</sup>, and the greater emphasis on substantive Science in Society activity under the Capacities heading.

However several important issues from EURAB's earlier Report continue to need attention:

- o **Infrastructures:** Opportunities for improved for Social Science infrastructures are opening up in FP7.

EURAB welcomes the launching of the European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructure (ESFRI), but work is still needed on the diverse needs of European SSH research within the upcoming FP7 Work Programmes.

- o **SSH contributions to other Themes:** SSH contributions have been identified in the Specific Programme texts for some of the Themes, but significant opportunities are still being missed for SSH to contribute to the achievement of EU S&T goals.
- o **Science in Society:** Whilst the FP7 proposals in this area represent an important advance on those in FP6, they need further attention, including mechanisms to embed these issues within all Themes.
- o **A Consultative Conference for the Humanities:** EURAB welcomes the SSH Conference to be held on 12-13 December 2005 in Brussels, and the Conference to be held on 8 December in London by the 'Humanities in the European Research Area' ERANET (HERA), but more work is needed to develop the agenda for the Humanities in FP7.
- o **SSH Research Innovation Spaces:** EURAB regrets that this 2004 Recommendation has not been explicitly followed up, but sees other opportunities within FP7 to meet the particular needs of SSH scholarship.

# 4. The debate since January 2004

For R&D policy in Europe, the period since January 2004 has been one of significant events, important publications and lively debate. The review of the Lisbon goals has further sharpened the focus on policies for economic growth, innovation and employment. Debates on the draft Constitutional Treaty have drawn attention to the need for deepened social, cultural and political understanding. For example, more attention to knowledge generated in the Humanities and Social Sciences could have alerted policy makers to the disquiet of European citizens, and led to better preparation for the recent political shocks. Social, cultural and historical knowledge can make a significant contribution to these kinds of policy agendas - both in its own right and in positive interaction with leading edge research in medicine, the sciences and technology.

The last 18 months has also been a period of reflection about the substantive content of research priorities, about their delivery within the Framework Programme, and about the institutions of European research. In addition to

the Framework Programme proposals, four other European reports carried important implications for the future development of SSH within FP7, and these are now briefly reviewed.

## 4.1 Converging Technologies – Shaping the Future of European Societies

The Converging Technologies (CT) Report discusses the transformative potential of convergence of nano-, bio-, and ICT-technology, along with their collective potential for 'engineering for the mind and the body' or (in its more radical form, which the Report rejects) 'to the mind and the body'. The Report recommends for FP7 a series of preparatory actions which it asserts will begin to develop 'Converging Technologies for the European Knowledge Society' (CTEKS). The Report also foresees a positive interaction between CT research programmes and European policy agendas. Health care (e.g. through 'lab-

on-a-chip' technologies), education and learning, ambient sensing devices, and new technologies for the generation, storage, transport and use of energy are just some of the innovations identified. CTs are seen as particularly significant because of their capacity to alter boundaries between the self, nature and the human environment, thereby confronting societies, institutions, groups and individuals with new choices and new risks. Cognitive science, social psychology and other social sciences are seen as central to upstream understanding of those choices and risks, and of the way in which human behaviour and values will shape the directions which CT research and CT products take<sup>13</sup>.

EURAB supports the proposals that FP7 resources should be allocated to the building of a multidisciplinary CT research community, in which SSH disciplines would have a significant part. It agrees the need for early European initiatives which would (*inter alia*) "recognise and support the contributions of SSH in relation to CTs"<sup>14</sup>. It is therefore disappointing that little explicit attention is given to these frontier opportunities in the FP7 proposals. The absence is particularly noticeable in the Specific Programmes which address the constituent elements of CTs; for example nanotechnologies, biotechnologies, ICTs, and SSH.

An important element of the CTEKS report is its commitment to engagement with social, economic and political issues at an early stage of scientific and technological development. One route for delivering this upstream engagement is through the tools and approaches of 'Constructive Technology Assessment' (CTA)<sup>15</sup>, which aims to bring together SSH thinking with scientists and technologists, civil society and stakeholders in the public and private sectors in the early stages. EURAB sees this as a good example of the ways in which SSH research in FP7 could play an important complementary role in shaping S&T futures. CTA could also provide a route for remedying the regrettable absence of SSH contributions within most EU Technology Platforms.

**Recommendation 1: FP7 should support exploratory research on the ambitious CTEKS agenda, including the recommended SSH contribution.**  
**Recommendation 2: In parallel with this, CTA should be explored by the Commission as a potential tool for upstream engagement between scientists and technologist and other social actors, within Technology Platforms as well as within S&T led activities within FP7.**

## 4.2 European Universities: Enhancing Europe's Research Base

This is a Report to the Commission on new challenges faced by Europe's universities as contributors to the Lisbon goals. It discusses knowledge production in universities, their role in the exchange and transfer of knowledge, and questions of institutional governance and performance. Institutions which facilitate the crossing of disciplinary boundaries, are seen as important for future success. There are three significant messages for the support of SSH research :

- i. Much of the analysis in the Report draws, albeit indirectly, on SSH research on innovation, knowledge transfer and exchange, management, governance and networking, thereby exemplifying the policy contributions SSH make at the European level.
- ii. The Report includes in its recommendations a specific call to "*reinforce research on the socio-economic dimension of the (production of) knowledge and its implications, in particular on its actors as well as on research-active universities*". Research within SSH is picked out both for its contribution and for its need for additional support.
- iii. The recommendations for FP7 include reinforcing mechanisms for crossing disciplinary boundaries (not least within the ERC, see below) with appropriate instruments and evaluation procedures.

## 4.3 Mid-term Synthesis Report on the Integration of Socio-economic and Foresight Dimensions in FP6 ('The Horvat Report')

This report was commissioned from Professor Manfred Horvat of the Austrian Research Promotion Agency. Its remit was to examine the extent of integration of 'socio-economic and foresight dimensions' at the mid-point of FP6. Humanities were not included, presumably because of their very small part in FP6. Horvat has selected some 100 projects, to show the different ways how socio-economic and foresight dimensions are integrated under different modalities of FP6 activities. This is only a small sample of the more than 3.000 FP6 projects that were running at the time of the report, and, therefore, the examples cannot be taken as a robust quantitative assessment of the extent of integration of social science research.

In addition, it is emphasised in the Horvat report that the level of Social Science involvement runs from in-depth social science research – either integrated or conducted alongside S&T research – to more limited, supportive inquiry using some social science concepts or tools, and through to much weaker processes of general reflection on (or reference to) socio-economic aspects. These distinctions are important. EURAB welcomes their identification and they are also discussed later in this Report. It is sufficient to note here that the focus of this EURAB inquiry is on the *integration of Social Sciences and Humanities*, in which most social scientists and many policy makers would not include the weaker end of the range identified by Horvat. From that point of view, Horvat's conclusions may be to a certain extent over-optimistic<sup>16</sup>, and his recommendations all the more urgent. In any case, more detailed qualitative and – as far as possible – quantitative analyses of SSH integration should be commissioned.

Taking all this into account, the Horvat Report's assertion that *"since, so far, all efforts for stronger integration of socio-economic dimensions have been of limited success, a new attempt is necessary for FP7"* (p.47) is persuasive, and feeds in to EURAB's further recommendations on this issue in the FP7 context.

The Horvat proposals for procedural change are also persuasive, based as they are on careful analysis of past experience. His report draws attention to the way in which useful and cumulative advice from different reports seems not to have been used within the Commission. EURAB shares that concern and this Report includes some later proposals for encouraging institutional learning in the next stages of the design and management of FP7.

Last but by no means least, the Horvat Report provides valuable insights into the challenges faced when attempting the integration of SSH into S&T programmes. It includes an interesting and important proposal for rethinking technology as an endeavour that encompasses both human actions and decisions as well as artefacts within the lifecycle of R&D, production, application, use, and disposal. In this perspective, human values, choices and perspectives are embedded within the development and use of technology. EURAB endorses this multi-dimensional notion of technology, and also recommends that the concept be translated into FP7 guidance for Commission staff, applicants and evaluators.

**Recommendation 3: The Commission should urgently pursue the proposal for development and implementation of a broader concept of 'technology' in which human actions, values and choices play an integral part. This approach should then be embedded within internal and external FP7 guidance.**

#### 4.4 Frontier Research – the European Challenge

The term 'frontier research' was introduced by this Report and taken up by the Commission in the "Ideas" part of FP7. A European Research Council (ERC) is to be established to fund European 'frontier research', a term which is distinguished from basic or applied research – *"Frontier research, because it is at the forefront of creating new knowledge, is an intrinsically risky endeavour that involves the pursuit of questions without regard for established disciplinary boundaries or national borders"*. Preparations for the ERC are now underway with the appointment of a Scientific Council, and the inclusion of financial and administrative proposals for the ERC within the 'Ideas' element of the FP7 Specific Programmes.

EURAB welcomes the explicit inclusion of the Social Sciences and Humanities within the ERC framework. This should be taken as positive encouragement to the SSH research communities in Europe to begin to discuss and define what 'frontier research' in SSH might mean, so that they can make full use of the opportunities offered.

#### 4.5 Looking ahead to SSH in FP 7

One compelling message from these four reports is that FP7 must not be seen as a roll-over of FP6. The extended period for this Framework Programme means that decisions are being taken now which will shape the funding and output of European science up till 2013 and beyond. It is reasonable to suppose that this will be a period of large-scale societal effects from research-led innovation. EURAB is convinced that FP7 must not be 'business as usual' if it is to contribute significantly to Europe's ambitious economic, social and political goals. Creative thinking, imaginative leadership and new institutional flexibilities are needed in the design of the Programme. It is a time of unusual opportunity for new research directions, where collaboration across national and subject boundaries will be crucial for ensuring added value from this large investment in R&D by European states and citizens. SSH research has a very important part to play in this process, both in its own right and as a partner with science and technology. This Report and its recommendations address both those roles.

# 5. The Humanities in FP7

## 5.1 Including the Humanities

EURAB welcomes the Commission's far-sighted decision to include the Humanities as significant actors within FP7. Humanities research has much to contribute to our understanding of continuity and innovation, migration, social cohesion, attitudes to the environment, diversity and identity. Humanities research also has the capacity to explore and explain national and regional boundaries<sup>17</sup>. There are clear opportunities for European added value in the support of Humanities inquiries into the underlying dynamics of European cohesion and differentiation.

However, progress in defining contributions for the Humanities in FP7 may be being hampered by an insufficient appreciation of its scope, which includes not only philosophy and ethics, classics, religion, language, linguistics, history, but also visual arts and media, information studies and design<sup>18</sup>. Confusion in the Commission terminology for the Humanities also risks reducing the capacity for shared understanding about the relevance of this field for European research and policy goals.

**Recommendation 4: The Commission should adopt a common terminology and understanding of the scope of the Humanities, and to that end include these questions in its dialogue with the Humanities.**

## 5.2 The Humanities in Theme 8

Because of the wide scope of the Humanities, careful thought is needed to identify the fields and topics where research can contribute to European goals and achieve optimum European added value. The best minds in European Humanities need to be engaged in this process. EURAB commends the efforts the Commission has already made in this direction<sup>19</sup>, initiating dialogues and starting to develop its own in-house expertise. The Activities outlined in the Specific Programme for Theme 8 appear to offer some scope for the Humanities, particularly under the heading of 'The Citizen in the EU'. However there is work still to be done if the promise of European Humanities research is to be properly delivered.

For example, much of the terminology used throughout the Specific Programme text is that of the Social Sciences. Four of the seven Activities seem limited only to the Social

Sciences, and the Humanities options elsewhere seem to be limited to 'cultural interactions'. Humanities thinking needs to be more widely diffused through the whole of the Theme. Otherwise there is a serious risk that the best Humanities researchers will believe that this programme is not really available to them, and will not engage with FP7.

EURAB wishes to stress the importance of the Humanities to the Framework Programme in providing a deeper readiness for the unforeseen, for example through deep inquiry into culture, borders, heritage and religion. A few examples of possible humanities research topics may be helpful as illustrations of the additional contributions that could be made:

- Understanding and shaping cultural identity
- The origins (and arbitrariness) of national borders
- Conditions of cultural transfer inside and across national and EU boundaries
- The continuing 'invention' and adaptation of the cultural heritage
- The effects of the gradual adoption of English as a 'lingua franca'
- The contributions of cultural production to economic performance, for example in the creative arts, design and the media

**Recommendation 5: For Theme 8, there is a pressing need to identify and include priorities for high quality research in the Humanities in the upcoming Work Programme, so as to achieve a good balance between Social Sciences and Humanities content, and attract contributions from the best Humanities researchers.**

## 5.3 Humanities contributions to S&T led Themes

Humanities contributions to other Themes get little attention in the design of FP7. The few exceptions, such as the inclusion of 'Content, Creativity and Development' in the Information and Communication Technologies Specific Programme, are to be welcomed as signposts to what may be achieved in subsequent Framework Programmes, but most attention is need at this stage to the adequate inclusion of challenging Humanities topics in Theme 8, as discussed in paragraph 5.2 above.



## 5.4 The need for enhanced dialogue on the Humanities in FP7

EURAB welcomes the several initiatives which the Commission has taken to discuss European Humanities research with the Academia Europaea<sup>20</sup> and with representatives of national agencies. However these dialogues have tended to focus on European Research Council issues, and have not yet produced structured proposals for Humanities research in FP7. For the reasons already given, these dialogues need to be continued, and indeed deepened, in order to address the relatively weak Humanities content in FP7 texts. The preparation of detailed Work programmes in the coming months provide a crucial opportunity for the Commission to invite national and

European associations and research organisations to join in this task. For their part, those organisations should be preparing to contribute.

**Recommendation 6: The Commission should review and improve its contacts with leading European researchers in the Humanities and prioritise further consultation about the Humanities content in Theme 8. At the same time, European and national Humanities associations, academics and research councils, should also prioritise giving advice on the upcoming FP7 Work Programmes.**

# 6. The Social Sciences

The Social Sciences have played an important part in Framework Programmes since the inclusion of the Targeted Socio-economic Research Programme (TSER) in FP4. They should have a large role in FP7, not only in Theme 8, but as contributors to several other Themes. They are also core contributors to the programme of work on Science in Society. Some further action is needed to improve these contributions.

## 6.1 Scope and description of the Social Sciences

As with the Humanities, there are unhelpful variations in the terminology used for the Social Sciences in Framework Programme documents. For example, 'Socio-economic sciences' is used in the title of Theme 8, but elsewhere 'Socio-economic research' (e.g. TSER). Part of the problem here may come from varying terminology at the national level. For example, economics is sometimes included within 'Social Sciences' at the national level, and sometimes not<sup>21</sup>. As the conventional term seems to be 'Social Sciences', EURAB believes there is a prima facie case for the Commission standardising on this term, and at

the same time revising the proposed title of Theme 8. The 'socio-economic' alternative is less clear, seemingly a fusion between economic research and a separate category of social research. In any event, a standard terminology for the Social Sciences should be adopted and sustained. There is a second particularly unhelpful terminological confusion between Social Science research and the term 'Socio-economic dimension' (SED). Problems arise when 'SED' is taken to include both research and the very different issue of awareness. There is a very important distinction to be made between studies and programmes which include genuine social science as structured inquiry, and those which only recognise and discuss socio-economic dimensions and impact.

**Recommendation 7: Consistent and inclusive terminology for the Social Sciences should be adopted within DG Research, distinguishing explicitly between research in these fields and more general consideration of the socio-economic dimension(s) and impact.**

## 6.2 The Social Sciences in Theme 8

EURAB welcomes the inclusion of forward looking, futures-oriented proposals for the social sciences in Theme 8. This should provide a stronger base for co-operation with S&T led Themes. EURAB also welcomes the degree of continuity with FP6, which takes on board the criteria proposed in the EURAB Financial Perspective Report (EURAB 05.015). Given the importance of looking ahead, the Commission should take the opportunity of the next few months to develop and intellectually adventurous Social Science content for the Theme 8 Work Programme.

## 6.3 The Social Sciences in the S&T led Themes

Improved, targeted integration of the Social Sciences within the eight other FP7 Themes remains one of largest challenges in the design of FP7. EURAB has already reported on the importance of interdisciplinarity (EURAB 04.009). High priority should be given to crossing these boundaries in FP7 because of the contributions Social Sciences can make to S&T led research.

As a starting point, the Horvat Report provides some outstanding FP6 examples of the genuine integration of SSH research with science and technology<sup>22</sup>. These should be studied carefully to see what lessons can be learnt for future interdisciplinary work, as Horvat recommended.

An alternative route to engaging with Social Sciences was tried in FP6, where a BioSociety website<sup>23</sup> was created. This site now looks a little dated but had the commendable intention to engage not only with societal issues but also with social scientists. This kind of web-based approach to wider dialogue has clear potential for further development, but requires substantial effort and resources to engaging participants effectively, and to keep the content up to date.

Turning then to FP7, there is reason to be concerned that the situation reported by Horvat for FP6 has not yet improved as much as might have been hoped. Some significant opportunities are being created, for example the activity on 'Understanding Human Behaviour' proposed within the Food Theme, and the cross-cutting 'Security and Society' Activity within the Security Theme. In these cases, adequate resources for these activities and their connectivity with the rest of the work in the Theme need to be assured. Otherwise SSH research will be marginalised, and not be able to contribute to the effective delivery of FP7 goals.

Beyond these few cases, the evidence of the Specific Programmes text within the 'Co-operation' element of FP7 is that important opportunities for SSH research to contribute creatively to the effective delivery of social and economic benefit across FP7 are being missed<sup>24</sup>. There seem to be a significant number of areas within the Specific Programmes where inclusion of the Social Sciences could add obvious value. Contributions will be needed here from social scientists as well as the Commission. During the process of developing the FP7 Work Programmes, it is strongly recommended that attention be given to identifying Social Science research which can add value to the S&T goals. To help this discussion, EURAB provides here some examples of activities and themes where there is a *prima facie* case for including the Social Sciences:

*Human development and ageing; Translating clinical research into clinical practice; Integration of technologies; Personal and home environments; Meeting societal challenges for health; ICT for trust and confidence; Nanosciences, nanotechnologies, materials and new production technologies<sup>25</sup>; Energy efficiency and savings; Knowledge for energy policy making; Pressures on the environment and climate; Natural hazards; Conservation and sustainable management of natural and man-made resources; Encouraging modal shift; Ensuring sustainable urban mobility and strengthening competitiveness.*

EURAB believes that there is scope in many of these fields for the inclusion of complementary but closely coupled Social Science research, and for interdisciplinary projects with social scientists as active partners. There are two reasons for this. Firstly it will provide more robust knowledge of the topics being studied. Secondly it will help to connect scientific and technological choices with those made by European citizens, thus assuring downstream social and economic benefit.

**Recommendation 8: Qualitative analysis should be commissioned of the projects where integration of Social Science research in FP6 is claimed, to look for positive examples and lessons, in addition to forming a view of the extent of integration.<sup>26</sup>**

**Recommendation 9: Care is needed to ensure those Social Science contributions which are planned in S&T led Themes, are properly resourced and connected. Additionally the development of FP7 Work Programmes in S&T led activities should include analysis (and inclusion) of the areas where the understanding of human behaviour and choices will contribute to the effective translation of S&T research into social and economic benefit. This should be a joint effort between the Commission and interested social scientists.**

## 7. Theme 8

The stated intentions of Theme 8 are to address the challenges of European growth and competitiveness, employment, social cohesion and sustainability, quality of life and global interdependence. Research here will make core contributions to European goals, to the Lisbon agenda and the needs of European citizens. The Theme recognises the underlying diversity of economic, social, political and cultural domains within Europe, and aims to improve the knowledge base for policies in these fields. This is one of the areas where enhancement of the FP6 funding levels is essential, to support research appropriate to the scale of the problems being addressed. In its report on the “Financial Perspective for FP7”, EURAB has already drawn attention to the need to ensure adequate funding for SSH<sup>27</sup>. Additional resources are needed to avoid the evidently negative effects of oversubscription in FP6, and of the dysfunctionally small number of awards made in the Citizens and Governance area and to ensure the effective inclusion of the Humanities.

**Recommendation 10: In any revision of the budget for FP7, care must be taken to ensure sufficient funds for the significant contributions needed from SSH for the effective delivery of the Programme’s goals.**

In addition to providing adequate resources, it will be vital that the investment being made in FP7 brings together the Humanities and Social Science contributions within Theme 8, and benefits from the important potential for synergies between them – for example in the study of Europe’s place in the world, and of citizenship within the European union. The Work Programme (and its associated evaluation criteria) should provide explicit incentives for European scholars to work across the SSH boundaries.

**Recommendation 11: Within Theme 8, incentives for research which crosses SS & H boundaries should be built in to the Work Programme and the evaluation criteria.**

## 8. SSH elsewhere in FP7

The FP7 Specific Programme proposals offer other opportunities for SSH contributions, for example in the ‘Capacities’ proposals for Regions of Knowledge, Research Potential and International Co-operation. EURAB welcomes these wider opportunities. Three are elaborated here.

### 8.1 Marie Curie and Institutes of Advanced Study

EURAB’s earlier suggestion for Research Innovation Spaces<sup>28</sup> was driven in part by the need for more effective inclusion within European research policy of the Institutes of Advanced Study (IAS). EURAB welcomes the initiative taken by the Commission to progress this issue by talking with the IAS Association, and the new opportunity which seems now have been provided within the Marie Curie section of the Specific Programme on ‘People’. Institutes of this kind provide invaluable space, time and resources for leading European SSH researchers. They allow quality time to be spent away from their everyday commitments,

and are critical to the development of new SSH thinking and scholarship. Thus far, the best Institutes of Advanced Study have often found themselves excluded by Framework Programme structures. However the FP7 proposal that career development resources will be provided on a co-funding basis should allow Institutes to come forward as joint applicants with the researchers they wish to host. This opportunity should be sustained within the ‘Lifelong Training and Career Development’ activity, to allow funding for the best researchers to spend time at the best European IAS. This will significantly enhance European research capacity in SSH.

**Recommendation 12: Within the ‘People’ part of FP7, the ‘Lifelong Training and Career Development’ Work Programme should ensure the participation of Institutes of Advanced study, and of the leading European researchers who are invited there.**

## 8.2 SSH Infrastructures

In line with the detailed analysis and recommendations in the EURAB's 2004 Report on "ERA and SSH", the Humanities and the Social Sciences<sup>29</sup> have both been included within the remit of the European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructure (ESFRI). The recommendations of the ESFRI Expert Group on Cultural Heritage, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Roadmap Working Group (SSH RWG) are due early in 2006. EURAB hopes the exemplary success story of EU support for the European Social Survey will now be seen as a first step towards meeting the diverse infrastructure needs of both qualitative and quantitative European SSH research.

## 8.3 Science in Society

EURAB reported on Science and Society questions in September 2005<sup>30</sup>. It is worth repeating here that understanding of the challenges science faces today, depends on high quality SSH research. EURAB welcomes the attention given to these issues within the 'Capacities' area of FP7. A well-crafted programme of work on this topic can make a vital contribution to the overall effectiveness of the Programme. The scale and design of the FP7 'Science in Society' proposals constitutes a significant improvement on the equivalent section of FP6. It will be very important that this is not prejudiced by budget reductions, or lack of ambition in the Work Programme design.

EURAB wishes also to point out that Europe has an impressive capacity in this field, for example in science and technology studies, in science policy research and in communication studies. FP7 has the opportunity to build on this excellent research, but must at the same time not

overlook the need to continue to improve the knowledge base. The agenda needs to include provision for generating new policy-relevant knowledge through additional research, together with the support for networking which is already foreseen. That research agenda should also emphasise the need for European Science in Society research to provide a platform for the interchange of knowledge across SSH and S&T boundaries, and between research and policy - for example by including stakeholders in research on the governance of science, or funding agency decision makers in the study of policy making, or practising scientists as research partners in inquiries into the social acceptability of new technologies.

In this context, EURAB restates its earlier recommendation for building 'dialogue workshops' into the activities to be funded within S&T led Themes. These meetings should be designed to bring together scientists, technologists and STS researchers, and to facilitate connections across the 'two cultures'<sup>31</sup>.

**Recommendation 13: The FP7 Science in Society programme should explicitly support a programme of research in STS (Science and Technology Studies), to expand knowledge about the interfaces between scientific research and societal institutions, giving priority to research which engages directly with policy makers, scientists and other stakeholders.**

**Recommendation 14: To strengthen the impact of the investment in Science in Society activities, dialogue workshops should be built in to the activities of each of the FP7 Themes.**

# 9. Institutional creativity in support of new SSH contributions

Some of the recommendations made in this Report are straightforward, but others seem to require some variation in well-established ways of working, in the institutional patterns of the Commission<sup>32</sup>.

EURAB has noted and fully supports the carefully researched recommendations of the Horvat Report on the "Socio-economic and Foresight Dimensions in FP6" (op.cit.). One of the points to emerge most vividly there is the concern that better use should be made of the wealth of reports to the Commission<sup>33</sup> which (directly or indirectly) made recommendations on the integration of Social Science Research within the Framework Programme. Many of their recommendations were cumulative – for example on the selection and briefing of evaluators – but the process by which they are considered and acted upon is far from clear<sup>34</sup>. It sometimes seems that reports do not progress beyond the groups which commission them, even when they have wider organisational implications. If this analysis is correct, it suggests the presence of substantial institutional barriers to organisational learning. Moreover it would mean that good use is too often not being made of the valuable time of the many experts involved.

Institutional barriers of this kind may well explain the slow progress made on the integration of Social Sciences within Framework Programmes. For example, the Horvat Report recommends enhanced communication across Directorates, and strengthened mechanisms for collaborative learning of staff in DG Research and other DGs of the research family to exchange knowledge and experience on the implementation of an advanced multi-dimensional concept of technology integrating natural and engineering as well as social and human values and perspectives. Horvat made substantive recommendations for developing the management information by consistent use of a science classification scheme for getting deeper insight into the extent and quality of the integration of socio-economic dimensions. Tom Burns's paper<sup>35</sup> underlines several of Horvat's institutional recommendations, for example also in relation to the selection of advisers and peer reviewers.

EURAB believes that new routes need to be opened to take account of the reports which are on the table now, which speak not only to project selection but also to upstream questions of issue definition and the writing of the all-important work programmes. Increased connectivity is needed across DG Research; together with an increased capacity for communication, learning and sharing knowledge. This institutional creativity will need promotion at the highest levels, as well as support across Directorates. The first priority is for the need to be established and accepted, and to be followed by a number of specific actions. Thereafter these changes need themselves to be institutionalised within new routines and procedures in for making good use of future reports and advice.

**Recommendation 15: The Commission should as a matter of priority collect together and act upon the key recommendations and arguments in the Horvat Report and the antecedent documents to which it refers and publish its reflections and responses.**

**Recommendation 16: A process should be instituted for more systematic internal discussion of reports commissioned by DG Research, and for responses on the actions taken to be published.**

**Recommendation 17: Ways need to be found of reducing the barriers to integration of SSH in other Framework Programme areas. An annual meeting should be held for SSH evaluators from across the whole Programme, to compare experiences and make recommendations.**

**Recommendation 18: The effective integration of SSH research should be seen to have leadership support, and to be a clear responsibility at both Cabinet and Directorate levels.**

# 10. Conclusions - SSH and the ERA

Social Sciences and Humanities research is central to the achievement of the Lisbon goals and to the intermediating need for sustainability and social cohesion. There is growing evidence of the contributions which have already been made, and of the new knowledge which SSH can be expected to produce in the future. Moreover, SSH can contribute not only in its own fields of inquiry but also to the more effective delivery of programmes traditionally seen as the separate entities of science and technology. These boundaries no longer make policy sense in a world where the progress of science is bound closely to human choice and social acceptance.

With its long reach into the middle of the 2010s, the 7th Framework Programme will have a critically important shaping effect on European knowledge production. Its design therefore needs to reflect the changing patterns of scientific inquiry and a new vision of the potential for SSH as a contributor to scientific and technological as well as social and economic futures. This is not 'business as usual' for the Framework Programme, and this Report has suggested some ways in which these ambitions can be advanced. There are no doubt many others, and it is EURAB's hope that this Report will stimulate debate and action on these issues inside and outside the European Commission.

# Footnotes:

- <sup>1</sup> 'Recommendations on the ERA and the Social Sciences and Humanities', EURAB 03.076
- <sup>2</sup> 'Converging Technologies – Shaping the Future of European Societies', European Commission, 2004
- <sup>3</sup> 'The Past and Future of Constructive Technology Assessment', by J. Schot and A. Rip, Vol.54, 2-3, Technological Forecasting and Social Change, Feb-March 1997, pp. 251-268
- <sup>4</sup> "Mid-term Synthesis Report on the Integration of Socio-economic and Foresight Dimensions in FP6", the 'Horvat Report', to be published by the European Commission in December 2005
- <sup>5</sup> EURAB 04.069
- <sup>6</sup> 'Building the Europe of Knowledge', COM (2005) 119. The Specific Programmes are COM 439-445 Final. This Report also draws on 'Simplification in the 7th Framework Programme, COMSEC (2005) 431
- <sup>7</sup> COM 2005.024, 02.02.2005 "Working together for growth and jobs: A new start for the Lisbon Strategy", Communication from President Barroso in agreement with Vice-President Verheugen
- <sup>8</sup> European Commission, May 2005
- <sup>9</sup> HLEG Report, EUR 21619, Brussels, April 2005.
- <sup>10</sup> COM (2005) 119, p.31
- <sup>11</sup> *ibid*, p.31
- <sup>12</sup> Section 2.1 of the Commission's proposals for Simplification in FP7, COMSEC(2005) 431
- <sup>13</sup> These propositions have since been supported at a Commission-sponsored Conference in Brussels in September 2004 on 'Converging Technologies for a Diverse Europe', which further developed the idea of a distinctively European approach to CTs. (The Conference Report is available on CORDIS)
- <sup>14</sup> Converging Technologies Report, *op.cit.*, p5
- <sup>15</sup> Schot and Rip, *op.cit.*, 1997
- <sup>16</sup> A reading of the examples of socio-economic inclusion given in the Appendix to the Horvat report confirms there is an issue about the extent to which Social Science *research* has really been integrated. As far as can be judged from the abstracts, only a small proportion report the inclusion of substantial Social Science research, and less than half refer to social scientific inquiry at all. The rest contain references to socio-economic issues but seem not to include research into them
- <sup>17</sup> As exemplified in the creation of European Museums ('The Emerging Museums of Europe', by B. Rogan, *Ethnologia Europaea*, 33,1, pp 51-60)
- <sup>18</sup> Drawn in part from the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council web site [http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/about/subject\\_coverage.asp](http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/about/subject_coverage.asp)
- <sup>19</sup> The Directorate General for Information Society and Media also has an interesting programme "Culture in the Digital Area"
- <sup>20</sup> Leading to an Academia Europaea statement on the importance of the Humanities in the ERA, available on [www.acadeuro.org](http://www.acadeuro.org)
- <sup>21</sup> For example, in the UK, social sciences are usually taken to include economics. In other countries the equivalent of human sciences is used. For example in the French CNRS 'Sciences Humaines et Sociales' are found in a department of 'Homme et la Société', and include economics. From January 2006, this Department will be called "Homme et Société"

- <sup>22</sup> A good example is the FP6 MARBEF Sustainable Development project on marine biodiversity and ecosystem functioning which gives a central place to the 'socio-economic importance of biodiversity', and includes social scientists as full partners in the Network of Excellence
- <sup>23</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/biosociety/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/biosociety/index_en.htm)
- <sup>24</sup> This view is supported by a paper from the Centre for European Policy Studies (J. Mortensen, 22.8.2005) which was provided to us by the Commission. See also T. Burns 'Bridges between Social Sciences and other Thematic Priorities – the challenge of interdisciplinarity', 2005; a paper to the Commission's Advisory Group on SSHERA
- <sup>25</sup> It is striking that a programme of work on Nanotechnologies is being proposed with as yet no space apparently for research into social acceptability, and also that earlier discussions about the inclusion of a European programme of research on Converging Technologies seem not to have led to any FP7 funding opportunities
- <sup>26</sup> Supported also by Burns, op.cit., in his final recommendation
- <sup>27</sup> EURAB 05.015, p.3
- <sup>28</sup> EURAB 03.076
- <sup>29</sup> EURAB 03.076 (2004) pp 8-10
- <sup>30</sup> EURAB 05.035
- <sup>31</sup> C P Snow, 'The Two Cultures', Cambridge University Press, 1993; 'The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution', Cambridge University Press, 1961
- <sup>32</sup> 'Institutional' is here used in its social scientific sense, as descriptive of the formal and informal rules and practices which shape the behaviour of organisations and the individuals within them, and constrain the ability to change (cf. 'Varieties of New Institutionalism' by V. Lowndes, Public Administration, Vol. 74, Summer 1996, pp. 181-197)
- <sup>33</sup> Within DG Research, in addition to EURAB Reports : Monitoring, Mid-term and Synthesis Reports, Surveys, impact evaluations, HLEG Reports on Key Technologies, Advisory Group recommendations. Most recently the Burns and Mortensen papers referred to in Note 24. Other DGs, such as DG INFOSOC, commission their own reports
- <sup>34</sup> EURAB has already made this point to the Commission in its October 2004 Report on SSH (EURAB 04.069). The issue seems not to be confined to reports on the Social Sciences and Humanities
- <sup>35</sup> Burns, op.cit.



# Annex 1 to the Report

## **The Membership of EURAB Working Group 8:**

### **“The Social Sciences and Humanities in the 7th Framework Programme”**

**Ragnhild Sohlberg (Chair), *Vice President, Hydro ASA***

**Miltiades Hatzopoulos, *Professor and Director of the Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity, National Hellenic Research Foundation***

**Maria Jepsen, *European Trade Union Institute***

**Tomasz Kosmider, *President and Managing Director of the Technology Partners' Consortium, Warsaw***

**Zita Kucinskiene, *Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, Vilnius University***

**Gretty Mirdal, *Professor of Transcultural and Clinical Psychology, University of Copenhagen***

**Helga Nowotny, *Professor em., ETH Zürich and Chair of EURAB***

**Chris Caswill (Rapporteur), *Distinguished Visiting Fellow, James Martin Institute, University of Oxford***



# Annex 2 to the Report

## **EURAB Report on “The Social Sciences and Humanities in the 7th Framework Programme”**

### **List of Acronyms used in the Report**

AHRB	Arts and Humanities Research Board (UK) (which became the Arts and Humanities Research Council - AHRC – in 2005)
CNRS	Centre national de la recherche scientifique (France)
CT	Converging Technologies
CTEKS	Converging Technologies for the European Knowledge Society
CTA	Constructive Technology Assessment
DG	Directorate General
ERA	European Research Area
ERA-NET	ERA Network – an instrument for supporting transnational co-operation within FP6
ESFRI	European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructure
EURAB	European Research Advisory Board
FP 6	Framework Programme 6 (2002-2006)
FP 7	Framework Programme 7 (2007 –2013)
HLEG	High Level Expert Group
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
R&D	Research and Development
S&T	Science and Technology
SSH	Social Sciences and Humanities
STS	Science and Technology Studies
TSER	The Targeted Socio-Economic Research Programme within the Fourth Framework Programme



European Commission

**EUR 22004 — European Research Advisory Board - The Social Sciences and the Humanities  
in the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme**

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

2005 — 32 pp. — 17.6 x 25.0 cm

ISBN 92-79-00804-8



## **SALES AND SUBSCRIPTIONS**

Publications for sale produced by the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities are available from our sales agents throughout the world.

### ***How do I set about obtaining a publication?***

Once you have obtained the list of sales agents, contact the sales agent of your choice and place your order.

### ***How do I obtain the list of sales agents?***

- Go to the Publications Office website <http://publications.eu.int/>
- Or apply for a paper copy by fax (352) 2929 42758

The European Research Advisory Board was established in 2001 to advise the Commission on the design and implementation of Community RTD policy. Its 45 members include some of Europe's best-known scientists and industrialists.

In 2005, EURAB has produced recommendations on «The Social Sciences and Humanities and the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme». These recommendations and the supporting text are presented in this publication.

Further information on EURAB, its members and its activities can be found on the EURAB website: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/eurab/index\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/eurab/index_en.html)



Publications Office

*Publications.eu.int*

ISBN 92-79-00804-8



9 789279 008047