

rovněž vyplývá, že autoři těchto gramatik ve většině případů nerespektují doporučenou mluvnickou terminologii z roku 1997. Francouzští autoři gramatik používají k výkladům mluvnických jevů především tradiční terminologii (užívají např. termín „adjectif“ místo „déterminant“), u českých autorů je naopak patrná snaha přizpůsobit francouzskou terminologii české terminologii, což se nejvíce projevuje u zájmen a číslovek, např. používáním termínů „zájmena samostatná a nesamostatná“, zatímco správným označením zájmena nesamostatného je „determinant“ neboli „určovatel“.

Je tedy evidentní, že harmonizace mluvnické terminologie by měla patřit mezi prioritní snahy odborníků zabývajících se touto problematikou, a to jak na úrovni francouzštiny jako mateřského jazyka (FLM), tak i francouzštiny jako cizího jazyka (FLE).

rozhovor

Gabriel Bădescu
Přemysl Rosůlek

Přemysl Rosůlek

Interview with Gabriel Bădescu

Gabriel Bădescu is Professor and Chair of the Political Science Department at Babeş-Bolyai University, and Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy. He has a BS in mathematics, a BA in sociology and received his doctorate in sociology and habilitation at the Babeş-Bolyai University. He held a Fulbright post-doctoral research fellowship at the University of Maryland, College Park, U.S., a Central European University Research Fellowship, and an International Fellowship at the Open Society Institute, and attended courses of the ICPSR Summer Program in Quantitative Methods at the University of Michigan. He has been the author or editor of six books and has published more than 40 articles and book chapters on democratic and economic transitions, social capital, educational policies, research methodology, income inequality and labour migration. His publications include "Social capital and the transition to democracy" (2003, Routledge, co-edited with Eric Uslaner) and articles published in journals such as Communist and Postcommunist Studies, Higher Education Research & Development, Europe-Asia Studies, East European Politics and Societies, and Politics in Central Europe. In addition to his academic research activity, Gabriel Bădescu is frequently involved in policy research. Between 2009 and 2010, Bădescu was the president of the Romanian Agency for Governmental Strategies. Between 2011 and 2013, he was a member of the Romanian National Research Council.

25 years after the fall of communism. Have the faculties of Social Science in CEE countries transformed to be comparable with analogous Western institutions at least in some respects? What could be the answer to this in general? And what about Romania?

The transformation of higher education institutions has been profound in all of these countries, and, in most cases, social sciences have changed more than hard sciences and engineering. Political science in particular, as a result of inheriting weaker roots and less legitimacy than other fields at the beginning of the 90s, was more prone to rapid convergence to the similar Western institutions. Social sciences in Romania had a slow start, with several specializations that had been banned under communism or completely politicized. In addition, the harsh economic conditions at the beginning of the post-communist transition made it difficult for local scientists to travel abroad and to become part of international projects and networks. If we assess the development of social sciences in the East by counting publications and citations, we see a very significant increase after 1990, faster than in the West European countries, but far from enough to close the gap in any foreseeable future.

Is it in fact desirable to struggle for CV profiles with high-value publications and citations from the web of science? In the heavily quoted article of Per O. Seglen,¹ he argues using numerous reasons listed why journal impact factors are not fully accurate – e. g. they do not say anything about the quality of individual articles and their individual citations, there is heavy citation of review articles that “inflate the impact factor of journals”, “books are not included in the database as a source for Citations”, the database of citations is dominated by American publications, and the impact factor depends on popularity of the field researched, which can overshadow minor research fields. In short, he argues that impact factors of journals depend on technical issues which are not related to the scientific quality of their articles...

It is very tempting to quantify research quality in a quick and automatic way. The adoption of citation metrics has the potential to result in a better resource allocation between research organizations, as well as between researchers. At the same time, almost everyone agrees that the use of metrics as measures of research quality can be very problematic, especially at an individual level. In addition to the sometimes weak connection between citation counts and the quality of academic research, citation counts are highly vulnerable to gaming and manipulation, particularly by corporate rankings providers.

Some of the problems can be fixed or alleviated, such as increasing comparability between fields and subfields by using impact factor measures that are standardized. Also, manipulation has a weaker effect if we use article influence scores and 5-year impact

factor instead of journal impact factors. Manipulation can be reduced by penalizing the journals that are caught to inflate their impact factor by illicit means, such as coercive self-citation. But even after careful corrections and calibration of the citation metrics, the remaining problems are too significant to ignore. Research evaluation should use, at least at the individual level, experts who read each paper and carefully evaluate it against complex and demanding criteria, ideally under conditions of anonymity.

Konradin Metze,² who is critical of impact factor metrics in his text “Bureaucrats, researchers, editors, and the impact factor – a vicious circle that is detrimental to science” reminds us of the attitude of the European Association of Scientific Editors, which officially recommends that journal impact factors should not “be used for the assessment of single papers, and certainly not for the assessment of researchers or research programs, either directly or as a surrogate”. On the contrary, the CEE scholars are pressed by their chairs, faculties and universities to “collect points” in high-ranked journals. Also, the ratio is sometimes affected by the financial issues of the universities. Is there any “third way” between these two aforementioned options?

I think that there are two fundamental problems: one is that more and more states, including many in the CEE, try to decrease the amount of funding for universities. The national average of the university funding cuts in the US between 2008 and 2012 was almost 30% per student. Some of the best public universities in the world receive now a remarkably small portion of their budgets from the state. For instance, Cambridge University receives about one third of the budget from the state, and the University of Michigan about 15%. These cuts at the top legitimize the cuts for the rest. The second problem is that the public pays close attention to the university rankings, which are based to a large extent on citation metrics. As a result, policy makers are pressuring universities to perform well in these rankings, and university administrators convey the pressure to the researchers. Since it is impossible to ignore research metrics, a practical solution is to try to refine them as much as possible and to complement them with qualitative assessments, especially at an individual level. The use of experts who read papers and evaluate them under conditions of anonymity, tends to result in better assessments. Yet, they are not perfect and should not be idealized, as we know from cases such as the so-called Sokal hoax, or from the repeated rejections of papers that later proved to be of outstanding value – for instance, Mark Granovetter’s paper “The Strength of Weak Ties”, a highly influential research, having also a huge number of citations.³

2) Metze 2010.

3) Granovetter 1973. This article has been quoted 30132 times according to Google Scholar, 4. 12. 2014. See <http://scholar.google.cz/> (note of the inquirer).

1) Seglen 1997.

As already mentioned, for scientific book publishers, there is no single internationally accepted ranking system. However, there are some ranking systems available, such as e. g. the one elaborated by SENSE (Socio-Economic and Natural Sciences of the Environment) Research School and approved by SENSE General Board in May 2009.⁴ What are the ranking rules for the evaluation and are there more objectives than the journal's impact factor ranking system?

First, the scientific value of the monographs and edited volumes tends to be very different across social domains. The economists tend to see book writing more as an effort to science popularisation and less as original research, whereas historians prize them much more. Second, an international ranking of publishers would be useful, but, as far as I know, the existing rankings have only limited acceptance. The problem with SENSE is that ranking methodology is not public, so we cannot assess its validity and reliability. One solution is to have professional associations producing their own ranking by asking all members, or a representative sample, to produce individual hierarchies based on reputation, and then, to aggregate them. A potential problem with this approach is that some respondents could favour certain publishers only because they have already published with them.

Another approach, which we used in Romania, was to create an algorithm that uses the number of citations of books in the top journals (according the impact factor measures) in order to create a ranking of publishers.

Moreover, as for Romanian scholars, I assume they are more able to write in the French language than some other CEE scholars. Nevertheless, would you not be discriminated for writing in French, which – unlike English and German – discredits you from your works to be cited in the web of science database?

Being able to read and publish in French helped some of the Romanian scholars to connect faster to the international scientific communities shortly after the fall of the communist regime. However, it had soon become obvious that English is the new lingua franca among social scientists and a language that is necessary to master in order to get access to resources, such as scholarships and research grants. According to the Scimago statistics, French social scientists publish a number of citable documents that is less than 5% of those published by the US scholars, about the same as Netherlands, and

4) SENSE Ranking of Academic Publisher: http://www.sense.nl/gfx_content/documents/ABCDE-indeling%20Scientific%20Publishers%20SENSE_approved_May_2009.pdf, 1. 12. 2014.

have much fewer citations per article than in many other advanced societies.⁵ Moreover, a growing number of social scientists from France, Germany, Spain, Italy, to name some of the countries with official languages that are widely spoken in the world, are publishing in English. Nowadays, French is less popular among the Romanian students than it was in the past, even less than German and, perhaps Spanish.

In general, it seems that in the first period after the fall of communism in CEE countries, CEE scholars struggled to publish in any foreign (Western) publication that would be good for their CV portfolio. Fortunately, the situation has since changed. Nevertheless, it is extremely difficult or almost impossible for non-established CEE scholars to publish a book with e.g. Routledge or Ashgate, as such publishing houses usually publish the books of invited writers only. As you have mentioned, the National Science Agency in Romania introduced its own ranking system of book publishers. What are the objectives? And do they meet the objective requirements?

More and more Romanian social scientists succeed to publish with good international publishers. However, the vast majority of them are working abroad, being affiliated to the top international universities, very often from the United States. By having a ranking that aims to distinguish between several categories of publishers, the Romanian National Science Agency hopes to provide incentives at individual and organizational level to strive for the best.⁶ This ranking was hoped to be less vulnerable to subjective factors, which is an important aspect in a relatively small community, with low levels of institutional and interpersonal trust.

It is too early to say what the results of this system are. In fact, our current Government has cut a very significant part of the research funds, so the rules of allocating them became less relevant. Despite these problems, my hope is that a growing number of scholars will strive to become internationalized and, as a result, their results will become more visible and relevant.

Another problem among the CEE scholars might be in relation to the development of methodology...

It is, to a large extent, the result of limited funding. I do not have systematic data about the CEE social sciences departments, but my guess is that they tend to have

5) For example a leading scientific and academic journal both in France *la Revue française de science politique*, established in 1951, is now available also in English version. For this information I'm thankful to Prof. Miroslav Novák (in Plzeň, 26. 11. 2014).

6) See *The National Science Agency in Romania*: <http://www.cnsc-nrc.ro/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/200-edituri-st-soc.xls>, 1. 12. 2014.

fewer people and a heavier teaching and administrative load than in the Western universities. Therefore, learning specialized methods and updating them constantly is a luxury that few places in the East can afford. Also, the high price of specialized software, training for the summer schools, etc., have contributed to the current gap between the East and West.

What about your department. Does it have more of a "content identity" regarding the field of research outcomes, published studies and teaching programmes or does it rather prefer "methodological identity"?

During the 90s my department had a relatively strong "methodological identity", being one of the first among social sciences departments in Romania to have a strong focus on empirical approaches, especially quantitative methods. A couple of my colleagues attended the ICPSR program at the University of Michigan, one of the best summer schools in social research methods in the world. Based on that experience we have developed several post-graduate programs in research methods, including a master program, taught in English. In addition, for the last couple of years, my department has developed a solid expertise on several topics, including the study of democratic transitions in Eastern Europe, civil society and political culture, labor migration, ethnopolitics and international development.

What do you think are the optimal choices in terms of the aforementioned topics, which also include research agendas, developing research skills, and dissemination results for an academic in CEE universities and at Romanian universities?

One striking fact about many of the CEE national communities of social scientists is the lack of communication and cooperation. It is very common for many of these people to get informed about research conducted in other departments of their own university or from other universities in their country by attending conferences abroad, including those organized by APSA, IPSA, ECPR, etc. Therefore, I encourage my colleagues to invest in developing research networks and communities, both national and regional. My department was established twenty years ago with the help of an American program, which helped us to form ties with several US researchers, some of them long lasting and very fruitful. It was only recently that we started to invest more in developing partnerships with other CEE universities. I think that some of these new ties will prove very beneficial over time, at least as much as those with the Western scholars.

References

Literature

SEGLÉN, Per O. (1997): Why the impact factor of journals should not be used for evaluating research. *British Medical Journal*, Vol. 314, no. 7079, pp. 498–502.

METZE, Konradin (2010): Bureaucrats, researchers, editors, and the impact factor - a vicious circle that is detrimental to science. *Clinics*, Vol. 65, No. 10, pp. 937–940.

GRANOVETTER, Mark S. (1973): The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 78, No. 6, pp. 1360–1380.

On-line sources

SENSE Ranking of Academic Publishers. http://www.sense.nl/gfx_content/documents/ABCDE-ndeling%20Scientific%20Publishers%20SENSE_approved_May_2009.pdf, 1. 12. 2014.

The National Science Agency in Romania: <http://www.cncs-nrc.ro/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/200-edicturi-st-soc.xls>, 1. 12. 2014.