

# Philosophy and history of ideas in Norway

Evaluation of research 2004–2008

Evaluation  
Division for Science





# **Philosophy and history of ideas in Norway**

**Evaluation of research 2004-2008**

---

**Evaluation  
Division for Science**

---

© The Research Council of Norway 2010

The Research Council of Norway  
P.O.Box 2700 St. Hanshaugen  
N-0131 OSLO  
Telephone: +47 22 03 70 00  
Telefax: +47 22 03 70 01  
bibliotek@forskningsradet.no  
www.forskningsradet.no/english

The report can be ordered at:  
[www.forskningsradet.no/publikasjoner](http://www.forskningsradet.no/publikasjoner)

or green number telefax: +47 800 83 001

Design: Design et cetera AS  
Photo/illustration: Shutterstock  
Printing: Allkopi  
Number of copies: 450

Oslo, September 2010

ISBN 978-82-12-02823-4 (printed version)  
ISBN 978-82-12-02824-1 (pdf)

# To the Research Council of Norway

The evaluation panel for this review of basic research in philosophy and history of ideas in Norway hereby submits the following report.

The task of making a fair, adequate and comprehensive review of the research activities during the last five years in the required time frame has been a demanding one. The evaluation panel expects, however, that this review will be a useful instrument for the Research Council of Norway, the Ministry of Education and Research and other relevant ministries, and the departments and research groups concerned.

This report represents an agreed account of the assessments, conclusions and recommendations.

Folke Tersman (Chair)

Hanne Andersen

Simo Knuuttila

Dag Prawitz

Hans-Jørgen Schanz

Robin M. Schott



# Contents

Executive summary .....	7
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>11</b>
1.1 The Terms of Reference and the evaluation work .....	12
1.2 Data sources and limitations.....	13
<b>2 Overview of Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas.....</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1 Overview of the Norwegian research communities and the delimitation of the evaluation .....	14
2.2 Resources and framework conditions.....	17
2.2.1 Personnel at selected units .....	17
2.2.2 Major funding sources .....	23
2.3 Summary of main observations .....	29
<b>3 Research, recruitment and collaboration.....</b>	<b>32</b>
3.1 Research and publication: unit profiles .....	32
3.1.1 NTNU: Department of Philosophy .....	32
3.1.2 UiB: Department of Philosophy.....	33
3.1.3 UiO: Philosophy.....	35
3.1.4 UiO: History of Ideas.....	38
3.1.5 UiT: Department of Philosophy.....	39
3.2 Research training, mobility and recruitment .....	40
3.2.1 Some overall figures on recruitment and mobility .....	41
3.2.2 The PhD programmes .....	44
3.2.3 Career opportunities.....	45
3.2.4 Recruitment strategy? .....	46
3.3 Collaboration: International, cross-institutional and cross-disciplinary.....	47
3.4 Main observations and overall structural issues.....	50
<b>4 Scope and quality of the research .....</b>	<b>54</b>
4.1 Defining disciplines, sub-fields and major thematic areas in Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas.....	54
4.2 Review of Norwegian history of ideas .....	54
4.3 Review of Norwegian philosophy .....	56
4.3.1 Aesthetics.....	56
4.3.2 Epistemology .....	57
4.3.3 Ethics.....	58
4.3.4 Gender studies.....	60
4.3.5 History of philosophy .....	60
4.3.6 Logic .....	62
4.3.7 Metaphysics and the philosophy of mind .....	63
4.3.8 Phenomenology and existential philosophy.....	64

4.3.9 Philosophy of education .....	65
4.3.10 Philosophy of language.....	66
4.3.11 Philosophy of science .....	67
4.3.12 Social and political philosophy.....	68
4.3.13 Wittgenstein studies .....	69
4.4 Summary of main observations.....	70
<b>5 Conclusions and recommendations .....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Appendix 1 Terms of Reference.....</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Appendix 2 Template for the self-evaluations .....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Appendix 3 Publication analysis .....</b>	<b>85</b>



## Executive summary

This evaluation of Norwegian research in philosophy and history of ideas was initiated by the Research Council of Norway (RCN). Its main purpose is to provide better insight into the strengths, weaknesses and challenges of Norwegian research in philosophy and history of ideas, and to help develop good research and good research environments in Norway. The evaluation encompasses the key institutions in Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas in the period 2004 to 2008. In other words, all major research units with activity within these two fields are covered, but not all Norwegian research in the fields. The units covered are five departments/parts of departments at Norway's four oldest universities.

### *Key characteristics of the institutions of Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas*

The evaluation points to some specific features of the institutions of Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas.

Due to the compulsory university introduction course in philosophy (*examen philosophicum*), Norway has a large total workforce of philosophers employed at its higher education institutions. The scope of ex.phil.-teaching has resulted in a large proportion of the philosophers holding teaching positions and having little time for research. Less than half of the “senior” staff at the evaluated departments hold a doctoral degree (2007 figures). There are, however, large variations between the departments as regards staff with doctoral degrees — differences resulting from variations in the organisation of their ex.phil.-teaching.

There is little national collaboration and little mobility between the departments. There is a large proportion of teaching personnel, and there are some very small departments, some of which have a low proportion of female scholars and a high average age. The institutions' basic funding accounts for most of the research activity, which means that there are few resources for research apart from the staff members' research time.

The number of scholars in the history of ideas is rather limited, and there is only one unit devoted to research in this field (a section of a multidisciplinary department at UiO).

An analysis of the publications for which the departments have obtained credits (in the performance-based budgeting for Norwegian universities) indicates that the average publication per researcher is fairly stable for the period 2005 to 2008, at around one “article equivalent” per researcher per year, although there is great variation in publication activity, both between researchers and between departments. Furthermore, there is a low proportion of publications in English and other foreign languages, and a low proportion of publications in highly rated outlets.

### *Scope and quality of the research*

A total of 290 works were submitted for review. Most of the submitted works are competently written and show good scholarship. One striking and commendable fact is that many successful efforts have been made to communicate with a wider audience outside philosophy and history of ideas, and even outside academia. It is a matter of concern to the committee that a rather small number of the submitted works are published in high-ranking journals or in books issued by well-known international publishers. The impact of the results of Norwegian research in philosophy and history of ideas on international debates is thereby rather limited.

There are submitted works of high quality in several areas. Within the history of philosophy, ancient philosophy and Kantian studies stand out as especially productive branches with a considerable number of works showing very good international quality, some works even being outstanding. We also consider applied ethics to be a strong field. Researchers from all of the reviewed departments have done work in this area and their efforts have led to a large number of publications, including some that make significant contributions to international debates and are published in high-ranking journals. Within theoretical philosophy, the strongest branches are philosophy of language, philosophy of mind and some parts of philosophy of science. We would also like to stress that many of the finest contributions stem from quite limited research contexts. These are cases where a small number of philosophers who share an interest in certain topics have formed a group that has then proved to be a fruitful context for research.

Although most central areas of philosophy are covered by Norwegian researchers during the period in question, we have identified a number of areas where there is remarkably little or almost no research, at least judging by the submitted works. One example is meta-ethics, another is logic. It is also surprising that there is hardly any research on the history of philosophy between ancient philosophy and the late eighteenth century, nothing on medieval philosophy or Renaissance philosophy, and very little on the philosophy of the modern period before Smith and Kant. Other areas that could be mentioned in this connection are non-Western philosophy, philosophy of the social sciences and philosophy of religion. Of course, while it is not reasonable to require Norwegian researchers to cover all philosophical disciplines, some of these areas are so central that the lack of attention to them should be noted.

As for the separate evaluation of research in the history of ideas, from a comparative Scandinavian perspective the reviewed research is of good quality and the productivity is very high. A relatively small number of the works in this area are published internationally. But this is due to the fact that a considerable part of the research is oriented towards Norwegian culture and is therefore primarily of interest to a Norwegian audience. The low number of international publications can therefore be seen as of limited concern.

### *Main challenges and recommendations*

- *Collaboration:* Collaboration promotes scholarly debate and thereby helps to maintain a stimulating environment and high quality of research, and all departments are concerned with establishing and maintaining fruitful arenas for internal collaboration. National collaboration seems to be a special challenge for Norwegian philosophy. To ensure that Norwegian philosophy develops as strongly as possible, it is necessary that strong units shoulder their share of the responsibility for increased national collaboration and do not leave this task exclusively to those that have a need but not the resources. Limited collaboration within the departments has likewise been a recurrent topic in the evaluation. We recommend increased collaboration on PhD education, as well as increased collaboration between large and small units to help small units reach critical mass for research activities, workshops etc. (see also *Research resource allocation* below). The committee also urges the individual units to continue developing their internal collaboration.
- *Dissemination:* Many Norwegian researchers in philosophy and history of ideas have been diligent in getting their results published. It is also commendable that so many have made efforts to communicate with a wider, non-philosophical audience. However, there is room for improvement regarding international publication, especially (but not exclusively) at the smaller departments. An improvement along that dimension would obviously increase the chances of having an impact on international debates. To promote international publication, we recommend that funds be provided for translation and proof-reading and also to help researchers to improve their proficiency in English and other foreign languages. We also recommend seriously re-evaluating the publication scores of the performance-based budgeting system with the aim of creating clearer incentives to choose the most high-ranking journals and publishing houses of publication. Another issue to address in such an evaluation is how to acknowledge the high number of publications that do not fit the current system, including textbooks and publications for a non-professional Norwegian audience.
- *Examen philosophicum:* Ex.phil. creates a unique situation and is an important asset for Norwegian philosophy, partly because it introduces all university students to philosophical ideas and methods, and partly because it supports a large community of university employed philosophers. However, ex.phil. teaching presents an important challenge for the philosophy departments: uneven distribution of the teaching load over the academic year leads to unstable working conditions, and the huge amount of teaching at an introductory level has led to deviations from the requirement for research-based university teaching. We recommend setting up a committee with the task of reviewing ex.phil. activities, including examining the research basis of ex.phil. teaching, analysing how to develop the potential for didactical reflection on this kind of philosophy education, analysing the working conditions and career opportunities of ex.phil. teachers, and analysing how teaching and research can best be shared among faculty members.
- *Mobility:* The circulation of ideas is furthered by a certain circulation of people, and, for this and other reasons, mobility between academic institutions is generally seen to

be a good thing. It is clear that the Norwegian system of personal promotion to full professor impairs mobility between institutions; there is no longer a need to move to another university in order to advance to a higher position. The negligible collaboration between the philosophical departments should be seen in connection with the low mobility between them — the two phenomena influence, and may aggravate, each other. There are few obvious solutions to the lack of mobility. We do recommend, however, that the departments ensure that new positions are widely advertised, and that there are incentives to form cross-departmental networks (see also *Research resource allocation* below).

- *Post-graduate training*: There is great divergence in the nature and relevance of the courses that are mandatory for PhD students. In particular, students of the history of ideas are required to participate in courses that have little direct relevance to their field. There is also considerable variation in the quality of the supervision. Recommendations for improvement include: (1) establishing a system of national PhD courses, (2) offering a more appropriate programme for PhD students in history of ideas, (3) assuring travel funds for PhD students to participate in international seminars, conferences, and to spend research periods abroad, as well as participating in national PhD courses, (4) carrying out an informal review of PhD supervision to ensure that students have adequate contact with advisors, and (5) offering all PhD students the opportunity of a four-year PhD period, i.e. four years with one year of teaching instead of three years without teaching.
- *Research resource allocation*: There is a strikingly uneven distribution of research resources between the Oslo department and the other research environments in Norway. The existence of a number of different research environments in a country — environments that can develop in different directions, methodologically and topic-wise — is important to scholarly breadth and quality. In order to address the uneven distribution of research resources, and also the lack of collaboration between departments, we recommend incentives for forming cross-departmental networks as the basis for joint applications for project-funding. On the basis of our observation of the success of limited research contexts, we also wish to stress the importance of continued support for smaller projects. It would be unfortunate if the presently popular idea of concentrating resources makes it less likely that such groups and traditions will emerge.

# 1 Introduction

This evaluation of Norwegian research in philosophy and history of ideas was initiated by the Research Council of Norway (RCN). It is intended to contribute to:

- Better insight into the strength, weaknesses and challenges of Norwegian research in philosophy and history of ideas.
- Identifying conditions that promote good research.
- Developing the division of roles and cooperation between the RCN and the research institutions.
- Developing good research and good research environments in Norway.

The evaluation is based on information from five research units. All these units are departments or parts of departments at Norway's four oldest universities:

- The Department of Philosophy at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)
- The Department of Philosophy at the University of Bergen (UiB)
- The philosophy unit at the University of Oslo (part of IFIKK — the Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas)
- The history of ideas unit at the University of Oslo (part of IFIKK)
- The Department of Philosophy at the University of Tromsø (UiT)

The primary target group for the evaluation consists of the evaluated scholarly units and their leadership and host institutions, as well as the Norwegian research policy authorities (the Research Council of Norway and the Ministry of Education and Research).

The panel appointed to perform the evaluation consisted of:

- Professor Folke Tersman (Chair), Department of Philosophy, Uppsala University
- Associate Professor Hanne Andersen, Department of Science Studies, Aarhus University
- Professor Simo Knuutila, Department of Systematic Theology, University of Helsinki
- Professor Dag Prawitz, Department of Philosophy, Stockholm University
- Professor Hans-Jørgen Schanz, Department of History of Ideas, Aarhus University
- Research Professor Robin M. Schott, Danish School of Education, Aarhus University/Senior researcher, Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), Copenhagen

Liv Langfeldt (NIFU STEP) served as secretary to the panel. Nina Nordvik coordinated the project on behalf of RCN. Several researchers at NIFU STEP provided analyses for the panel, as specified in the notes to Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 3.2.1, as well in the list of references.

In the following sections, the Terms of Reference (ToR), evaluation tasks, data sources and limitations are described.

## **1.1 The Terms of Reference and the evaluation work**

The RCN's evaluations of research fields follow fairly standardised procedures, including self-evaluations by the relevant research units/departments, reviews of publications from a large number of researchers in the field, meetings with representatives from the departments and the collection and analysis of various kinds of background information (see Section 1.2). The Terms of Reference (mandate) of the evaluation are presented in Appendix 1.

The evaluation panel met six times in Oslo (five one-day meetings and one three-day meeting) during the period August 2009 to April 2010. The most time-consuming part of the evaluation work was the reviewing of the works submitted by the researchers, 290 works in total. It should be noted that the panel had to evaluate two quite distinct academic fields with different methodologies, criteria and traditions — philosophy and the history of ideas. To make the reviewing manageable, reading assignments were divided between the panel members. Each submitted work was read by at least two of the panel members (cf. also Section 1.2).

The meetings with the departments, combined with their submitted self-evaluations, proved valuable in terms of gaining insight into the various research environments and their research profiles, situations and challenges. In particular, the meetings were important in achieving a better understanding of the challenges indicated in the self-evaluations and how they were handled.

The panel wishes to draw attention to the fact that not only are philosophy and history of ideas different subjects, they are also both quite extensive and varied in themselves; in particular, philosophy contains sub-fields that vary greatly as regards the methods that they use. The task of the panel as set by the Research Council (see Appendix 1) is quite ambitious. In view of these circumstances, the panel wishes to warn against overestimating what can be achieved by a small group in the limited time available. On the other hand, the resources invested in an evaluation of this kind are quite considerable, also taking into account the time that the departments and the individual researchers have spent, and the panel wants to encourage critical reflection on the question of whether they are in reasonable proportion to the results of the evaluation.

## 1.2 Data sources and limitations

In accordance with the Terms of Reference, the evaluation is based on the following sources of information:

- Self-evaluation reports prepared by the selected research units (see template in Appendix 2).
- Publications submitted by academic personnel at the selected research units. A total of 104 scholars with doctoral level competence were asked to select and submit three publications each, and to submit a statement on the background to their selection. In total, 290 publications/works were received. The review is presented in Chapter 4.
- CVs and publication lists from the selected researchers for the period 1999-2008.
- Interviews with representatives of the management, academic staff, postdocs and PhD students at the selected research units. A total of seven group interviews of 2 to 2 1/2 hours were held, covering a total of 32 persons affiliated to the evaluated units. The whole panel took part in all interviews.
- Background reports from NIFU STEP on personnel, recruitment, mobility, economic resources and publication in Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas. These are presented in Chapter 2, Section 3.2.1 and in Appendix 3.

The evaluation is limited to research reported from four selected departments (at UiB, UiO, UiT and NTNU) and to a five-year period (2004–2008). Section 2.1 describes the delimitation of departments/research units for the evaluation. The evaluation is further delimited at department level. Only about half of the academic staff are included; i.e. only scholars with doctoral level competence were asked to submit publications for review. Some, but not all, emeriti were included in the evaluation. Moreover, not all doctoral level personnel submitted full CVs, three publications and a statement on their selection of publications. In sum, there may be substantial parts of Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas that were left out of this evaluation.

## 2 Overview of Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas

### 2.1 Overview of the Norwegian research communities and the delimitation of the evaluation<sup>1</sup>

*A broad scope of activity in philosophy and history of ideas*

This report evaluates Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas<sup>2</sup> by focusing on the *key institutions* in the field during the period 2004 to 2008. In other words, all major units with activity in philosophy and history of ideas are covered, but not all Norwegian research in the field.

As background to the delimitation of the evaluation, the RCN commissioned a mapping of research in philosophy and history of ideas in Norway. Based on the available databases, researchers with a master-level degree in philosophy or history of ideas were identified. Moreover, research units with scholarly publications classified under philosophy and history of ideas were identified. Four university departments emerged as the dominant milieus, both with regard to personnel and publications (Langfeldt and Klitkou 2009). These four departments cover the five milieus/units selected for the evaluation (one department at UiO hosting two of the selected milieus).

Publications and researchers classified under philosophy/history of ideas were also found at a wide variety of other institutions. As illustrated in the table below, personnel with a background in these fields were found at 26 different higher education institutions, as well as at 12 independent research institutes. The large majority of the philosophers were affiliated to higher education institutions; 96 per cent of the 216 identified philosophers were at higher education institutions and only four per cent at independent research institutes (figures for 2007). A somewhat higher proportion of those educated in the history of ideas worked at independent research institutes (19 per cent of the 31 scholars identified were affiliated to an independent research institute and 81 per cent to a higher education institution). In conclusion, Norway has a *large total workforce* of philosophers employed at higher education institutions. It is notable that a large proportion of the philosophers hold teaching positions (“lecturers”) and have little time for research.

---

<sup>1</sup> This section is based on Langfeldt and Klitkou 2009.

<sup>2</sup> In the Register of research personnel, history of ideas is classified as a subcategory in “philosophical fields” (“filosofiske fag”). For the sake of simplicity, we denote researchers in philosophy and history of ideas as philosophers/HoI.



Table 2.1 *Research and development (R&D) personnel with a master-level degree in philosophy or history of ideas, by sector and institution, 2007*

Institution/unit	(Hol)	Total number of Philosophers/Hol	Percentage of all philosophers/Hol
<b>Universities</b>	<b>(17)</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>78.1</b>
Universitetet i Bergen	(3)	69	27.9
Universitetet i Oslo	(13)	66	26.7
Universitetet i Tromsø		30	12.2
Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet		17	6.9
Universitetet i Stavanger		6	2.4
Universitetet for miljø og biovitenskap		2	0.8
Universitetet i Agder	(1)	2	0.8
Helseforetak i UoH-sektoren		1	0.4
<b>Specialised University Institutions</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2.0</b>
Norsk lærerakademi		2	0.8
Arkitektur- og designhøgskolen i Oslo	(1)	1	0.4
Diakonhjemmets høgskole		1	0.4
Menighetsfakultetet		1	0.4
<b>State University Colleges</b>	<b>(7)</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>14.2</b>
Høgskolen i Oslo	(3)	9	3.6
Høgskolen i Bodø		5	2.0
Høgskolen i Lillehammer	(1)	5	2.0
Høgskolen i Telemark	(1)	3	1.2
Høgskolen i Hedmark		2	0.8
Høgskolen i Tromsø		2	0.8
Samisk høgskole/sami allaskuvla		2	0.8
Høgskolen i Akershus		1	0.4
Høgskolen i Bergen		1	0.4
Høgskolen i Buskerud		1	0.4
Høgskolen i Harstad		1	0.4
Høgskolen i Nesna	(1)	1	0.4
Høgskolen i Sør-trøndelag		1	0.4
Høgskolen i Volda	(1)	1	0.4
<b>Research institutes</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5.7</b>
Arbeidsforskningsinstituttet as (AFI)		2	0.8
NIFU STEP Norsk institutt for studier av innovasjon, forskning og utdanning		2	0.8
Forsvarets forskningsinstitutt (FFI)		1	0.4
Henie Onstad kunstsenter		1	0.4
Institutt for fredsforskning (PRIO)		1	0.4
Nasjonalmuseet for kunst, arkitektur og design		1	0.4
Norsk institutt for forskning om oppvekst, velferd og aldring (NOVA)		1	0.4
Norsk sjøfartsmuseum		1	0.4
Norsk teknisk museum		1	0.4
NTNU samfunnsforskning as		1	0.4
Statens institutt for rusmiddelforskning (SIRUS)		1	0.4
Stavanger museum		1	0.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>(31)</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: NIFU STEP, Register of research personnel.

Similarly, when studying publications categorised under philosophy/HoI,<sup>3</sup> the selected institutions emerge as the most central ones. The four older universities account for 81 per cent of the publications given credit in the performance-based budgeting in the period

<sup>3</sup> The philosophy category also covers journals in the history of ideas, see <http://dbh.nsd.uib.no/kanaler/?search=advanced>. There is no separate history of ideas category.

2005-2007.<sup>4</sup> For journal articles indexed by ISI Thomson, the picture is somewhat more complex. The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences (NIH) comes up with a few more journal articles in philosophy than UiT and NTNU. NIH has several articles in two journals categorised under philosophy — *Journal of the philosophy of sport* and *Science and engineering ethics* — whereas several of the journals in which the philosophers at the university departments publish their work are not ISI-indexed (Langfeldt and Klitkou 2009, p. 26).

### *Key units in Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas*

Table 2.2 summarises what emerged as the most central units in Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas in the preliminary analysis. The table includes units that fulfil at least one of the following criteria: 1) three scholars/staff members with a registered education in philosophy or history of ideas, 2) a minimum of publication within these fields,<sup>5</sup> 3) philosophy or history of ideas in the name of the unit. Sorted by number of philosophers/HoI with professor level competence (1.stilling), the four selected departments emerge as the largest units.

**Table 2.2** *Overview of academic personnel and publications in Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Research units ranked by number of professor level staff with a registered master-level education in philosophy or history of ideas*

Institution, department/unit	Academic personnel with a degree in philosophy/Hol, 2007	Personnel with professor level competence***, 2007		Total DBH-publications* in philosophy, 2005–2007 (weighted)	Total ISI-indexed articles** in philosophy, 1998–2007
		Number of philosophers/Hol	Total number of researchers in the unit		
1 UiO, The Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas	41	21	47	153.9	17
2 UiB, Department of Philosophy	54	16	24	62	1
3 UiT, Department of Philosophy	22	10	13	26	0
4 NTNU, Department of Philosophy	12	7	14	40.5	2
5 Bodø University College, Bodø Graduate School of Business	3	3	29	0	0
6 UiB, Centre for the Study of the Sciences and the Humanities	3	2	5	12	2
7 Telemark University College, Department of Humanities and Cultural Studies	3	2	20	0	0
8 UiA, Department of Religion, Philosophy and History	1	1	18	2	0
9 UiO, Centre for technology, innovation and culture (TIK)	3	0	7	5	0

\* DBH=Database for statistikk om høgre utdanning (Information on Research and Higher Education) at the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD).

\*\* Source: National Citation Indicators, Thomson ISI.

\*\*\* Professor level competence=1.-stilling (Full Professor or Associate Professor /1. amanuensis).

<sup>4</sup> Some of these publications are, however, registered at other departments/units at these four universities, and, for some publications, information about the department is missing. Langfeldt and Klitkou 2009, Table 3.14.

<sup>5</sup> Twenty credited publications in *Database for statistikk om høgre utdanning* (DBH) in the period 2005-2007 and/or five articles indexed by Thomson ISI in the period 1998-2007.

### *Non-included units*

No other units than the four selected departments had more than three philosophers/HoI. There are some multidisciplinary units with relevance to philosophy, however. The Centre for the Study of the Sciences and the Humanities (Senter for vitenskapsteori) at UiB had three philosophers and 12 credited publications in philosophy (scholarly publications registered in DBH 2005-2007). The Department of Religion, Philosophy and History at the University of Agder is the only unit with philosophy in its name that was not included in the evaluation (with only one philosopher and two registered publications in the field). The Centre for technology, innovation and culture (TIK) at UiO had three philosophers, but none among its senior staff. In addition, the University of Stavanger (UiS, not in Table 2.2), should be mentioned. As shown in Table 2.1, UiS had six philosophers on its staff in 2007. However, these philosophers were registered at six different units at UiS, indicating that the university lacked a separate group/unit for philosophy at the time.

## **2.2 Resources and framework conditions<sup>6</sup>**

### **2.2.1 Personnel at selected units**

In 2007, a total of 247 scholars with a master-level degree in philosophy were employed at Norwegian higher education institutions and research institutes (Section 2.1). The four departments selected by the Research Council for the evaluation employed a total of 197 scholars. Of these 197 scholars, 65 per cent (129 scholars) held a registered master-level degree in philosophy or history of ideas (see Table 2.3). The remaining 68 scholars (35 per cent) at the selected units have a different or unknown educational background, from Norway and/or abroad. A large proportion of them are found at the one multidisciplinary department included in the analysis — IFIKK at UiO, which consists of four sections/groups: Philosophy, History of Ideas, Classical Languages (Greek and Latin), and Art History. In total, about half of the scholars at IFIKK held a registered master-level degree in philosophy or history of ideas (53 per cent in 2007). Sixteen of the scholars at IFIKK have a registered education in languages or art history. For as many as 17 scholars at IFIKK, the register lacks information about field of education (Table 2.3), which complicates the analysis. At the Department of Philosophy at NTNU, there is also a relatively high proportion of scholars who may have a different educational background than philosophy (43 per cent in 2007). Presumably, some of them have a non-registered philosophy education. At the philosophy departments at UiB and UiT, the proportion of (registered) philosophers is higher, accounting for 76-79 per cent of the scholars.

---

<sup>6</sup> This section is based on Schwach and Hansen 2009, with additional information from the selected units' self-evaluations.

**Table 2.3** *Academic personnel at departments selected for the evaluation, by educational background\*, 2007.*

Field of education	UiB, Dept. of Philosophy	UiO: IFIKK	UiT, Dept. of Philosophy	NTNU, Dept. of Philosophy	Total
Philosophy	54	36	22	12	124
History of ideas		5			5
Other disciplines within the humanities	6	17			23
Humanities, non-specified discipline	8	13	3	8	32
Social sciences	1		1		2
Natural sciences/mathematics		2	1	1	4
Medical and health sciences	1				1
Non-specified field of education	1	4	1		6
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>197</b>
<i>Percentage of staff with reg. master-level education in Philosophy/Hol</i>	76.1	53.2	78.6	57.1	65.3
Number of scholars included in the evaluation (evaluation sample of scholars with "1.-stilling" or postdoc)	27	Philosophy: 40 Hol: 9	13	15	104
Total number of scholars listed in the unit's self evaluation	42	Philosophy: 102 Hol: 20	19	28	211

Source: NIFU STEP, Register of research personnel 2007. Source for the two last rows: Lists from the evaluated units. The last row also includes staff who ended/stated their affiliation to the unit before/after 2007.

\*Defined as their master-level degree (e.g. Cand.philol., mag.art., master).

Note: The figures for philosophers/Hol in the upper part of this table are not identical to the figures in Table 2.1, as this table includes the selected departments only, whereas Table 2.1 shows figures for the whole institution. E.g. Figure 2.1 shows 66 philosophers/Hol at UiO. Forty-one of them (36 philosophers and five within Hol) are affiliated to IFIKK (Table 2.3), whereas the remaining 25 are spread between many different units.

### *The different personnel samples at the analysed departments*

When presenting the data on the units to be evaluated, most of the tables provide two sets of data. One set comprises (1) *researchers with a registered master-level degree in philosophy/Hol*; the other set embraces (2) *all academic personnel at the department*.

Note that the sample of scholars being evaluated (the evaluation sample of 104 scholars) does not fully correspond to either sample 1 or 2 (see Table 2.3). There are several participating scholars who are not registered with an education in philosophy or history of ideas, so neither sample 1 nor 2 fully covers the evaluation sample. In Tables 2.5-2.7, the "philosophers" column (including both philosophy and the history of ideas) provides the most accurate figures for scholars active in philosophy or history of ideas at the multidisciplinary IFIKK. For the remaining "philosophy only" departments, the column "all researchers" is probably the most accurate.

Moreover, the evaluation sample (those who were asked to submit publications for review) only includes personnel with "1.-stilling" competence and postdocs affiliated to the evaluated departments in 2008 (except for a few recent professor emeriti who were also included). The statistics in this section, however, are more encompassing and also include research fellows and lecturers. Furthermore, there may have been staff mobility after 2007 (the year to which our data apply), also reducing the correlation between the samples.

Below, the academic positions, degrees, age and gender profiles of the academic staff at the selected departments are analysed. Both the total figures for the departments and for philosophers alone are given (see text box above).

### *Academic positions and degrees*

The proportion of scholars holding a position concentrated on teaching obligations, i.e. the lecturers, is relatively high at the evaluated departments. There are as many lecturers as professors, 43 per cent (Table 2.4, including all scholarly staff at the departments). When including only philosophers/HoI in the calculations, half of the scholars are lecturers, 35 per cent are professors, 11 per cent hold recruitment positions (mostly PhD students), and four per cent are postdocs or have researcher positions. In addition, a large proportion of the professors/assistant professors in philosophy at UiO have the same teaching obligations as lecturers. By comparison, in total for the four universities, only five per cent of the academic personnel hold a lecturer position. The reason for the high proportion of lecturers at the studied departments is the number of teaching staff involved in the general introduction courses in philosophy, *examen philosophicum* (ex.phil.).

**Table 2.4** *Academic personnel's positions in 2007. Percentages at the units selected for the evaluation*

<b>Institution/unit</b>	<b>Professor level<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Researchers and postdocs.<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Recruitment positions<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Lecturers<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>N</b>
UiB, Department of Philosophy	29.6	2.8	7.0	60.6	71
UiO, Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas	51.9 **(39.0)	3.9 (2.4)	9.1 (12.2)	35.1 (46.3)	77 (41)*
UiT, Department of Philosophy	39.3	7.1	7.1	46.4	28
NTNU, Department of Philosophy	66.7	0.0	23.8	9.5	21
<b>All selected units</b>	<b>43.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>43.1</b>	<b>197</b>
(Philosophy/HoI only)	(34.9)	(3.9)	(10.9)	(50.4)	(129)*

Note: The table includes all academic staff at the institute /department.

\*Numbers in brackets include only scholars with a registered master-level degree in philosophy or HoI.

\*\*In the figures for IFFIKK, seven philosophy professors (five assistant professors and two full professors) with lecturer/teaching obligations are included. When excluding these non-regular professors from the professor category, *only 22 per cent* of the staff (with a registered master-level degree in philosophy or HoI) remain in the professor category.

<sup>1</sup>The category "Professors" includes: full professors, associate professors ("førsteamanuensis") and academic leaders (employed deans and chairs/heads of departments).

<sup>2</sup>The category "Researchers and postdocs" includes: all positions as researchers and postdocs without regard to their source of funding.

<sup>3</sup>The category "Recruitment positions" includes: research fellows ("stipendiater") and research assistants regardless of source of funding.

<sup>4</sup>The category "Lecturers" includes: "førstelektor", and "universitetslektor".

Source: NIFU STEP, Register of research personnel.

Eleven per cent of staff in recruitment positions is somewhat low. For the humanities in total, recruitment positions account for 17 per cent of the total staff.<sup>7</sup> It is possible that

<sup>7</sup> A recent analysis carried out for the national evaluation of the scholarly discipline of law shows a much higher proportion of recruits in law compared to philosophy. In law, 35 per cent of the scholarly personnel at the evaluated units hold recruit positions (Norges forskningsråd 2009, p. 27).

potential recruits can be found among the many who currently hold teaching positions in the philosophy departments.<sup>8</sup>

The differences between the departments in terms of the relative distribution of positions are substantial. UiB has the highest share of lecturers, at 61 per cent. NTNU, on the other hand, has the lowest proportion of lecturers (10 per cent) and the highest proportion of recruitment positions (24 per cent) and professors (67 per cent). These differences are related to differences in the organisation of ex.phil. teaching, and differences in the use of professors and other academic personnel, permanent lecturer positions and temporary teacher positions (“timelærere”) in ex.phil. teaching.

Table 2.5 shows the proportion of staff at each unit who hold a doctoral degree. All academic personnel except the doctoral students and research assistants are included in the figures.

*Table 2.5 Academic personnel holding a doctoral degree in 2007. Percentages at the units selected for the evaluation*

Institution/unit	Philosophers		All researchers	
	Holds a doctoral degree %	N	Holds a doctoral degree %	N
UiB, Department of Philosophy	22.0	50	24.2	66
UiO, Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas	47.2	36	50.0	70
UiT, Department of Philosophy	38.1	21	38.5	26
NTNU, Department of Philosophy	87.5	8	87.5	16
<b>All selected units</b>	<b>37.4</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>42.1</b>	<b>178</b>

Note: The table shows the proportion of academic personnel that held a doctoral degree in 2007. Recruitment positions, PhD students and research assistants *are not* included.

Source: NIFU STEP, Doctoral Degree Register; NIFU STEP, Register of research personnel.

In all, 42 per cent of the “senior” staff at the selected institutions held a doctoral degree in 2007. If only philosophers are included, 37 per cent have a doctoral degree. The proportion of philosophers with a doctoral degree varies considerably between the units, from 22 to 88 per cent. Compared with Table 2.2, we find, not surprisingly, that the department with the highest proportion of lecturers has the lowest proportion of doctoral degrees (UiB), whereas the department with the lowest proportion of lecturers has the highest proportion of doctoral degrees (NTNU). Note that UiB has many part-time lecturer positions. This results in a higher proportion of lecturers and a lower proportion holding a doctoral degree than would more accurate figures based on full-time equivalents instead of number of staff members.

<sup>8</sup> In total, 85 persons have a lecturer position at the four departments, 65 of whom are registered as philosophers (including one with a master-level degree in the history of ideas). The average age of those holding a lecturer position is 46 years — 34 of them are under 40 and 36 are over 50. Only three of the 85 philosophers with a lecturer position hold a doctoral degree. All figures are updated as of October 2007.

Table 2.6 Academic personnel's average age. The units selected for the evaluation

	Philosophers/HoI		All researchers	
	Mean age 2008	N	Mean age 2008	N
<b>By institution/unit</b>				
UiB, Department of Philosophy	42.9	54	42.8	71
UiO, Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas	54.2	41	53.1	77
UiT, Department of Philosophy	52.1	22	51.5	28
NTNU, Department of Philosophy	45.0	12	47.5	21
<b>By position</b>				
Professor level	55.9	45	55.8	86
Researchers and post-docs	37.8	5	36.1	7
Recruitment position	33.4	14	32.6	19
Lecturers	47.0	65	46.0	85
<b>All selected units and positions</b>	<b>48.3</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>48.6</b>	<b>197</b>

Source: NIFU STEP, Register of research personnel.

Table 2.6 shows that the average age of the academic personnel at the included units was 48.6 years in 2008. Variations occur between the different units. The Department of Philosophy at the University of Bergen, which, due to its organisation of ex.phil. teaching, has a different employment structure than the other departments,<sup>9</sup> had an average age of 42.8 in 2008. The average age at the Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas at the University of Oslo was as much as 10.3 years higher. The average age of professor level personnel is 55.8 years, whereas the average age of the recruits is 32.6 years. The average age of professor level personnel differs considerably by department; UiT has the oldest (average 60 years) and NTNU the youngest (average 50 years) personnel at this level.

About a quarter of the scholars at the selected departments are females (Table 2.7, 23 per cent of the philosophers/HoI, and 26 per cent of the total academic personnel at the departments). This relatively low proportion of female researchers varies somewhat between the departments, from 18 per cent among personnel in Tromsø to 29 per cent at NTNU and at UiO (Table 2.7).

<sup>9</sup> UiB comments that its philosophy department has 22.5 full positions (2010) in philosophy and that counting the total number of positions — and full-time equivalents in research — does not give an adequate picture of the department.

**Table 2.7** *Female academic personnel in 2007, the units selected for the evaluation. Percentages*

Institution/unit	Philosophers/Hol		All researchers	
	% female	N	% female	N
UiB, Department of Philosophy*	24.1	54	26.8	71
UiO, Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas	22.0	41	28.6	77
UiT, Department of Philosophy	18.2	22	17.9	28
NTNU, Department of Philosophy	33.3	12	28.6	21
<b>All selected units</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>197</b>

Source: NIFU STEP, Register of research personnel.

\*UiB comments that only 12 per cent of its professor level staff are females.

There is no notable difference between professorships and other positions as regards the proportion of female personnel (25 to 26 per cent females regardless of position, when all scholars at the departments are included, Table 2.8). The exception is researcher and postdoc positions, where there are slightly more women than men. This may be promising for the future recruitment of females to senior positions, but, as few scholars hold postdoc/researcher positions (in total only seven persons at the four departments in 2007<sup>10</sup>), it far from outweighs the fact that 74 per cent of the PhD students/recruitment positions are held by men.

**Table 2.8** *Academic personnel in 2007 by gender and academic position, the units selected for the evaluation. Percentages*

Gender	Professor level <sup>1</sup>	Researchers and postdocs. <sup>2</sup>	Recruitment positions <sup>3</sup>	Lecturers <sup>4</sup>	Total
<b>All researchers at the four departments</b>					
Females	24.4	57.1	26.3	25.9	26.4
Males	75.6	42.9	73.7	74.1	73.6
<b>N</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>197</b>
<b>Philosophers/Hol only</b>					
Females	22.2	60.0	21.4	21.5	23.3
Males	77.8	40.0	78.6	78.5	76.7
<b>N</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>129</b>

Note: The table includes all academic staff at the institute /department.

<sup>1</sup>The category "Professors" includes: full professors, associate professors ("førsteamanuensis") and academic leaders (employed deans and chairs/heads of departments).

<sup>2</sup>The category "Researchers and Postdocs" includes: all researchers and postdocs without regard to their source of funding.

<sup>3</sup>The category "Recruitment positions" includes: research fellows ("stipendiater") and research assistants regardless of source of funding.

<sup>4</sup>The category "Lecturers" includes: "førstelektor" and "universitetslektor".

Source: NIFU STEP, Register of research personnel.

The overall proportion of women in philosophy is low, also compared with overall Norwegian figures for the humanities. In 2007, there were 25 per cent females in philosophy<sup>11</sup> and 44 per cent in the humanities in general.<sup>12</sup> The proportion of females was

<sup>10</sup> It should be noted that this rather small figure only includes registered researchers and postdoc fellows in 2007. The self-evaluation reports from the departments report a total of 24 postdoc fellows in the period 2004 to 2008, ten of whom are females.

<sup>11</sup> Figures not limited to the four selected departments, but including all the 247 philosophers/Hol in Table 2.1.



lower for all kinds of positions and particularly for recruitment positions (humanities 59 per cent females, vs. 21 per cent in our philosophy sample).<sup>13</sup>

### 2.2.2 Major funding sources

Most of the research in philosophy and history of ideas is funded by the general university funds (81 per cent in 2007). The largest external funding source is the RCN (15 per cent in 2007). In total, the research expenditure in the field amounted to NOK 57.2 million in 2007. More details about the economic framework conditions are presented below.

*The data in this section are overall figures for Norway, and the evaluated departments account for nearly all of it.*

This section presents figures based on the official Norwegian statistics for expenditures on research.\* The figures show all expenditures categorised under philosophy and history of ideas, regardless of whether the units are included in the evaluation. National R&D statistics split by discipline do not include the independent research institutes (as they are mainly interdisciplinary institutes). Consequently, the analysis includes philosophy and history of ideas at the higher education institutions only. In the statistics, philosophy and history of ideas belong to the same category (“filosofiske fag”) and there are no separate figures for history of ideas.

The national R&D statistics are based on regular reports from the institutions to NIFU STEP. Note that, in the statistics, all R&D at units that consider more than half of their R&D as being within a discipline is classified under this discipline. This implies that philosophy and history of ideas at units/departments where these fields are “minority disciplines” are *not visible in the statistics*. The result is that the departments selected for this evaluation account for nearly all research registered as philosophy and history of ideas in the statistics. It also means that statistics broken down by discipline are sensitive to reorganisations such as the merger of departments.

\*Except for the last part of the section, which presents figures from the evaluated departments’ self-evaluations.

### *Funds for philosophy and history of ideas 1995–2007*

The universities account for nearly all the registered Norwegian R&D expenditure on philosophy or history of ideas. Except for around one per cent of the expenditure in 2003

---

<sup>12</sup> The proportion of females differs between the various subject fields, and is also low in, e.g., history (Norges forskingsråd 2006, p. 33).

<sup>13</sup> Within the humanities (overall figures for Norway 2007) 53 per cent of lecturer positions, 32 per cent of professor level positions and 59 per cent of recruitment positions were held by women. Postdoc and researcher positions were the only kind of positions where our (very small) philosophy sample has a higher proportion of females than the overall figures for humanities. Forty-nine per cent of researcher and postdoc positions in the humanities were held by women, compared with 60 per cent in the philosophy sample.

and 2005 at state university colleges, all the philosophy R&D expenditures in the national statistics are found at the universities. Table 2.9 shows R&D expenditure on philosophy and history of ideas at the Norwegian higher education institutions, organised by funding sources for the years 1995 to 2007.

*Table 2.9 Philosophy and history of ideas: current R&D expenditure in Norwegian Higher Education Sector, by funding source. Percentages for 1995–2007*

<b>Funding source</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2007</b>
General university funds (GUF)	80.9	89.2	83.4	84.8	87.1	88.9	81.3
Research Council of Norway (RCN)	8.0	4.7	10.5	6.4	4.4	8.1	14.6
Other public sources	10.7	5.2	3.4	5.4	5.9	1.0	1.2
Industry	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.6
Other domestic sources	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.0	0.8	0.7
Foreign sources	0.3	0.5	2.6	2.4	2.3	1.1	1.6
<b>Total per cent</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Total million NOK*</b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>39.4</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>35.6</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>45.0</b>

Notes: \*Fixed 2000 prices.

Source: NIFU STEP, R&D statistics.

The largest funding source is general university funds (GUF). The percentage of funding based on this source varied between 81 and 89 per cent in the period. Project funding from the Research Council of Norway (RCN) is the largest external funding source — funding from four to 15 per cent of the expenditure. The RCN has replaced other public sources as the second most important source during the period. Other funding sources than the above mentioned GUF and RCN only sponsor small proportions of research in philosophy, the largest of these being foreign funds (1.6 per cent in 2007).

According to the national statistics covering the higher education sector, the University of Oslo has the largest share of the total R&D expenditure on philosophy and history of ideas (Table 2.10). In the years from 1991 to 2007, it covered between 40 and 55 per cent of all R&D expenditure. Note that, due to the IFIKK merger in 2005, the most recent figures for the University of Oslo include more than philosophy and history of ideas (see the note to the table). The most recent figures give the University of Bergen the second largest share, with 22 per cent of all R&D expenditure on philosophy. NTNU and the University of Tromsø each account for about 13 per cent of the expenditure in 2007.

*Table 2.10 Current R&D expenditure on philosophy and history of ideas in the Norwegian Higher education sector by institution. Percentages for the years 1991–2007*

Institution	1991	1993	1995	1997	1999	2001	2003	2005	2007
UiB	27	22	25	16	18	14	21	18	22
UiO	40	40	51	50	43	51	47	*55	*53
UiT	15	19	14	18	21	17	18	16	13
NTNU	18	18	10	16	18	17	14	12	13
<b>Total percentage</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Total R&amp;D expenditure, NOK mill.**</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>20.6</b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>39.4</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>35.6</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>45.0</b>

Notes: \*The figures for UiO for 2005 and 2007 include more than philosophy. The explanation is that, when four departments at UiO merged to IFIKK in 2005 (see Chapter 2), the R&D of two former non-philosophy departments was classified as philosophy. Based on the relative size of the department's R&D before the merger, about 80 per cent of the expenditure at IFIKK can be classified as philosophy or the history of ideas. (In the national statistics, all R&D at units that consider more than half of their R&D to be in the discipline of philosophy/Hol are classified as philosophy/Hol; this implies that the statistics are sensitive to reorganisations.)

\*\*Fixed 2000 prices.

Source: NIFU STEP, R&D statistics.

There was a substantial increase in the total expenditure on philosophy and history of ideas, from NOK 19 million in 1991 to NOK 45 million in 2007 (measured in fixed 2000 prices), but the increase should be understood with the above-mentioned reservations for the 2005 and 2007 figures for the University of Oslo in mind.

#### *Comparisons with other disciplines within the humanities*

Table 2.11 shows research resources spent on philosophy and history of ideas compared with other humanities disciplines, including the higher education institutions only. In terms of economic resources, philosophy and history of ideas is a research field of medium size within the humanities in Norway.

*Table 2.11 Current R&D expenditure on the humanities in the Norwegian Higher Education sector by subject field, for the years 1991–2007. NOK million*

Subject field	1991	1993	1995	1997	1999	2001	2003	2005	2007
Languages and literature studies	33.3	46.5	41.4	45.4	35.4	45.6	152.3	119.5	146.4
History	41.2	45.0	46.6	54.5	65.1	71.4	49.2	40.7	40.3
Archaeology and classical studies	19.4	26.5	29.7	30.9	40.9	39.1	74.3	54.8	34.4
Musicology/musical studies	10.8	13.7	16.1	20.6	20.4	26.4	32.8	34.0	53.7
Architecture and design	6.1	6.5	9.7	11.4	8.5	15.3	13.1	22.6	36.9
Theology, religious studies	27.1	39.5	42.7	45.9	46.0	55.0	65.8	68.0	79.6
<b>Philosophy and history of ideas</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>29.8</b>	<b>37.9</b>	<b>42.1</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>55.6</b>	<b>57.2</b>
Film and Drama studies	1.7	1.7	2.3	2.4	3.9	4.2	9.4	9.9	17.2
Other subject fields in the humanities*	182.6	236.0	336.3	417.3	434.3	499.9	331.0	463.2	619.7
<b>All humanities</b>	<b>336.6</b>	<b>431.6</b>	<b>544.4</b>	<b>658.2</b>	<b>692.4</b>	<b>798.8</b>	<b>768.1</b>	<b>868.3</b>	<b>1085.4</b>

Note: \*The category *Other fields in the humanities* mainly consists of multidisciplinary departments (at the Universities and State university colleges), i.e. departments whose R&D activities are classified under a variety of different disciplines (without a "majority discipline"). The category varies considerably, mainly due to institute mergers and reorganisations.

Source: NIFU STEP, R&D statistics.

The proportion of general university funds in philosophy and history of ideas (81 per cent in 2007) is somewhat higher than the average for the humanities (75 per cent in 2007). However, a large percentage of the research funded by general university funds is common to many subject fields in the humanities (Table 2.12). The percentage of external funding

(around 20 per cent) in philosophy and history of ideas is neither very high nor particularly low when compared with other subject fields in the humanities. However, scholarly fields such as archaeology and history have a substantially higher percentage of external funding.

*Table 2.12 Current R&D expenditure on the humanities in the Norwegian Higher Education sector, by funding source in 2007. Percentages for subject fields*

Subject field	*GUF	**RCN	Other public sources	Industry	Other domestic sources	Foreign sources	Total mill. NOK
Languages and literature studies	71	17	3	0	0	9	146.4
History	61	16	9	-	2	12	40.3
Archaeology and classical studies	30	3	43	12	13	-	34.4
Musicology/musical studies	88	10	1	-	0	1	53.7
Architecture and design	81	15	3	1	0	0	36.9
Theology, religious studies	89	4	2	0	4	1	79.6
<b>Philosophy and history of ideas</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>57.2</b>
Film and Drama studies	86	7	7	-	-	-	17.2
Other subject fields of humanities	75	10	10	2	2	1	619.7
<b>All humanities</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1085.4</b>

Notes: \*General university funds.

\*\*Research Council of Norway.

0 = figures lower than NOK 0.5 million; - = no value.

Source: NIFU STEP, R&D statistics.

### *The Research Council of Norway's funding of philosophy and history of ideas*

The Research Council of Norway is the major external funding source for Norwegian universities and it has a variety of funding schemes. Table 2.13 includes all grants categorised under philosophy and history of ideas by RCN in the years 2001 to 2008.

Independent projects (“free research”) account for around 27 per cent of the total RCN funding for philosophy and history of ideas in the eight-year period, whereas research programmes account for 49 per cent of the funding. Most RCN research programmes are of a multidisciplinary nature. Examples of programmes that involved philosophical research are:

- within “Large Scale Programmes”, grants to projects dealing with ethics and risk under *The Fuge Programme* (Functional Genomics);
- within “Basic research programmes”: grants to projects under ethics programmes, i.e. ELSA (*Ethical, Legal and Social aspects of Biotechnology, Nanotechnology and Neurotechnology*) and the previous Ethics programme (*Etikkprogrammet*).

Table 2.13 The Research Council of Norway's funding of philosophy and history of ideas by type of funding, 2001–2008

Type of funding	Type of funding scheme	Percentage of funds
<i>Independent projects</i>		
	Independent projects ("fri prosjektstøtte")*	25.7
	International projects ("internasjonal prosjektstøtte")	1.2
	Total Independent projects	26.9
<i>Research programmes</i>		
	Basic research programmes	17.4
	Action-oriented programmes	9.0
	Large Scale Programmes	22.1
	Total Research programmes	48.5
<i>Infrastructural and institutional measures</i>		
	Centres of Excellence	12.4
<i>Network measures</i>		
	National measures/arenas ("nasj. stimul.tiltak, møteplass")	9.9
	International network measures ("internasj.nettverkstiltak")	0.1
	Total Network measures	10.0
<i>Diverse R&amp;D-related activities</i>		
	Information/communication/publishing	2.2
<b>Total NOK millions, 2001–2008</b>		<b>116.5</b>

Note: The figures include funding classified and coded as subject field philosophy by the Research Council of Norway (RCN). The figures in the table are based on the RCN budgets. The figures are *not comparable* with the figures in the other tables in this report, which are based on the national R&D statistics. In the national R&D statistics, the expenditures are coded according to the subject fields of the performing research units, whereas in RCN the grants are coded according to the subject field of the individual projects. Therefore, the funding categorised as philosophy may differ between the two sets of data.

\*For types of funding schemes for which no English term is found on the RCN website, the Norwegian term is given in parenthesis.

Source: Research Council of Norway, revised budgets 2001–2008.

The RCN also funds research through infrastructural and institutional measures. This type of funding accounts for 12 per cent of the total RCN funding categorised under philosophy and history of ideas in the period. The most prominent current example is a Centre of Excellence, the *Centre for the Study of Mind in Nature* at the University of Oslo. The types of funding presented above account for 88 per cent of the total funding from the RCN. A variety of network measures and other activities account for the remaining support.

To sum up, in addition to the funding of independent projects, philosophy and history of ideas receive a substantial proportion of their financial support from the RCN through multidisciplinary research programmes and through the funding of a Centre for Excellence. It should be noted that the figures in Table 2.13 are totals for an eight-year period, that the figures vary considerably between years, and that the establishment of a Centre of Excellence in philosophy in 2007 has a great impact on the RCN figures for philosophy. In 2008, Centres of Excellence-funding accounted for 51 per cent of the RCN funding of philosophy and history of ideas, independent projects for 37 per cent and research programmes for five per cent.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup> The total RCN funding for the field was NOK 14 million in 2006, 15 million in 2007 and 19 million in 2008.

*The departments in the evaluation: figures from the self evaluations*

The figures in the departments' self-evaluations confirm that most of the activity in philosophy and history of ideas is internally funded. External funding is generally low. There is still some variation over time and between departments (Tables 2.14 and 2.15). Notably, there is a large increase in external income in the two latter years, and in 2008 in particular. The UiB department has had a large increase in internal income as a result of the merger with first semester studies in 2007, but it still managed to increase its share of external income from 2007 to 2008 (from 9 to 14 per cent). IFIKK has had the most significant increase in external income as a result of the establishment of CSMN in 2007, which has also resulted in increased internal income (institutional co-funding is a requirement in the Norwegian Centre of Excellence scheme). The UiT department is the smallest one, with internal income around NOK 10 million per year throughout the period, and external income varying — with no trend for either an increase or decrease — between five and 15 per cent of the total income. The NTNU department, on the other hand, has had a clear increase in external income throughout the period, from nine per cent in 2004 to 34 per cent in 2008 (percentage of total income from external sources).

**Table 2.14** *The income of the evaluated departments broken down by internal and external sources, 2004–2008. Current prices, NOK.*

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<i>UiB: Dept. of Philosophy</i>					
Internal sources	13 930 267	13 170 000	12 770 885	13 499 016	**17 400 892
External sources	2 238 603	1 750 000	1 220 509	1 404 368	2 838 353
<b>Total</b>	<b>16 168 870</b>	<b>14 920 000</b>	<b>13 991 394</b>	<b>14 903 384</b>	<b>20 239 245</b>
<i>UiO: IFIKK*</i>					
Internal sources		65 192 000	65 558 000	69 067 000	87 163 000
External sources		4 334 000	3 849 000	9 628 000	19 864 000
<b>Total</b>		<b>69 526 000</b>	<b>69 407 000</b>	<b>78 695 000</b>	<b>107 027 000</b>
<i>UiT: Dept. of Philosophy</i>					
Internal sources	10 232 000	9 927 000	10 373 000	9 550 000	10 129 000
External sources	1 593 666	929 680	581 488	1 684 078	1 146 523
<b>Total</b>	<b>11 825 666</b>	<b>10 856 680</b>	<b>10 954 488</b>	<b>11 234 078</b>	<b>11 275 523</b>
<i>NTNU: Dept. of Philosophy</i>					
Internal sources	11 927 000	12 472 000	12 300 000	12 100 000	12 200 000
External sources	1 207 000	2 419 000	2 733 000	3 449 000	6 241 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>13 134 000</b>	<b>14 891 000</b>	<b>15 033 000</b>	<b>15 549 000</b>	<b>18 441 000</b>

Sources: The self-evaluations from the departments. The figures include all income (teaching, administration and research). There is some uncertainty concerning what is included in the NTNU figures, as the NTNU self-evaluation does not specify what is included in the figures.

\*The departments merged in 2005 and no figures from 2004 are available.

\*\*Increase due to merger between the Department of Philosophy and the unit for first semester studies.

Table 2.15 External funding as a percentage of the departments' total income, 2004–2008.

Department	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
UiB: Dept. of Philosophy	13.8	11.7	8.7	9.4	14.0
UiO: IFIKK (research in Philosophy and Hol only)		6.2 (14)	5.5 (15)	12.2 (33)	18.6 (38)
UiT: Dept. of Philosophy	13.5	8.6	5.3	15.0	10.2
NTNU: Dept. of Philosophy	9.2	16.2	18.2	22.2	33.8
Total percentage	12.3	8.6	7.7	13.4	19.2

Sources: The self-evaluations from the departments. The figures include all income (teaching, administration and research). There is some uncertainty concerning what is included in the NTNU figures as the NTNU self-evaluation does not specify what is included. For UiO, the figures in brackets include income for research only, and only the parts of IFIKK relevant to the evaluation (Philosophy, History of ideas, CSMN and the Ethics Programme).

It should be noted that the figures in Tables 2.14 and 2.14 are not comparable with the previously presented figures from the national R&D statistics. The self-evaluations includes all kinds of income (for teaching, research, administration etc.), whereas the national R&D statistics include expenditure on research and development only.

## 2.3 Summary of main observations

### *Philosophers/Hol in Norway: overall figures*

Norway has a *large total workforce* of philosophers employed at higher education institutions (233 in total, including 25 with a master-level degree in history of ideas). The vast majority are affiliated to the four oldest universities, located in Bergen, Oslo, Trondheim and Tromsø. The large number of philosophers is due to the role of *examen philosophicum* in Norway, which means that a large proportion of the philosophers hold teaching positions (“lecturers”) and have little time for research. Moreover, only a small proportion of the philosophers work at independent research institutes, whereas a somewhat higher proportion of those educated in the history of ideas have found a position at these institutions.

### *Personnel at the units to be included in the evaluation*

The four university departments included in the evaluation employ 52 per cent of the scholars at Norwegian research institutions who are educated in philosophy or the history of ideas (129 of the 247 scholars). In addition, there are a substantial number of scholars at the evaluated units active in philosophy for whom we lack information on educational background, as well some with education from other fields.

At the evaluated departments, only 10 per cent of the personnel hold recruitment positions (PhD students). This is lower than the average for the humanities in Norway. Moreover, as many as 43 per cent of the academic personnel at the selected units hold lecturer positions, which is far above the average for other disciplines at the universities. In addition, there are professors with the same teaching obligations as lecturers (i.e. no time reserved for

research). Linked to the high proportion of lecturers, only 42 per cent of the “senior” staff at the evaluated departments hold a doctoral degree. However, there are large variations between the departments. At UiB, 24 per cent of the seniors hold a doctoral degree, while at NTNU 88 per cent hold a doctoral degree (all figures are from 2007). The proportion of lecturers and personnel with a doctoral degree is related to differences in the organisation of ex.phil. teaching and the use of part-time positions.

### *Age and gender*

The average age at the units was 49 years in 2008, varying considerably between research units, from 43 to 53 years. The average age of professor level staff varies between 50 and 60 years.

About a quarter of the scholars at the selected departments are females, varying from 18 per cent at UiT to 29 per cent at NTNU and at UiO. There is no notable difference between professorships and other positions concerning the proportion of female personnel, and 74 per cent of the PhD-students/recruitment positions are held by men (total figures for the four departments, 2007).

### *Economic resources: overall figures*

In terms of economic resources, philosophy and history of ideas is a research field of medium size within the humanities at higher education institutions in Norway. The major funding source is general university funds (basic institutional funding), which account for between 81 and 89 per cent of the expenditure in the period 1995–2007. The Research Council of Norway is the largest external funding source — funding from four to 15 per cent of the expenditure in the period. The RCN’s funding for philosophical research comprises independent projects (27 per cent), various multidisciplinary research programmes (49 per cent), a Centre for Excellence (12 per cent), as well as some network activities (10 per cent; all figures are totals for the period 2001–2008). The establishment of a Centre of Excellence in philosophy in 2007 has a great impact on the RCN figures for philosophy; in 2008, funding of Centres of Excellence accounted for 51 per cent of the RCN funding for philosophy and history of ideas.

### *Economic resources: the departments in the evaluation*

As in most fields within the humanities, external funding for philosophy and history of ideas is low, but there is notable variation over time and between departments. There is a large increase in external income in the two latter years, and in 2008 in particular. IFIKK has had the most significant increase in external income as a result of the establishment of CSMN in 2007. The NTNU department had a steady increase in external income throughout the period, and in 2008 34 per cent of the total income was from external sources.



### *Structural challenges*

The figures presented point to some specific features of personnel and funding in Norwegian philosophy. There is a large proportion of teaching personnel (lecturers) due to the teaching load for *examen philosophicum*. There are some very small departments, some of which have a low proportion of female scholars and a high average age. The institutions' basic funding accounts for most of the research activity, i.e. there are few resources for research apart from the staff members' research time. These structural challenges are discussed in Chapter 3.

## 3 Research, recruitment and collaboration

Based on wide-ranging information (self-evaluations from and meetings with the departments, submitted CVs and publications lists, as well as publication, recruitment and mobility analysis from NIFU STEP), this chapter presents the research and publication profiles of the five evaluated research milieus, and discusses overall questions relating to collaboration, mobility and recruitment.

### 3.1 Research and publication: unit profiles

#### 3.1.1 NTNU: Department of Philosophy

The Department of Philosophy at NTNU consists of two units: *Exphil-senteret* and *Filosofisk institutt*. The two units are located in different buildings at the Dragvoll campus. The original difference between the two units with respect to teaching and research obligations has now partly been eliminated. Scholars from both units are included in the evaluation.

#### *Research strategy and profile*

In its self-evaluation, the department emphasises the role of NTNU as a classical university and that this entails a responsibility to maintain a broad philosophical profile covering all the main philosophical areas: theoretical philosophy (metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of science, logic, philosophy of language, philosophy of mind), practical philosophy (ethics, political philosophy) and aesthetics, and covering both continental and analytical traditions, both historical and systematic approaches, and both theoretical and applied research questions. Obviously, resources and research output cannot be equally distributed between all these various areas and approaches. In the self-evaluation, three areas are defined as strong research areas at the department: applied ethics and political philosophy, aesthetics, naturalism and consciousness.

It is emphasised in the self-evaluation that the main ideal of the department is freedom of research. Thus, the three areas that the department defines as its strong research areas have not developed as the result of a deliberate strategy. Likewise, it is stated that any research priorities must satisfy the requirement for scholarly breadth and academic freedom that is essential to philosophy. In the interview with the evaluation panel, as well as in its strategy plan, the department nevertheless had some reflections on future priorities. Applied ethics<sup>15</sup> is characterised as a good opportunity for growth. A majority of the department's research fellows work on applied ethics, reflecting the availability of external funding within this field. On the other hand, there is concern at the department that the recruitment

---

<sup>15</sup> ”Program for anvendt etikk ved NTNU startet høsten 2001 og har under en treårsperiode vært drevet med støtte fra Norges Forskningsråd. Fra og med 2004 finansieres programmet helt av NTNU.”  
<http://www.anvendtetikk.ntnu.no/main.php>

of research fellows to theoretical philosophy is weak, and more emphasis on theoretical philosophy is indicated as a priority in the department's strategy plan.

### *Research output*

The three areas defined by the department as their strong research areas (applied ethics and political philosophy, aesthetics, naturalism and consciousness) account for a large percentage of the publications submitted by researchers at this department. Two thirds of the submitted publications relate to social and political philosophy, ethics, aesthetics, metaphysics and philosophy of mind. A large proportion of the remaining publications deal with epistemology and history of philosophy.

Compared with the other departments, the NTNU philosophy department's publication profile has some specific characteristics (based on analysis of the publications for which the departments has obtained credits in the performance-based budgeting 2004-2008, see Appendix 3).

- More journal articles than UiO/philosophy and UiB.
- A lower proportion of English and lower proportion of level 2 than UiO/philosophy and UiB.
- The only department publishing in medical journals: Contributions to *Tidsskrift for Den norske lægeforening*, as well as contributions to three international medical journals (on palliative medicine).
- The only department where all the included scholars have registered publications.

### **3.1.2 UiB: Department of Philosophy**

Since the merger in 2007, the full name of the department is the Department of Philosophy and First Semester Studies (Institutt for filosofi og førstesemesterstudier). Even though all staff are now involved in ex.phil. teaching, the two former units are not merged in terms of teaching and research obligations. Many of the scholars affiliated to the *examen philosophicum* unit hold teaching-only, often part-time, positions. Note that scholars from both units are included in the evaluation (but not scholars without "first position" competence), which means that some of the evaluated research is performed outside the scholars' formal academic position.

Moreover, the number of part-time positions means that figures based on the number of staff members (as in this report), and not on full-time equivalents, give a flawed picture of the size of the department.

### *Research strategy and profile*

Research at the department is organised in five research groups. All researchers are members of at least of one of these groups, which also include PhD students and some master students:

1. Social and political philosophy
2. Wittgenstein studies
3. Ancient philosophy
4. Phenomenology and existential philosophy
5. Analytic philosophy

The research groups are flexibly organised. They have overlapping membership and their profiles vary from formal units to more active cooperative networks. Joint publications are unusual. Reorganising the groups in relation to new research orientations is not regarded as realistic.

The leaders of the groups constitute the department's research committee, which organises joint seminars and also makes recommendations with regard to the allocation of research funding. The department maintains that the introduction of the research groups has advanced the coordination of the research activities, added to internal, national and international cooperation in research and the initiation of projects, and improved the research milieu for doctoral students. All groups are active in creating international networks and symposia.

In the self-evaluation, aesthetics, continental philosophy, philosophy of language, social philosophy and work-life research, and Wittgenstein studies are defined as strong traditions in the department. In relation to the national research context, the department sees itself as being particularly strong in:

- (a) Wittgenstein studies,
- (b) social philosophy, and
- (c) phenomenology and existential philosophy.

The *Wittgenstein research* group is associated with The Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen (WAB) which is a research infrastructure best known for the publication of *Wittgenstein's Nachlass. The Bergen Electronic Edition*. This is the most international research unit at the department. To better profit from the international network, the department would like WAB to be co-located with the department (the archive is not only a separate organisational unit and not part of the Faculty of Humanities, it is also located elsewhere in Bergen).

There are also international and local projects in bioethics, medical ethics and philosophical aesthetics that are outside the research groups, and some researchers participate in interdisciplinary projects on gender issues and the philosophy of law. Of these, the self-evaluation defines medical ethics as an important national research profile of

the department. The department perceives the balance between the activity of individual researchers and the research groups as good and unproblematic.

### *Research output*

The submitted works ranged over numerous sub-fields. The three areas defined by the department as its particular national strength (Wittgenstein studies, social philosophy, and phenomenology and existential philosophy, see above), account for one third of the reviewed publications from the department. Other areas with high activity (judging from the number of submitted publications) are ethics and history of philosophy, which, together, are responsible for another third of publications. There are also notable amounts of publications in aesthetics and epistemology.

Compared with the other departments, the UiB philosophy department's publication profile has some specific characteristics (based on analysis of the publications for which the department has obtained credits in the performance-based budgeting 2004-2008, see Appendix 3).

- A relatively high proportion of publications in English (46 per cent), and a more moderate proportion of level 2 publications (16 per cent).
- The UiB philosophers are the only ones with articles in the international philosophy publications *Journal of Philosophical Research* and *Analecta Husserliana*, as well as in two Norwegian law journals.

Bergen is the centre of Norwegian studies of Wittgenstein's philosophy and the majority of the works on phenomenological and existential philosophy comes from there. However, the largest sub-field measured on the basis of submitted publications is history of philosophy. As for theoretical philosophy, there are no works on logic and very few on metaphysics and philosophy of mind. However, there are some noteworthy contributions to epistemology.

### **3.1.3 UiO: Philosophy**

UiO is by far the largest Norwegian milieu for research in philosophy, but the only evaluated milieu which is not a separate department. It is part of the multidisciplinary *Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas* (IFIKK). The department (established 2005) consists of four formerly separate departments (all indicated in the name of the department).<sup>16</sup> The *examen philosophicum* unit was a separate unit in the former Department of Philosophy, but has now merged into one philosophy group at IFIKK. The unit has a large number of teaching-only staff (lecturer positions with little time for research). Some of them have obtained a doctoral degree and are now titled professor or associate professor (*førsteamanuensis*), but still have the same teaching obligations as

---

<sup>16</sup> The department was the result of a general process of merging departments at the Faculty of Humanities.

lecturers (those who have not been promoted to professor or associate professor are not included in the evaluation). In total, there are more professors/associate professors with the same teaching obligations as lecturers (11) than there are regular professors/associate professors (13).<sup>17</sup>

### *Research strategy and profile*

According to the self-evaluation, the milieu is characterised by much individually initiated research. There is a high degree of research autonomy, and participation in research groups depends on the researchers' own preferences. It is mentioned that there is a long tradition in Oslo of a systematic and, in a broad sense, analytic approach to philosophy.

There are three initiatives that have influenced the research profile in different ways and which in some way extend beyond the department: (1) The *Ethics Programme*, which is a strategic priority of UiO (established 2002) and has been hosted by IFIKK since 2007; (2) the "Oslo Happiness project" initiated at the department in 2004 and currently hosted by the Centre for Advanced Studies as a research group in *Ethics in Antiquity: The Quest for the Good Life*; and (3) the *Centre for Study of Mind in Nature* (CSMN) a Centre of Excellence hosted by the department.

In its self-evaluation, ethics and ancient philosophy are mentioned as research areas with high activity and quality. Ethics brings together philosophers from the department, the Ethics Programme and the Moral Agency part of CSMN, while ancient philosophy gets much of its impetus from the "Oslo Happiness project". Besides ethics and ancient philosophy, also including late ancient philosophy and early Byzantine thinking, the self-evaluation mentions philosophy of language (broadly defined) as an area where there is high quality and activity across the organised groups and initiatives. Philosophy of science and political philosophy are mentioned as areas where resources are lacking.

It is obvious that the establishing of CSMN has changed the research milieu in philosophy in Oslo. It has meant greatly increased economic resources, the strengthening of organised international contacts, many additional postdoc positions, graduate courses with many prominent international researchers, and, generally, "a hive of activities (conferences, guest lecturers etc.)" as stated in the self-evaluation. On the other hand, as is also stated in the self-evaluation, this has sometimes led to unfortunate collisions. It was clear from the interviews that the philosophical activities of the centre have not as yet been well integrated in the department. Many of the researchers are connected to it in one way or another and many participate in its activities. However, there are also those who are less involved and who are thereby alienated from the new, dominating activities. Since the centre was established, activities involving the whole department have become proportionally smaller as a result of the great amount of activities in the centre as well as in the other research groups (e.g. Etikkprogrammet). For instance, the joint "philosophy

---

<sup>17</sup> Information from IFIKK May 2010.

seminar” at which permanent members of staff in particular could present ideas that they were working on is now making up a smaller proportion of the philosophical activities in the department. Research projects outside those CSMN is engaged in are now rarely the subject of joint discussions in the philosophy group. There is a risk that this will lead to fragmentation and create difficulties in developing a communality and shared identity. On the other hand, the teamwork involved in the centre could serve as a model.

It should be noted that the creation of a big department with many different subjects has given rise to similar risks. Being part of a larger department, philosophy at UiO seems to lack a forum for discussing and coordinating its research activities and priorities. During the interviews, department representatives expressed concern that there was little opportunity to influence the research profile in terms of, for example, its impact on new recruitment. In the long run, the negative aspects of the two events discussed here could hurt the Oslo philosophy group’s capacity to provide a varied and fruitful context for research.

### *Research output*

The unit’s research spans many different areas of philosophy. All the philosophy sub-fields defined for this evaluation, apart from Wittgenstein studies, are represented among the works submitted by UiO philosophers. The four largest areas — ethics, history of philosophy, metaphysics and philosophy of mind, and philosophy of language — account for about three quarters of the reviewed publications. The remaining quarter includes works in phenomenology, philosophy of science, logic and aesthetics.

Besides ethics, ancient philosophy and philosophy of language, which the self-evaluation mentions as its research areas with high activity and quality, we have identified philosophy of mind and philosophy of biology (within the philosophy of science) as strong fields, as seen in Chapter 4. Within the history of philosophy, we have found Kant studies to be a qualitatively strong field in addition to ancient philosophy, and within ethics we have identified applied ethics, and military ethics in particular, as qualitatively strong.

Compared with the other departments, the UiO philosophy publication profile has some specific characteristics (based on analysis of the publications for which the department has obtained credits in the performance-based budgeting 2004-2008, see Appendix 3):

- The highest proportion of publications in English (55 per cent), and by far the highest proportion at level 2 (29 per cent).
- Only UiO philosophers have articles in level 2 journals in ancient philosophy. Moreover, these articles in ancient philosophy account for a substantial proportion of the level 2 journal articles from UiO philosophy.

### 3.1.4 UiO: History of Ideas

The History of Ideas section in Oslo, which has existed since 1946, is relatively small. Since 2005, it has been part of the multidisciplinary *Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas* (IFIKK). Its prior organisational history includes being a separate department and being linked with history as well as cultural studies. It is the only separate Norwegian unit for the History of Ideas, although studies in the history of ideas have also emerged at other Norwegian higher education institutions in recent years.

#### *Research strategy and profile*

The unit has a broad research profile characterised by individual projects. The self-evaluation's list of research topics during the last five years includes: philosophy of time, political ideologies, Norwegian conservative intellectual traditions, educational thinking, history of prison administration, history of Italian literature, Ibsen, Kierkegaard, psychology in the Age of Enlightenment, university history, history of journals, Byzantine pious life, Christian mysticism and early Christian texts.

On the basis of the section's self-evaluation, there appears to be no attempt to provide a firm overarching or systematic structure for the research carried out in the section. Based on the publication lists and the works submitted, it appears that individual researchers are quite free to choose their research themes, as well as to change their area of focus. The self-evaluation states, however, that Norwegian history of ideas and eighteenth century (Western) European history of ideas are emerging as areas for joint research efforts at the unit. There have also been some efforts to define studies of modernity as a joint effort for research and teaching. Moreover, history of science is mentioned as an area that would be given priority in the event of a new permanent position. Apart from this, no particular profile or strength is defined in the self-evaluation, and it is emphasised that the unit is too small to implement a research strategy.

International collaboration is based on personal networks, which seems to work in a satisfactory manner. Researchers have to a certain extent profiled themselves internationally through contributions to international conferences, anthologies, and through periods of residency abroad.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the section has been the backbone of and driving force behind the Scandinavian journal *Ideas in History*, as well as the journal *Arr*, which functions as a meeting place for researchers from various environments and appears to have good resonance in intellectual public circles in Norway.

#### *Research output*

To a certain extent, the research in the section covers, in chronological order, the classical period, medieval period, the Renaissance and the modern period, as well as aspects of the contemporary period. History of philosophy as a genre is also covered. There are also



individual publications that reflect on methodological problems in the discipline of history of ideas.

Compared with the evaluated philosophy departments, the UiO history of ideas publication profile has some specific characteristics (based on analysis of the publications for which the department has obtained credits in the performance-based budgeting 2004-2008, see Appendix 3):

- The lowest proportion of publications in English (nine per cent),<sup>18</sup> and a low proportion at level 2 (nine per cent).
- Seventy-six per cent of their journal articles in the period are published in a journal edited at the department (*Arr*, with 29 of the registered 38 journal articles).

The overall impression is that the history of ideas section is exceedingly productive in its research, and that it also has very good relations with public intellectual life in Norway. However, the frequency of publication in international languages is low. Based on the publication lists,<sup>19</sup> it appears that seven short articles have been published in English, one article in French and three in German. One book has also been published in German. This limited number of publications in international languages is somewhat surprising given the generally high level of the research. See Section 4.3 for further assessment of the research in history of ideas, and a discussion of the language issue.

### 3.1.5 UiT: Department of Philosophy

Unlike the other evaluated units, the *Department of Philosophy* at UiT was until recently organised under the Faculty of Social Sciences, and it has more research objectives related to societal issues than found at the other evaluated units. After UiT's merger with Tromsø University College in 2009, the department belongs to the new Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education. It is expected that the department's teaching tasks will increase as a result of the merger, including the development of first semester studies for teacher education. The department considers itself to be at the forefront of net-based teaching in *examen philosophicum*. At present, it is a small department, in terms of both academic staff and students. There have been no new positions since 1999, contributing to an age and gender imbalance among the staff, which may be addressed through new positions. Several of the staff are in teaching rather than research positions.

---

<sup>18</sup> There is also one credited publication in French.

<sup>19</sup> That is, the full publication lists submitted and not just the publications given credit in the performance-based budgeting. Part of the discrepancies between the (credit giving) publications included in the analysis in Appendix 3 and the full publication lists of the researchers is explained by some researchers having multiple institutional affiliations and that some of their publications are credited to other institutions.

### *Research strategy and profile*

The department has defined practical philosophy as its priority area for the period 2008 to 2012, including ethics, social and political philosophy, philosophy of law, feminist philosophy and ecophilosophy. Its ambition is to be a central Norwegian milieu for practical philosophy. In addition to the practical philosophy group, there is also a smaller theoretical philosophy group at the department. The self-evaluation report defines history of philosophy, as well as social and political philosophy, as its strong research profiles.

According to the self-evaluation, the organisation of the research into groups, as well as collaboration with other groups at UiT on interdisciplinary projects, is positive for the department's research activities. Research groups have been organised in social and political philosophy around topics relating to religion and modernity, as well as topics in theoretical philosophy. The self-evaluation emphasises that the research activities also comprise individually run projects and that the staff enjoy a high level of academic autonomy. Defining a priority area for research was not in line with their tradition for academic autonomy and created some tension among staff.

### *Research output*

The topics of the submitted publications reflect the priorities and traditions of the department. Slightly less than half of the publications belong to ethics and social and political philosophy, and about one-fifth to history of philosophy.

Compared with the other philosophy departments, the publication profile of the UiT department has some specific characteristics (based on analysis of the publications for which the department has obtained credits in the performance-based budgeting 2004-2008, see Appendix 3):

- Few journal articles, most of which are in Norwegian journals.
- A low proportion of publications in English (21 per cent), and a low proportion at level 2 (four per cent).

The limited output should be understood in light of the small size of the department and the fact that the department was approaching a generation shift in the evaluated period.

## **3.2 Research training, mobility and recruitment**

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation demand that the importance (to the research activities) of researcher mobility and recruitment should be discussed. Based on the self-evaluations from the departments, the interviews with department representatives and recruits, as well as available statistics, this section addresses some key issues relating to research training, mobility and recruitment in Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas.

### 3.2.1 Some overall figures on recruitment and mobility<sup>20</sup>

During the period 1995 to 2005, the four universities awarded a total of 405 master-level degrees in philosophy and 148 master-level degrees in history of ideas.<sup>21</sup> Whereas 43 per cent of history of ideas candidates were females, only 31 per cent of the philosophy candidates were females. Gender percentages vary somewhat from year to year, but there was no major changes from the first to the last part of the period.

Table 3.1 shows the proportion of the candidates who were employed in Norwegian higher education or research in 2007. About 20 per cent of the philosophy candidates and 10 per cent of the history of ideas candidates held a scholarly position.<sup>22</sup> Notably, a slightly higher proportion of the female than of the male philosophy candidates were employed in research/higher education (23 versus 21 per cent in a scholarly position). Moreover, more women than men (particularly history of ideas candidates) were employed in *administrative positions* at research and higher education institutions.<sup>23</sup> In total, 76 per cent of the philosophy candidates and 85 per cent of the history of ideas candidates were *not* employed in the Norwegian research and higher education sector.

*Table 3.1 Academic employment of master-level degree\* candidates in philosophy and history of ideas in Norway 1995-2005. Percentage employed in different sectors, by discipline and gender.*

Employment in 2007	Philosophy education			History of idea education		
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total
University	16.9	15.7	16.0	7.8	3.6	5.4
Specialised university institution	1.6		0.5			
University college	3.2	3.9	3.7	1.6	4.8	3.4
Research institute sector	0.8	1.1	1.0		2.4	1.4
Total with a scholarly/research position in 2007	<b>22.6</b>	<b>20.6</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>10.1</b>
Administrative or technical position in higher education(HE)/research sector	4.8	1.8	2.7	9.4	1.2	4.7
Total employed in the HE/research sector 2007	27.4	22.4	24.0	18.8	11.9	14.9
Not employed in HE/research sector 2007	72.6	77.6	76.0	81.3	88.1	85.1
<b>N (candidates 1995-2005)</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>148</b>

\*Master-level degree=Cand.philol./Mag.art/Master

Source: NIFU STEP, Graduate register and Register of research personnel.

Table 3.2 shows the educational background of the academic staff at the four evaluated departments, more precisely the institutions that awarded their master-level degrees. A large proportion of the staff had their educational background from UiO or UiB. Forty-two per cent of the total staff at the four departments were educated at UiO, 30 per cent at UiB,

<sup>20</sup> The analysis in this section was provided by Hebe Gunnes and Terje Bruen Olsen of NIFU STEP.

<sup>21</sup> All degrees in history of ideas were awarded by UiO.

<sup>22</sup> Including institutions and positions covered by the NIFU STEP Register of research personnel, see Sections 2.1 and 2.2.

<sup>23</sup> The proportion of candidates employed in such positions is still much lower than for other disciplines we have studied (sociology, social anthropology and human geography).

eight per cent at UiT and only six per cent at NTNU. Moreover, the figures indicate that about 15 per cent were educated abroad (figures from 2007).<sup>24</sup>

The prior institutional mobility of the staff at UiB, and in particular the staff at UiO, is low. Of the total staff at IFIKK there is one person with a master-level degree in philosophy from UiB, but none from NTNU or UiT (Table 3.2).

**Table 3.2** *Mobility in Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Educational background of the academic staff (2007) at the four evaluated departments. Percentage.*

Institution awarding master-level degree**	Affiliation/place of employment in 2007						Total per cent
	UiB		UiO		UiT	NTNU	
	Dept. of Philosophy	All IFIKK	Staff with a master-level degree in philosophy*	Staff with a master-level degree in Hol*	Dept of Philosophy	Dept of Philosophy	
UiB	71.8	1.3	2.8		14.3	14.3	29.9
UiO	8.5	81.8	94.4	100.0	25.0	28.6	41.6
UiT	2.8				46.4		7.6
NTNU	2.8				3.6	38.1	5.6
UMB		1.3					0.5
Abroad	4.2	6.5	2.8			9.5	5.1
Not specified***	9.9	9.1			10.7	9.5	9.6
<b>N</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>197</b>

\*Includes personnel with a master-level degree in the discipline registered in the NIFU STEP databases, including all Norwegian master-level degrees, but not all foreign master-level degrees. As UiO is the only Norwegian institution offering a master-level degree in history of ideas, all their staff with a registered master-level degree in history of ideas are educated at UiO.

\*\*Master-level degree=Cand.philol./Mag.art/Master

\*\*\*In most cases "not specified" implies education from abroad as well as a non-specified discipline, explaining why these staff members are not broken down by philosophy and history of ideas at UiO.

Source: NIFU STEP, Graduate register and Register of research personnel.

### *Academic employment and mobility of doctoral candidates*

Forty-one doctoral degrees linked to the four evaluated departments were awarded during the period 2003-2007.<sup>25</sup> The vast majority of them were employed in Norwegian higher education/research in 2008. Five of them held an associate professor position at one of the four evaluated departments — all of them at the same institution as awarded the doctoral degree. Another 13 of the doctors had obtained an associate professor position at other university departments/units than the four evaluated departments. Eight were postdocs and two held lecturer positions at universities, while six were employed at a university college and two at research institutes. Only five of the 41 doctors were not registered as employed in Norwegian higher education/research in 2008 (Table 3.3). Web searches in March 2010 indicate that these five are all employed in Norway (one at a higher education institution and the remaining four outside higher education and research), none of them abroad.

<sup>24</sup> Five per cent have a registered master-level degree from outside Norway. For another 10 per cent, we lack information about the institution that awarded their master-level degrees. They were most probably educated abroad. Note that the figures are from 2007. Because of several new positions at UiO (CSMN), updated figures would show a higher proportion with a master-level degree from abroad.

<sup>25</sup> All candidates registered under philosophy and history of ideas were retrieved from the national register, and affiliation was checked with the lists of candidates in the self-evaluations from the institutions, as well as some additional information from the institutions on candidates in 2003 and on dr.philos degrees. Candidates listed in the self-evaluations as affiliated to other university units than the four evaluated departments are not included.

**Table 3.3** *Doctoral candidates in philosophy and history of ideas 2003-2007 and their affiliation and position in 2008*

Position 2008	Affiliation 2008				Total
	University	University college	Research institute	Not in the register	
Associate Professor	18	5			23
Senior Lecturer	1				1
University Lecturer	1				1
Researcher		1	2		3
Postdoc	8				8
Not in the register				5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>41</b>

Source: NIFU STEP, Register of doctoral degrees and Register of research personnel. The candidates include 27 Dr.artium, eight PhDs and six Dr.philos.

Notably, a higher proportion of the female doctors have obtained a position at one of the four evaluated departments. In total, 14 of the 41 doctors are women, and 27 are men. Nine of the female and five of the male candidates held a position at one of the four departments in 2008. In other words, the departments have employed 64 per cent of their female candidates, but only 18 per cent of their male candidates.

Table 3.4 shows the mobility of the 41 doctors within Norway. In 2008, 21 of them were employed at the institution that awarded their doctoral degree. There is very little mobility between the four universities that award doctoral degrees in philosophy and history of ideas. Table 3.4 below corroborates the low cross-institutional mobility shown in Table 3.2. One person with a doctoral degree from UiO and one with a doctoral degree from UiT were employed at UiB (none of them at the Department of Philosophy), but apart from that there was no mobility between the four institutions.

**Table 3.4** *Mobility of doctoral candidates in philosophy and history of ideas 2003-2007*

Place of employment 2008	Institution awarding the dr. degree (2003-2007)				Total
	UiO	UiB	NTNU	UiT	
UiO	<b>9</b>				9
UiB	1	<b>4</b>		1	6
NTNU			<b>4</b>		4
UiT				<b>4</b>	4
UiS	1	3	1		5
Bodø University College			1	1	2
Lillehammer University College		1			1
Oslo University College	1	1			2
Østfold University College	1				1
Research institute	1		1		2
Not in the register/outside research and higher education	3	1	1		5
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>41</b>

Source: NIFU STEP, Register of doctoral degrees and Register of research personnel.

Little mobility between the institutions is also confirmed when examining the institutions that awarded the master-level degrees of the 41 doctors. Sixty-eight per cent of them obtained their doctoral and master-level degree at the same institution. The lack of mobility is most notable at UiO. Only two of the 17 doctors from UiO had a master-level degree from another institution (Table 3.5).

**Table 3.5**      *The previous educational mobility of the 2003-2007 doctoral candidates in philosophy and history of ideas*

Mobility	Institution awarding the dr. degree				Total
	UiO	UiB	NTNU	UiT	
Same institution awarded master-level and dr. degree	15	6	3	4	28
Different institutions awarded master-level and dr. degree	2	4	5	2	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>41</b>

Source: NIFU STEP, Register of doctoral degrees, Register of research personnel and Register of academic degrees.

It should be noted that the data set includes no information on *ingoing* international mobility, which in some cases may be extensive. In particular, no general information is given above about the educational background of the research staff as regards doctoral degrees. Looking at the philosophy unit at UiO, for example, we find that 17 of the scholars who have submitted CVs to this evaluation hold a doctoral degree from another country. Several of them had master degrees from Oslo University, while others have all their earlier academic training from abroad.

### **3.2.2 The PhD programmes**

There are substantial differences in size between the departments, resulting in different framework conditions for research training. The size of the department, the number of PhD students and the scope and focus of the PhD programme are interlinked factors affecting PhD education. The value of the research training to the individual PhD student will depend on the relevance of the courses and seminars offered for their selected dissertation field, as well as matching research interests with a supervisor and other senior staff at the department. Among the evaluated units, the PhD programme offered to the PhD students in the history of ideas seems to be a particular problem. At present, the PhD programme offered to these students is very diverse, including Musicology, Theatre Studies, Aesthetics and History of Art and Ideas. According to informants, the courses offered as part of this programme are perceived as irrelevant to and not stimulating for the history of ideas. In the meetings with the department and the recruits, we learnt that students put extra effort into “putting together their own education”, for instance by including courses from abroad.

Furthermore, seminars and groups for the presentation of work in progress are an important part of the PhD education. Experiences of these forums also vary. Some find them fruitful and rewarding, others find the seminars less relevant to their dissertation and learn more outside the department - by going abroad or even in multidisciplinary forums.

The PhD students interviewed expressed a general desire to be closely integrated in a programme, to have committed supervisors and to be encouraged to publish and be given incentives to and expectations of completing within their fellowship period. Some PhD students hold that the PhD education is much improved during the latter years, including a shift of mentality at the departments towards closer follow-up and more incentives and encouragement to complete within the fellowship period. Others hold that they have not noticed any shift of mentality and that some of those who started their PhD education a long time ago have not yet obtained a doctoral degree. In conclusion, there seems to be great variation both between and within departments and a lot may depend on the supervisor. Concerning the latter, the meetings with the departments confirm that the time spent on and frequency of PhD supervision may vary enormously.

Concerning the scope of the PhD programmes and varying framework conditions for research training, it should be mentioned that most of the departments are in favour of more national collaboration on PhD education. National collaboration would increase the volume of the PhD courses, and everyone would profit from joint resources. Such collaboration has been a topic at the *Nasjonalt fagråd for filosofi og idéhistorie*. Increased Nordic collaboration on PhD education would likewise enable more courses better adapted to the students' topics and interests to be offered. Especially in the history of ideas, it is essential to take initiatives to provide courses at PhD level that are relevant and stimulating for the participating junior researchers.

#### *Funding and profile of PhD students*

The number of PhD students and the themes of their dissertations are interlinked with the external funding and research profile of the departments. The PhD students are important to the research activity of the departments, and their work may impact on both the present and future research profile of the departments. Some PhD students work on standard philosophy questions, but it is the perception of some students that it is easier to obtain a grant to work on applied issues. Several of the departments emphasise that their primary need for external funding concerns PhD grants. However, these grants are often linked to applied research programmes. The scholarly units seem to have little influence on the profile of the PhD students funded by the university.

### **3.2.3 Career opportunities**

The interviewed recruits were well aware of the small chances of securing a permanent academic position in philosophy/history of ideas. Likewise, the departmental representatives emphasised that they tried to make it clear to the recruits that there were small chances for a permanent position. In particular, the UiO department envisaged a very competitive situation with many applicants from abroad.

A large part of the interviewed recruits expected to do semi-academic work and/or ex.phil.-teaching after their fellowship period, whereas an academic position was part of their long-

term plan. Some also plan for jobs outside the university, where the opportunities were considered to be good, including independent research institutes, public administration, media and publishing (for history of ideas in particular) and teaching. The options at new universities and at the university colleges were mentioned by many — as ex.phil. is expanding there. Moreover, “Historie og filosofi” is being launched as a new subject in secondary school, and it will provide new job opportunities in both philosophy and history of ideas. Adding all these career opportunities outside the university to the positive result of the analysis of the academic employment of doctoral candidates (Section 3.1.2 above), the career opportunities appear to be good. On the other hand, there are a considerable number of doctoral students presently working on their dissertations; in total, 58 in philosophy and four in history of ideas are listed in the self-evaluations from the departments. In addition, there are applicants from abroad when a professorship in philosophy is advertised, which means that the competition is hard. In the history of philosophy, candidates compete with candidates in several neighbouring fields when a position is advertised (philosophy, history, history of religion, literature etc.).

In addition, there may be a discrepancy between the career expectations of the junior scholars and the career opportunities available. Since the production of PhDs clearly exceeds the needs of the universities for research positions in philosophy and history of ideas, active career counselling may help junior researchers to develop successful career strategies early on and minimise problems and frustrations related to people getting stuck in serial employment in temporary teaching positions etc. Furthermore, insofar as participation in applied research programmes entails different career opportunities, this should also be part of the active counselling of junior researchers.

Perceptions of postdoc positions were somewhat mixed. Informants saw them as, on the one hand, hard to get and very attractive, and, on the other hand, as a highly insecure route to a temporary position that could even be disadvantageous in relation to a later change of career strategy to include non-academic positions after postdoc training.

Both at the PhD and the postdoc level, informants gave the impression that career strategies were very often focused on opportunities at the local university rather than on a national or international academic job market (see also Section 3.2.4 below).

### **3.2.4 Recruitment strategy?**

The ability to influence the research profile of the departments is primarily linked to the recruitment of new staff members. As mentioned above, grants for recruitment positions often come from applied research programmes and shift the research profile of the departments in the direction of applied research. Several of the informants emphasised new permanent positions/retirements as the only way to change the research profile of the department. Influencing the profile of new positions seems to be problematic, however. For various reasons, announcements of positions tend *not* to be restricted to specific fields of research, and the outcome of the selection processes is dependent on external review



committees that are supposed to base their judgments on scientific quality alone and not on a plan for the future research profile of the department.

As regards *national mobility*, there are some distinct patterns in Norwegian philosophy. As seen in Section 3.2.1, UiO seldom recruits philosophy candidates from the other Norwegian Universities to their PhD fellowships, and during the period in question it has not employed any doctoral candidates in philosophy from the other Norwegian Universities. Its recruitment is almost exclusively internal and international, in particular recruitment to CSMN, where there is substantial international recruitment. The three other universities, on the other hand, and particularly UiT and NTNU, recruit more from other Norwegian universities.

Some concerns regarding the *international mobility* of Norwegian recruits were also raised in the interviews. PhD students are better paid in Norway than elsewhere, and consequently have less incentive to go abroad. Moreover, Norwegian PhD students often have a family situation that impedes mobility, both international and national. Most PhD students still have a sojourn abroad as an integrated part of their fellowship. Some of the postdocs are offered a mentor, which, among other things, is intended to help them enter the international job market.

In relation to recruitment, several informants were concerned about *gender balance*. About three quarters of the academic staff at the departments are male, both at professor level and in recruitment positions (see Section 2.2.1). The proportion of females among the master-level degree candidates is not much higher (31 per cent, see Section 3.2.1). Some held that gender balance was not taken sufficiently seriously, and that the considerable under-representation of female scholars not only influenced the working environment, but also the research profile. The figures on the employment of female and male doctoral candidates (Section 3.2.1) do indicate, however, that efforts to improve gender balance are taken seriously at the majority of the departments. Measures mentioned to improve the gender balance included job announcements not restricted to particular topics and sub-fields, and mentoring for female postdocs (UiO). The first kind of measure is intended to open for a broader scope of applicants and thereby give female applicants a fairer chance. On the other hand, as noted above, job announcements open to all sub-fields may obstruct the groups' ability to develop and implement a research strategy.

### **3.3 Collaboration: International, cross-institutional and cross-disciplinary**

Collaboration can serve a multitude of aims and take many different forms. One aim is to increase the quality of research through detailed peer discussions. Another aim is to address research issues that require several different areas of expertise. Yet another aim is to undertake large-scale projects that require the concerted action of several people. Where resources are scarce, division of labour can also be an incentive to collaborate.

According to the self-evaluations and the interviews, Norwegian philosophy has extensive international research contacts and much interaction with other research disciplines locally at their institutions, as well as a long tradition of interaction with the Norwegian public. Whereas there is a notable amount of collaborative research projects *within* the departments, research cooperation *between* the four departments is marginal. In other words, there is little national collaboration.

History of ideas differs from philosophy in two ways: the projects seem to be (even) more individually organised (there is no example of a collaborative research project), and as the discipline is more geographically constrained, the international networks are primarily in the Nordic countries. As for philosophy, there is notable cross-disciplinary interaction, both locally and internationally, as well as interaction with the public. Research interaction between philosophy and history of ideas, however, seems to be virtually non-existent.

The different kinds of collaboration are summarised below (based on the self-evaluations and the interviews).

#### *Internal collaboration*

Collaboration within the departments includes reading groups and seminars, as well as groups organised around collaborative research projects and programmes. The extent of group organisation varies a great deal between the departments, see Section 3.1. All the units have series of seminars aimed at the whole department (e.g. lunch seminars), whereas their frequency and attendance seem to vary somewhat. Judging from the self-evaluations and the interviews, there is a close relationship between satisfaction with the research environment and organisation into groups and attendance at seminars. How to organise groups and seminars also appear to be a key issue when the departments discuss how to improve the research environment. This has resulted in various measures to increase attendance at seminars, e.g. lack of attendance resulting in rejection of sabbatical applications.

There is little collaboration in terms of co-authoring of publications, but this is standard in both philosophy and history of ideas internationally. In total, 14 per cent of the scholarly credited publications in the period 2004 to 2008 were co-authored.<sup>26</sup> There is substantial variation between (sub)fields with respect to traditions for co-authorships, and in the history of ideas in particular there seems to be little collaboration directed at co-authored publications — the database does not contain a single co-authored scholarly credited publication during the period.

---

<sup>26</sup> Tables are presented in Appendix 3 (Tables 3.6 and 3.7). There is no analysis of the proportion of local, national, international or cross disciplinary co-authorship.

The data indicate that more of the research has been organised into groups in recent years. At IFIKK, CSMN in particular has contributed to such group organisation. On the one hand, CSMN attracts eminent scholars to the department and stimulates extensive international interaction and collaboration, especially for the junior scholars. On the other hand, as mentioned in Section 3.1.3, CSMN seems to have led to a smaller proportion of joint activities in which the whole philosophy group participates.

### *National collaboration*

As noted above, there is little national collaboration in Norwegian philosophy. The Norwegian scholars tend to have more direct contact with colleagues abroad than with those at other Norwegian universities. Both in philosophy and history of ideas, there is extensive interaction with other research disciplines. In particular, PhDs and postdocs involved in applied projects collaborate with researchers from other disciplines. There is little collaboration between philosophy and history of ideas. Many of the interviewed scholars were concerned about the lack of collaboration and expressed a desire for more research collaboration.

An important issue is what can be gained from more national collaboration and what kinds of collaboration will be fruitful in relation to achieving these aims. As noted in Section 3.3.2 above, most departments are too small to provide sufficient PhD training in the form of, for example, relevant courses at an advanced level, whereas national collaboration would result in a sufficient volume to provide adequate training. Further, collaboration on activities such as workshops, invitations to guest lecturers etc. may enable small departments to benefit from activities that they would not be able to initiate themselves.

Finally, as noted in Section 3.2.4, there is little mobility between Norwegian philosophy departments, and increased collaboration could help to overcome such barriers to mobility.

At the meeting with the departments, it was discussed whether the lack of national collaboration was partly due to the departments' different specialisations. However, it was also noted that in overlap areas it would be desirable to have more collaboration between departments, which could provide benefits in the form of synergies.

It was also discussed whether the lack of national collaboration was due to increased international collaboration that makes national collaboration either superfluous or difficult to find time for. However, it is important to note here that, while international collaboration may, for example, be important in relation to ensuring peer discussions at the expert level within a narrow research area, other forms of collaboration may be necessary at the national level to secure critical mass for advanced education.

Finally, it was discussed whether the lack of national collaboration between the departments of philosophy and of history of ideas was due to increased interdisciplinary collaboration with other departments. However, the interdisciplinary collaboration seems

to be concentrated on specific (sub)fields and it should not impede national collaboration at departmental level.

A first national conference will be organised in 2011 and, hopefully, it will facilitate more collaboration between the departments.

#### *International collaboration*

International collaboration seems to be the kind of research collaboration that is given highest priority at the departments. In the self-evaluations, all the philosophy units emphasise the importance of their international collaboration, and the interviewed researchers emphasised that it is important to be part of the larger scholarly community. Various plans for increasing international collaboration were mentioned in the interviews, including institutional agreements with foreign universities and recruiting foreign scholars to Professor II positions.

It should also be noted that there is a generation shift in relation to the use of English. The youngest scholars publish most of their scholarly works in English (but less in other international languages), whereas the older scholars publish most of their works in Norwegian. PhD students are encouraged to write in an international language, there is some financial support for proof reading and translation, and the universities may assist with international applications.

### **3.4 Main observations and overall structural issues**

In the above survey, we have identified various problems. Some of these problems concern particular environments, such as the risk of fragmentation and the lack of contexts in which the whole staff could meet at the Oslo philosophy unit. Other problems are shared by the units, such as the skewed age and gender balance, the concerns about PhD training and the lack of national collaboration. In Chapter 5, we make certain suggestions about how the problems, in our view, should be addressed. As for the worry about gender balance, however, it is important to realise that the units' freedom of action is somewhat limited. The most efficient way of addressing it is obviously to hire more women. However, the ability to employ that strategy is heavily constrained, for example by the fact that the outcome of selection processes is dependent upon external review committees and by the financial conditions under which the departments operate. For example, there is concern at some departments that positions are not going to be retained when individuals retire. This would obviously not make it easier to correct the skewed balance through recruitment.

We also wish to stress that, although there are worries, the departments show an awareness of the problems and have in some cases already taken measures to deal with them. Moreover, we have found that the level of research activity is generally quite high, that the research has adequate links to the research frontier, and that the priority given to

international collaboration has resulted in much interaction between Norwegian researchers and foreign scholars.

*Research profile: size, specialist and generalist orientations*

Many (sub)fields in philosophy have become very specialised, and participation in international debates requires command of a very specific/technical and often extensive literature. In such fields, development is often driven by papers in a specific range of international journals. Participation in these discussions calls for a focused research strategy, both in order to be in full command of the latest developments and in order to gain recognition as a player in the field.

Most of the departments included in the evaluation are quite small. In order to cover teaching in a full philosophy programme, scholars in such small departments need to be broadly oriented. Likewise, in order for small departments to maintain an intellectual interchange within the department, scholars need to have a somewhat generalist profile.

This can easily result in tension between the highly specialised profiles needed to match international discussions in the field and the broad generalist profiles that may be needed in small departments in particular.

Obviously, there are different ways to meet this challenge. Highly specialised scholars can increase their collaboration within Norway to reach critical mass for scholarly interchange at the national level, or, given sufficient funding for travelling and maintaining international networks, they can collaborate more or less exclusively with international peers. Generalists may play an important role in building bridges between specialised areas or by introducing important issues or discussions to a broader audience.

The so-called “Tellekantsystemet” seems to emphasise international impact and thus, implicitly, a high degree of specialisation. However, it may be useful to consider whether this is necessarily the most fruitful policy for a relatively small discipline in a country with a small population and great distances between departments. At the same time, it may be useful to consider whether the (small) departments could benefit from more explicit strategies for dealing with the specialist/generalist challenge. This also applies to graduate education. Some departments note that it is difficult to recruit graduate students in all fields, but it can be discussed whether a small group of graduate students with very diverse interests provides a satisfactory environment for graduate training, or whether strong national collaboration or departmental specialisation is required to reach the critical mass necessary for graduate training at an international level.

Some of the dangers of the specialist/generalist challenge are also apparent in the submitted material. Some of the submitted works seem to fall between two stools. On the one hand, they are directed at philosophical peers, but, on the other hand, they do not

display such a level of command of the international discussion that they are likely to be publishable in international journals.

Another issue is that philosophical analysis can serve to clarify difficult questions in other disciplines (e.g. medicine, law, technology). The impact of such interdisciplinary work may, but need not, be international. For some disciplines that are closely tied to particular national contexts (e.g. law), the impact will necessarily be national, but it can nevertheless be very valuable. Further, such interdisciplinary work may not, but can well, be pathbreaking seen from a narrow, philosophical perspective, but may nevertheless be pathbreaking from the perspective of other discipline(s). Often, much effort is required to achieve sufficient command of all disciplines involved in such interdisciplinary work, even if the philosophical analysis is not groundbreaking as philosophy (and even more so if it is). A strong emphasis on publication in major languages (English, German, French) or a strong emphasis on philosophical innovation may lead to such interdisciplinary work not being adequately awarded.

At the same time, while it is important not to downgrade research published in Norwegian or in non-philosophical journals solely because of the language in which is written or solely because of the publication channel, it is also important that authors reflect on the full scope of their contributions, ensuring that publication channels are found that maximise visibility, peer exposure and the potential for continuing peer dialogue. Some of the submitted works indicate that this is not always the case and that some of the works published only in Norwegian, only in regional journals, or only in non-philosophical journals have the potential to reach a wider audience of peers.

### *Examen Philosophicum*

The existence of *Examen Philosophicum* (ex.phil.) creates a unique situation in Norway, which is one factor behind the relative extensive scope of philosophical research in Norway. Ex.phil. figured prominently in both the self-evaluations and the meetings with departments and we want to convey the main observations that were made and to address some of the challenges raised by this course.

Firstly, the teaching load resulting from ex.phil., gives rise to a special recruitment situation for Norwegian philosophy. At some universities, the course is organised as a first semester course, which results in a much higher teaching load for the philosophy departments in the autumn than in the spring. This problem is sometimes solved by employing extra ex.phil. teachers for the autumn only while leaving them unemployed during the spring. This cannot be seen as decent employment conditions, and it obviously gives rise to great frustrations.

Furthermore, due to the high teaching load related to ex.phil., many ex.phil. teachers are hired in teaching positions with no opportunity or only limited opportunities for research. Nevertheless, several of these employees do produce research, and many struggle to

qualify for a permanent position. In some cases, differences between research opportunities create tensions.

There may be no easy solutions to these problems since it would be difficult to maintain ex.phil.-teaching intensity without lecturer positions. However, stable employment and clear and transparent policies with respect to career opportunities may help to minimise frustrations and tensions. At the same time, it should be noted that it is an essential characteristic of university education that it is research-based, and this needs to be incorporated in the setup for ex.phil. teaching.

Activities related to ex.phil. obviously have a strong link to activities in related fields such as philosophy of science, epistemology and argumentation theory. One of the effects of the existence of ex.phil. is a high production of monographs on epistemology, philosophy of science and argumentation intended solely or partially for the ex.phil. courses. The monographs differ in their conception of their audience. While some are written as introductory textbooks clearly targeting young students in particular, others also aim to convey original results that may be aimed more at philosophical peers. Many of the monographs contain reflections on didactical issues to explain the specific structure of the book, the selection of themes etc. Given the importance of ex.phil. to Norwegian philosophy, there may be a not fully exploited potential for research in and peer discussion of didactical issues relating to this particular kind of philosophy education.

## **4 Scope and quality of the research**

This chapter presents assessments based on the reading of submitted publications and publication lists (in total 290 publications from 102 scholars). All panel members participated in the review of the publications. Each of the publications was reviewed by at least two panel members, and the review of each sub-field was co-written by two panel members and discussed at the panel meetings. It should be noted, however, that the reviews are written by different people, implying somewhat different styles and emphases across reviews, and that assessments are not fully comparable between sub-fields. For overall assessments across sub-fields, the text in the summary in Section 4.4, should be consulted.

### **4.1 Defining disciplines, sub-fields and major thematic areas in Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas**

To simplify the discussion of the submitted philosophy works, we have categorised them as belonging to various familiar sub-fields (Aesthetics, Ethics, History of Philosophy, Logic and so on). History of ideas is reviewed as one discipline, see Section 4.2 for definition and scope.

The task of constructing a classificatory scheme raises many questions. How fine-grained should it be? How well should it fit the researchers' own terminologies and conceptions? Any classification is bound to be problematic in various ways. What we want to stress, however, is that our grounds for the classification are entirely pragmatic. It does not rest upon any substantive or controversial views about the nature of philosophy or about what topics philosophers should address. We fully acknowledge that there may have been alternative ways of dividing up the philosophical field and that they could perhaps have served just as well. We also acknowledge that there may be cases where a text is classified as belonging to a certain sub-field even if the author would have classified it differently, and cases where the reasons for placing a text in one sub-field rather than another may be challenged for other reasons. However, when coming across such cases, we have tried to minimise the damage by noting the difficulties and by mentioning the alternative ways of placing the works concerned. But we also want to emphasise that we do not think that our choice of classificatory scheme has had any serious implications for our general conclusions and proposals.

### **4.2 Review of Norwegian history of ideas**

The discipline of history of ideas studies the development of ideas articulated in philosophy, science, art and literature in a historical and contextual perspective. Research



is based on two primary components, history and philosophy, together with the history of science as broadly understood.

There is little overarching, easily manageable classification of the history of ideas except for a chronological one, extending from the classical, medieval and modern to the contemporary period. In principle, the discipline of history of ideas is very wide-ranging, both in terms of depth of historical knowledge and in terms of the breadth of its themes.

All the submitted publications in the history of ideas are from the Oslo unit. The reviewed research is clearly historical in its orientation, although some research is also oriented towards philosophy and to a certain extent history of science. Many of the publications are focused on the work of individual authors, although the context of history of ideas is, without exception, important in these publications as well.

As mentioned in Section 3.1.4, the research covers the classical period, the medieval period, the Renaissance and the modern period, as well as aspects of the contemporary period. A few publications reflect on methodological problems. Norwegian cultural history is covered with respect to the history of schools (which also addresses the Danish context). Norwegian history of prisons and of criminology is also covered, as is the Enlightenment — primarily, though not exclusively, in the Danish-Norwegian and French versions. In addition, there are a number of contributions to current debates in Norway, some addressing contemporary issues while others have a more historical focus. The range of issues is quite broad.

The history of natural science and the history of analytical philosophy are not represented in this research, and the history of political ideas is only rather narrowly discussed. Anglo-American philosophy and the history of ideas are only addressed in a peripheral manner. The history of aesthetics is only addressed in relation to particular issues, primarily dealing with the contemporary period. Noting these absences in the research areas of the section does not imply criticism. No history of ideas milieu could cover all the possible fields, given the enormous range of the discipline. The vastness of this field is due not only to its broad historical scope from the classical period to the present (primarily in reference to the West), but also to the complexities of the fusion between philosophy, historiography, and history of science.

Individual philosophers such as Machiavelli, Hegel, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche and Foucault are dealt with thoroughly or very thoroughly, and all have been skilfully placed in the context of history of ideas. A number of other philosophers have also been addressed in relation to the studies of historical periods. Some of these publications would be more properly characterised as philosophical work than work in the history of ideas.

The works included for evaluation are generally of a high scholarly level, and several of them are on an international level. The texts are also written in a very clear and accessible manner. It is difficult to point to any problems with the reviewed research.

However, only a small proportion of the publications are in international languages. At the same time, however, it should be noted that researchers in the history of ideas play a central role in reflecting on issues of national concern. Since the work in some cases has such a clearly Norwegian focus, one must expect the professional audience to be Norwegian, and Norwegian is the obvious language of publication. In other cases, the work is of an international comparative nature, and dissemination to a broader international public would be desirable. In these cases, access to translation or language revision could make a significant contribution to the international influence of Norwegian research.

Furthermore, it should be noted that individual researchers have played a central role in the compilation of major Norwegian survey works and encyclopaedic works intended to introduce international thinkers and traditions to a Norwegian context. This is obviously an important activity within the history of ideas, even though this it is not fully recognised in the Norwegian model for performance-based budgeting.

## **4.3 Review of Norwegian philosophy**

### **4.3.1 Aesthetics**

Philosophical aesthetics can be broadly described as the study of the beautiful and, to a lesser extent, its opposite, the ugly. It can include general or theoretical studies of the arts and related types of experiences, such as the nature of a work of art and its interpretation.

Some twenty of the submitted works belong to aesthetics. Broadly understood, philosophical aesthetics is represented in all of the departments of philosophy in Norway. However, there appears to be little or no collaboration on research in aesthetics amongst the departments.

The various departments follow different traditions of research in aesthetics. At the University of Trondheim, researchers are primarily oriented towards the Continental/German tradition, while researchers in Bergen are inspired by analytical philosophy and the work of Wittgenstein in particular. At the University of Tromsø, research in aesthetics borders on work on moral philosophy and philosophy of life. At the University of Oslo, work in aesthetics is partly inspired by Continental philosophy, and is partly historically oriented.

In all cases, the work relates to international debates in aesthetics, while there is virtually no work addressing the history of aesthetics in Norway. The latter only appears when researchers address aesthetics in relation to moral philosophy or philosophy of life, as in discussions of aesthetic existence. Topics addressed include questions regarding the

relationship between philosophy and literature, including issues of moral education, the nature of aesthetic experience, the role of the body in aesthetic encounter, the role of the senses in aesthetics — including the role of the proximal senses, which are not typically included in aesthetic analyses, as well as the study of language and metaphor.

In general, the level of research is competent, and more than half is of a high international standard. In a few cases, researchers collaborate with networks at institutions outside Norway. In virtually all of the work, researchers bring their individual perspectives to bear on the topic, and in many cases the work is quite original. Research in this area is published in Norwegian, English and German. Half the publications are in international languages.

#### **4.3.2 Epistemology**

The concept of knowledge, the nature of knowledge and distinctions between different kinds of knowledge are some of the basic questions in epistemology. Much research is concerned with sources of knowledge and the limits of knowledge; the debate about scepticism falls under the latter theme. There is also an ongoing debate of a more methodological nature concerning the status of the field of epistemology itself. The field overlaps in many areas with philosophy of science.

We have classified about a dozen of the submitted works as falling under the sub-field of epistemology. They are accounted for by fewer than ten scholars at the departments of philosophy at NTNU and the Universities of Bergen and Oslo. The themes of the submitted works deal with the whole spectrum of general themes mentioned above.

Several works by philosophers at NTNU and the University of Bergen devote special attention to different kinds of knowledge. It is noted that the philosophical tradition has mostly focused on propositional knowledge or knowledge of facts, also called knowledge *that*, and that practical knowledge or knowledge *how* has been much neglected. It is pointed out that even professional and scientific knowledge consists to a large extent of practical knowledge that has not been articulated explicitly and, in many important cases, must in principle remain implicit or tacit. Although this is not an entirely original point, Norwegian philosophy is here helping to call attention to an important distinction in epistemology.

Another general theme that appears in several submitted works concerns different sources of knowledge. Perceptual knowledge and experience are thoroughly discussed in works by philosophers at the Universities of Bergen and Oslo. Abduction, or reasoning to the best explanation, which is another important source of knowledge in many fields, is also thoroughly discussed in several works.

The debate on methodological issues is represented in the form of advocacy of a naturalised epistemology, which sees epistemology as being in line with other empirical investigations.

There is thus a respectable amount of competent research in epistemology at the three philosophy departments in question, and it can be seen from the CVs and the lists of publications that most of the treated topics are well entrenched in their local environment. Most of the works mentioned here are in English and contribute to the international discussion within the field.

### **4.3.3 Ethics**

Ethics, or moral philosophy, is the field devoted to questions concerning how actions, decisions, persons, institutions and states of affairs are to be evaluated from a moral point of view. For example, we may wonder whether a certain line of action is morally right or obligatory and, if so, why, or which moral requirements persons are subject to, or whether a certain state of affairs is good or morally desirable, or what it takes for a political institution to be just, and so on. Ethics is concerned both with trying to answer these questions and with determining their nature.

There are different ways to approach ethical questions. One is to try to answer them in a very general way, for example by articulating theories about what *makes* an action right, just etc. This is the aim of normative theory. In applied ethics, which is another sub-field, the aim is rather to answer, or shed light on, particular and concrete moral issues (Should we impose restrictions on stem cell research? Should we allow euthanasia?), perhaps by trying to apply the theories that have emerged within normative theory. Another approach to ethical questions is to determine what *kind* of questions they are. What is involved in answering them? Do they allow for true or false answers? Can those answers be objectively true, and, if so, in what sense of “objectively”? Such questions are addressed within the sub-field known as “meta-ethics”. Sometimes ethics is also said to include the study of the ethical thought of major figures in the philosophical tradition (Aristotle, Kant and so on). There is therefore some overlapping between ethics and history of philosophy.

Given our classification, fifty or so of the texts that have been submitted to the Research Council belong to ethics. The scholars responsible for those texts come from all the philosophy departments that are included in the evaluation (Bergen, Oslo, Tromsø and Trondheim), and the texts include contributions to all of the above-mentioned sub-fields. More than half of them, however, belong to applied ethics, and only a few (less than ten) are devoted to meta-ethics (the rest belong to normative theory, broadly construed). Most of the texts are in English. A few are written in other foreign languages (German and Italian) and the remaining ones (twenty-two) are in Norwegian. The texts include monographs (including doctoral dissertations), book chapters, book reviews, discussions, seminar reports and journal articles. Some of the texts (roughly ten per cent) are

unpublished. Relatively few of the texts are published in international journals with peer review, and a very small number (less than five) are published in the most highly ranked ones.

The texts devoted to applied ethics cover a wide range of issues, from more traditional topics, such as euthanasia and animal ethics, to somewhat less discussed ones, such as nanotechnology and military ethics. As one might expect, the quality of the works also varies, but the submitted texts do include a number of competent, original and well-argued contributions that have had a significant impact on both the international and the national debate. All in all, applied ethics appears to be a lively field of research in Norwegian philosophy. A possible explanation is that it seems relatively easy to get funding for such projects, perhaps as a result of a general interest in the issues in society at large.

Meta-ethics, by contrast, appears to be a relatively underdeveloped area, at least judging by the fact that only a few of the submitted texts belong to that category. This is rather surprising. Meta-ethical questions receive a lot of attention internationally in contemporary moral philosophy. Moreover, much work is done in Norway on issues in philosophy of mind, metaphysics, philosophy of language and epistemology. Given the overlap between these disciplines and meta-ethics, there should be more room for interesting and productive collaborations between researchers working in those fields and moral philosophers.

As for normative theory, some of the works (including some of those that we deem to be of the highest academic quality) address topics that, from the point of view of contemporary analytic moral philosophy, are relatively mainstream, such as issues pertaining to the understanding and assessment of consequentialism, Kantianism and so forth. However, there are also interesting works belonging to other traditions and using different methodological approaches, approaches that are sceptical of the aim of formulating general ethical theories and that offer alternative ways of exploring ethical issues, concepts and considerations.

Given the impressive number of submitted texts belonging to ethics, and given the diversity regarding topics, methodology and so on, it is difficult to make a general assessment of the standing and quality of the research done in Norway during the relevant period. Our verdict must therefore be somewhat mixed. Certainly, the impact of some of the submitted texts on the field has been quite limited. Other works, however, are highly valuable contributions that have had a significant impact. In view of the amount of energy invested in the field, one might perhaps have hoped for a greater fall-out in terms of international publications. But many researchers have chosen other channels for the dissemination of their research findings and have thereby, in some cases, been able to have an influence in more local contexts.

#### **4.3.4 Gender studies**

Gender studies in the field of philosophy, typically described as feminist philosophy in the international arena, encompass a broad range of research that spans work in aesthetics, epistemology, ethics, history of philosophy, phenomenology, philosophy of science and political philosophy. As such, it is particularly difficult to circumscribe what belongs to a sub-field of “gender studies” and what belongs to other sub-fields such as history of philosophy or phenomenology. Feminist philosophers also debate whether there are primarily methodological or strategic reasons for characterising work in gender studies as a distinct body of research. Feminist philosophers focus on the implications of sexed and gendered bodies for philosophical questions about, for example, political philosophy and ethics — such as the nature and role of freedom, equality, and morality; about ontology — such as the implications of sameness and difference; about phenomenology — such as the spatiality of sexed bodies; about epistemology — such as the role of value, interest, and identity in knowledge.

For pragmatic reasons, the committee has grouped half a dozen publications in the sub-field of gender studies. However, there are other publications that have been classified by the committee under aesthetics, history of philosophy, phenomenology and political philosophy that could equally well have been included here. So, although this sub-field is still quite small in Norway and involves only a handful of researchers, it is nonetheless more substantial than it would appear if we only consider the few researchers grouped here.

The work carried out by these researchers focuses on key figures in the history of philosophy, particularly Plato and Kant, in order to interpret central aspects of their philosophies in light of questions about otherness, difference and the sexed body, and in order to consider the implications of these questions for fundamental questions about ontology, language and ethics. A couple of the researchers draw on the work of 20th century feminist theorists in philosophy, psychology and psychoanalysis to interpret canonical philosophical texts, while others contribute to national political debates about topics such as the pension system in Norway.

Overall, it can be observed that the quality of the published works is good, and that these texts primarily serve to introduce international debates to the national context. Given that there is also an interdisciplinary environment for gender studies in Norway, it can be surmised that there are good possibilities for growth in this area in philosophy as well.

#### **4.3.5 History of philosophy**

In philosophy as distinct from the sciences, the classics play a considerable role in understanding what the discipline is, and the history of philosophy is consequently part of the teaching and research at most departments of philosophy worldwide. As a philosophical discipline, the history of philosophy combines historical scholarship with

philosophical interest in the arguments of past thinkers. The attention paid to the philosophers' argumentation distinguishes the history of philosophy from intellectual history, although the distinction between these disciplines is not sharp.

The history of philosophy is a strong sub-field of philosophy in Norway. The departments in Oslo and Bergen have several qualified senior and junior researchers specialised in the history of philosophy, and some research in this area is also conducted at the departments in Trondheim and Tromsø. In addition to specialised studies, historical themes are also discussed in general introductions to philosophy. Studies of the history of philosophy have two central focuses: ancient philosophy and Kantian philosophy.

The study of ancient philosophy is the most productive branch of research on the history of philosophy. There are Norwegian commentaries and introductions to ancient philosophical works, three monographs, some thirty scholarly articles and several dictionary entries. The centres for the study of ancient philosophy are Oslo and Bergen. Most publications come from Oslo and the majority of them consist of studies in Plato and Plotinus's Neoplatonic philosophy; in addition, there are some works on Aristotle, Stoicism and the thought of church fathers. The most popular themes are ethics and the philosophy of cognition. The ancient philosophy group at Oslo has created international cooperative projects as well as a supportive local research environment. It has been active in "The Oslo Happiness Project", which brings together scholars from Classics and Ancient Philosophy. The works on ancient philosophy from Bergen deal with Plato and, to a lesser extent, with Aristotle. The ancient philosophy group in Bergen has been active internationally in projects on feminist philosophy and philosophy as literature. These orientations mean it has a research profile that differs somewhat from that in Oslo.

Apart from introductions, commentaries and some other exceptions, the studies on ancient philosophy are published in English. The majority of the works are of good scholarly and philosophical quality. Half of the works submitted for evaluation are of very good or, occasionally, outstanding scientific quality; they are mostly published in highly ranked international journals or books.

The liveliness of Kantian studies is shown by more than twenty research articles, dictionary entries and two monographic works. There is also a recent Norwegian translation of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*. While most of the research works come from the University of Oslo, several Kantian studies are also conducted in Bergen and some in Trondheim and Tromsø. In addition, there are some studies on Kant's philosophy that have not been submitted as well as studies that are not included in the publication lists of these universities. Kantian studies cover central parts of Kant's theoretical and practical philosophy, such as the theories of consciousness, cognition, science, ethics, aesthetics, law and religion. The themes dealt with by more than one researcher include Kant's theory of perception, consciousness, knowledge, scientific methodology, ethics and aesthetics.

Most publications on Kantian philosophy are in English, some in German, and some in Norwegian. Apart from some less ambitious works, the publications show good scholarship and contribute to international interpretative and philosophical discussions. One third of the works submitted for evaluation are of very good international quality, two or three of them are even outstanding. The works of this group are mainly published in highly ranked international journals or books.

Kierkegaard studies in Oslo and Bergen form a minor concentration of historical research. Even though the scholars in this area are less numerous than in ancient philosophy or Kantian studies, they have been active in publishing in both English and Norwegian, continuing the internationally known tradition of Norwegian Kierkegaard research, which also includes works by theologians and philologists. Apart from the works on these themes and some valuable works on the moral philosophy of Adam Smith, there are short individual papers or surveys outside the main areas, mostly in Norwegian and with modest research results.

It is surprising that there is hardly any research on the history of philosophy between ancient philosophy and the late eighteenth century, nothing on medieval philosophy or Renaissance philosophy, and very little on the philosophy of the modern period before Smith and Kant. Concentrating on themes that are associated with a long-standing research tradition in Norway has the positive effect of contributing to a good research environment. Even though works of very good scientific quality and international relevance are numerous in the main areas, the absence of research in medieval and early modern philosophy is a shortcoming of the research culture in the history of philosophy and may compromise its international competitiveness. Broader historical research might also help to identify new and original research questions, also in the traditionally strong areas.

#### **4.3.6 Logic**

Traditionally, logic belongs to the core of a philosophical education, and it has been a vigorous field of research from the end of the 19th century, today attracting attention not only from philosophy but also from mathematics, computer science and linguistics. It has its roots in the study of valid deductive inferences — following common usage, we are assigning the study of defeasible reasoning, such as induction or abduction, to epistemology or philosophy of science — and branches off in a number of different directions. Most research in logic is tied to language in some way, and there is therefore a certain overlap between logic and the philosophy of language. Philosophical logic is sometimes used as a common name for the logic of terms that are seen as being of special philosophical interest, such as modal terms, expressing necessity or possibility. Mathematical logic is used more ambiguously either to denote the logic of mathematical languages or logic studied by mathematical methods, seen as a branch of mathematics. (The terminology is somewhat bewildering, however, since philosophical logic is often studied by deductive or mathematical methods, and mathematical logic may primarily be



of philosophical interest with a bearing on the philosophy of mathematics, naturally counted as a sub-field linked to logic.)

Little of what is going on internationally in logic within philosophy takes place or is reflected in Norway. Of all the submitted works, less than a handful, all of them by scholars at the University of Oslo, have been classified here as falling under the heading of logic. There are a few other works by other scholars that could be conceived as belonging to this field, but we have classified them as falling under other sub-fields (such as philosophy of language or Wittgenstein studies). As far as can be judged from the publication lists, no other works in logic were produced during the period in question. Research in logic thus seems to be essentially absent from all the philosophy departments in Norway except the department at the University of Oslo.

The few works in logic submitted by Oslo philosophers are thematically quite scattered, belonging to philosophical logic and philosophy of logic and mathematics, sometimes bordering on philosophy of language. The works are of a high standard and make contributions to the field. They are written in English, but are not always published or were published at a very late stage, which explains why their impact on the field is rather limited. One must conclude that logic is not an important field of philosophical research in Norway at present.

#### **4.3.7 Metaphysics and the philosophy of mind**

Metaphysics is here understood in the traditional sense as the field of philosophy devoted to ontological problems concerning existence, different forms of existence and the most fundamental categories and concepts used to categorise and describe what exists, such as the physical, the mental, space, time and cause. The status of metaphysics and the extent to which metaphysics is possible have been much discussed. In contemporary philosophy, the discussion often concerns the relationship between metaphysics and science, sometimes circling around various naturalistic positions. Philosophy of religion, often counted as a separate sub-field, but little cultivated in Norway, is here also assigned to metaphysics.

One main metaphysical issue is the mind-body problem, the question of how the relationship between the mental and the physical is to be understood: should we understand them as belonging to two distinct realms, or is all that exists of the same nature at bottom, the mental and the physical being two aspects of a uniform nature, one of which is even reducible to the other? There is renewed international interest in these questions, sometimes triggered by developments in neurophysiology and computer science. They are often intrinsically linked to problems concerning mental causation and free will. The study of such questions is often considered to constitute its own sub-field, the philosophy of mind. Less ontological themes in philosophical psychology, concerning such things as perception, emotions, attitudes and the will, are also assigned to that field.

In this report, we have found it convenient to collect all the topics mentioned above under one heading, metaphysics and the philosophy of mind. However, there are several submitted works on Kant, Kierkegaard and Heidegger dealing with metaphysical issues that are not included here but are considered in the review of the sub-field of history of philosophy or phenomenology and existential philosophy.

Research in the area of metaphysics and philosophy of mind is carried out at all the four universities, and, in the area of philosophy of mind in particular, substantial works have been submitted to the Research Council from all the philosophy departments. Altogether there are around 25 submitted works that we have classified as belonging to the area, and the majority of them have a bearing on the philosophy of mind. More than ten philosophers devote a large part of their research to this branch. However, at NTNU and at the Universities of Bergen and Tromsø, it is only individual scholars who work on philosophy of mind, while at the University of Oslo there is a large group of philosophers who do so, several of whom are attached to the Centre for Study of Mind in Nature.

Among the topics addressed in the philosophy of mind, one finds some that can be characterised as philosophical psychology, such as the logic of desires, the content of perception and the nature of emotions, which have all been the subject of substantial research. Metaphysical questions involving philosophy of mind have received even greater attention. There are several good studies of ontological aspects of mind and body and of the metaphysics of mental causation that clarify some vexed issues very well and offer some original points of view.

There are about ten submitted works in metaphysics with no particular bearing on philosophy of mind. Of the various topics addressed, two examples can be mentioned: contemporary criticism of metaphysics and the realism debate, i.e. the opposition between realism and various forms of anti-realism, which is much discussed in contemporary metaphysics.

Metaphysics and philosophy of mind is thus an active area of research for Norwegian philosophy. The works that have been submitted are of varying quality, but, as should be clear from what has already been said, some of them contribute significantly to the area. Unfortunately, their impact on the field has been rather limited so far, in most cases probably because of their form of publication or lack of publication.

#### **4.3.8 Phenomenology and existential philosophy**

The fields of phenomenology and existential philosophy are both historical and thematic. The historical sources include texts by some of the major thinkers in 19th and 20th century European philosophy, such as Hegel, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Beauvoir and Gadamer. Phenomenology studies human experience of phenomena and can be understood as systematic reflection on the structures of conscious embodied experience. Phenomenology addresses topics such as consciousness,

intentionality, memory, embodied action and interpretation, to name a few. Existential philosophy strives to develop categories to think about human existence, and is to a large extent rooted in phenomenological methods. Existentialist thinkers reflect on how a self makes herself/himself in a situation, understand freedom as the origin of values, and focus on topics such as the nature of freedom, commitment, alienation, boredom and dread.

In the area of phenomenology and existential philosophy, as in some of the other sub-fields, the division of the sub-field is a pragmatic division on the part of the evaluation committee. In this area, the committee has grouped work in phenomenology, existential philosophy and hermeneutics under one heading. However, work in this area also overlaps with other areas, including aesthetics, ethics, gender studies, history of philosophy and political philosophy.

The committee has grouped less than 20 works published in this period in this sub-field, primarily from researchers in Oslo and Bergen. Submitted works include books, anthologies and journal articles. There is strong use of international languages for publication in this area, especially English, with about one-third of the works published in Norwegian.

Researchers discuss basic questions, such as the meaning and methods of reflection of phenomenology, existential philosophy, existential ontology and hermeneutics. Researchers draw on these methods to analyse the spatiality and temporality of embodied subjectivities and their worlds, with discussions of memory, intentionality and identity, and in some cases of gendered bodies. Researchers also draw on existential analysis to probe fundamental attitudes, emotions and possibilities in human existence, including discussion of topics such as angst, joy, boredom and freedom. Some of the works take a more applied direction in order to engage philosophy with other fields and draw on existential philosophy to reflect on topics such as psychotherapy and child-rearing. And some of the works situate the methods of analysis, such as in hermeneutics, within fundamental debates about the history of philosophy, its self-understanding and the implications for the concept of truth.

Some of these works are directed more at a public than a professional audience, pointing to the important role of philosophy in the public sphere in Norway, and some of the works are primarily of pedagogical value, with the emphasis on explication of texts. A handful of the texts published for an international peer audience make a very good contribution to international debates.

#### **4.3.9 Philosophy of education**

The field of philosophy of education covers a very broad range of issues. To give a few examples, this field encompasses philosophical reflection on human development and on the relationship between individual and society; reflection on the values and norms implicit in educational and political institutions as well as their import for societal reproduction and

change; study of the genesis and methodologies of educational institutions as well as reflections on pedagogical practices.

A handful of Norwegian philosophers work in this area, and the committee has classified less than ten texts in this sub-field. Most of these texts are in Norwegian, with only a couple of the texts being published in English. The work in this sub-field is quite varied. It ranges from more historically-oriented work on the development of national teacher education and on the relationship between religion, language, education and national identity, to reflection on bodily space and interpersonal dialogue in learning, to reflection on the presuppositions, relations and methods of pedagogy, and to an evaluation of educational research. The submitted works include contributions to international handbooks.

Some of these works have specific practical aims for teaching or evaluation purposes and have a specific national focus. A couple of the texts make a good contribution to the field, though their impact is limited since they are published in Norwegian.

#### **4.3.10 Philosophy of language**

One speaks of a linguistic turn of philosophy in the 20th century due to the tendency to formulate philosophical problems in terms of meaning and to see the philosophy of language as the most basic branch of philosophy. The increased importance of concepts such as meaning and interpretation is not a phenomenon restricted to analytical philosophy. It holds for many continental directions as well. However, branches such as hermeneutics are considered in this report under different headings, and studies closely related to Wittgenstein's philosophy will be considered under a special heading, although his philosophy had a major impact on the development of analytical philosophy of language.

The very concept of meaning and what it is to know the meaning of a linguistic expression, or, in other words, what it is to understand an expression or to interpret it correctly, are major issues within the philosophy of language, or, more particularly, within one of its branches often called theory of meaning. Studies in the philosophy of language may take many forms, however: while some are closely connected with fundamental questions in epistemology, metaphysics and logic, others are closer to theoretical questions in linguistics. Semantics, pragmatics and the theory of speech acts are sometimes spoken of as branches of philosophy of language, but also stand for competing approaches to basic issues within the field.

Some twenty of the submitted works have been classified as philosophy of language. The majority of them are written by scholars at the University of Oslo, almost all attached to the Centre for the Study of Mind in Nature (although one of them has now left the University of Oslo). The remainder are by scholars at the Universities of Bergen and Tromsø, and are for the most part in the form of short articles, notes or reviews, while most of the works submitted by the group at the University of Oslo are quite substantial,

including books and (unpublished) doctoral dissertations. It thus seems that research in philosophy of language has mainly been carried out by scholars at the philosophy department at the University of Oslo in the period in question, which is not to say that competence in the field is lacking at other departments. It also appears from the CVs and the publication lists that several of the members of the Oslo group are actively engaged in various research projects within the field.

Among the submitted works from the Oslo group, there are some that focus on meaning, in particular on the question of the extent to which meaning is determined by pragmatic aspects, as well as some concerned with questions relating to other fundamental philosophical issues such as the concept of truth, the normative status of propositional attitudes and rationality.

As a whole, the works are of good standard and constitute a contribution to the field. Some of them have even had a great impact on current international discussions in the field.

Philosophy of language is thus a sub-field that has been the object of quite a lot of research at the University of Oslo on a level that has received international attention. It should be noted, however, that this is to a large extent due to recent importations to the Centre for the Study of Mind in Nature, and that much of the research in the sub-field that has been evaluated here has not been carried out in Norway but at philosophy departments abroad. On the other hand, although some of the researchers have now left Norway, it seems likely that philosophy of language will remain a field of active research at the Oslo department in the near future.

#### **4.3.11 Philosophy of science**

Philosophy of science is concerned with the foundations, methods and development of science. Philosophy of science has close ties to history of science and to science studies; an interdisciplinary field that combines social, historical and philosophical studies of science. Works included in the evaluation of this sub-field primarily concern philosophy of the natural sciences. Around a dozen of the submitted works have been identified in this category.

Philosophy of science is present as a sub-field at all four universities. However, the number of scholars within the sub-field is small, and the submitted works identified as philosophy of science have been produced by about a dozen authors. At the University of Oslo, a number of collaborating researchers are working on philosophy and history of science. At NTNU, the interdisciplinary *Vitenskapsteoretisk Forum* runs a number of workshops and a seminar series to support teaching and research in philosophy of science and science studies, broadly conceived.

As indicated in Chapter 2 of this report, it should be noted that work on philosophy of science is also carried out outside the departments included in the evaluation, especially at

the Centre for the Study of the Sciences and the Humanities (*Senter for Vitenskapsteori*) at the University of Bergen and the Centre for technology, innovation and culture (*Senter for studier av teknologi, innovasjon og kultur*) at the University of Oslo. Their activities are not covered by this evaluation.

Given the small number of researchers in the field, most of whom work individually and not exclusively within philosophy of science, the focus is obviously scattered. Several topics are closely related to (or included in) other sub-fields, such as epistemology, metaphysics, philosophy of language, philosophy of mind and (research) ethics.

The activity within general philosophy of science addresses a number of different topics, including causality, reductionism, explanation, realism and measurement. At UiO, there is a focus on philosophy of biology (including reductionism, causation, modelling and simulation), which has been a rapidly growing field within the philosophy of science during the last decades.

Research in the history of science and science studies includes analyses of scientific and technological development and change, the relationship between science and society, the relationship between internal and external factors in the development of science, and historical work on early modern science and on 20<sup>th</sup> century science.

A special topic is the production of ex.phil.-related monographs that broadly cover the philosophy of science (including social sciences), epistemology, and logic and argumentation theory. However, these textbooks are not covered in the evaluation of this sub-field.

Production is sparse in the philosophy of science, and a substantial part of it consists of isolated contributions spread over different topics. Most publications are in English, and some have been printed in high-ranking journals. Some of the submitted publications are of a very high quality. Submitted publications in Norwegian concern Norwegian issues and engage in national debates. The most productive branch of research in the philosophy of science proper is the work on the philosophy of biology, including related discussions of causality and reductionism.

#### **4.3.12 Social and political philosophy**

The fields of social and political philosophy engage in philosophical reflection on both how we arrange our collective life and how we ought to arrange it. These fields reflect on political institutions, social and cultural practices, and economic systems. Whereas some of the work in these areas focuses on historical issues regarding the genesis of certain practices and ideals, many of the central issues in political philosophy are normative. They are concerned with how resources should be distributed, what is required for a government to be legitimate, what rights and freedoms should be protected, which duties citizens owe to a legitimate government, what is the role of public reason and so on. Therefore, there is

some overlap between the fields of political philosophy and ethics, and some of the work carried out in these fields addresses the relationship between the ethical and the political. However, in the course of trying to answer the normative questions, a wide range of other topics is addressed, including metaphysical, empirical, conceptual and epistemological ones.

Given our classification, twenty or so of the submitted texts belong to this field. The majority of the authors responsible for these texts belong to the departments in Trondheim and Tromsø and only a few are from Oslo and Bergen. Approximately half of the submitted texts are in Norwegian or one of the other Scandinavian languages. The rest are in English. They include journal articles, monographs, a doctoral dissertation, a review essay and contributions to anthologies. Only a couple of the texts are research articles published in international journals with peer review.

The set of topics covered by the submitted texts is quite diverse. Some of the works are commentaries on the writings of major figures, such as Kant, Mill, Rawls, Adorno and Habermas. Other texts explore central concepts such as autonomy, freedom, citizenship, public reason and sovereignty. Yet others address more specific questions, such as issues relating to globalisation and the concept of the nation state, the implications of migration for theories and practices of citizenship, and the role of new technologies in public reason and democracy. There are also a number of texts whose aims and content are such that it may seem problematic to classify them as belonging to political philosophy in the conventional sense but that nevertheless address social phenomena from a philosophical viewpoint (this is why we have chosen to include the broader notion of “social philosophy” in the title of this section). For example, some of the texts discuss issues such as the historical ideals of family and state and their role in the Scandinavian welfare state, and the impact of various features of modern societies, such as their means of production, on cultural and technological practices.

In our evaluation, the impact on the field of the relatively few texts that belong to this area is limited, which is partly why we conclude that political philosophy has not been a strong research field in Norwegian philosophy during the relevant period. However, we also want to stress that there are individual researchers who have made strong contributions.

#### **4.3.13 Wittgenstein studies**

Ludwig Wittgenstein's philosophical writings have greatly influenced the development of analytical philosophy during parts of the 20th century. His ideas have also stimulated a kind of critique of contemporary culture and have also had a considerable impact outside philosophy. Furthermore, Wittgenstein had highly controversial and much debated opinions on the method and nature of philosophy. He was critical of systematic philosophy, and his own writings often took the form of an inner dialogue. However, the "writings" of Wittgenstein have a somewhat peculiar form also for another reason. During his lifetime, only one work was published and one was prepared for publication, while all

the rest of his very extensive writings were left as a *Nachlass*, not ready for publication; parts of it have later been put together in posthumously published books. Not surprisingly there have been many conflicting interpretations of Wittgenstein's philosophy and there is an extensive secondary literature.

We have gathered works submitted to the Research Council that deal with the interpretation of Wittgenstein's philosophy under the special heading "Wittgenstein studies". There are more than ten submitted works that have been classified as belonging to this sub-field. Almost all of them are by philosophers at the University of Bergen, and the interpretation of Wittgenstein's philosophy thus involves quite a large group of more than five persons at that university.

It should be mentioned that the University of Bergen has rendered a great service to the study of Wittgenstein's philosophy by making the entire Wittgenstein *Nachlass* publicly accessible in electronic form, the so-called *Wittgenstein's Nachlass: The Bergen Electronic Edition*. The electronic edition has three components: a facsimile of every page of the philosophical writings that Wittgenstein left on his death and two transcriptions, one which faithfully reproduces all features of the material, and one which presents the text in a more normal, readable form. The principles followed in building up this electronic edition and the opportunities it opens up for critical electronic editing are described and discussed in some of the submitted works. Philosophers at the University of Bergen are also active in managing the publication series "Publications from the Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen" and in editing collections of articles on Wittgenstein's philosophy.

Besides the works just mentioned, the submitted works in this area are devoted to several different subjects, for instance the relationship between *Tractatus* and Wittgenstein's later works and Wittgenstein's views on various of topics such as language, culture, aesthetics and ethics. Most of the works mainly discuss how Wittgenstein's texts are to be interpreted, and a few of them also contain a critical assessment of some of Wittgenstein's writings. The works certainly contribute to the understanding of Wittgenstein's philosophy. All the works are in English, and most of them are published in international philosophical journals, in anthologies or as separate volumes. They participate in this way in contemporary international discussions of Wittgenstein's philosophy. In spite of this, it must be said that they do not seem to be at the international forefront of the interpretation and discussion of Wittgenstein's philosophy.

#### **4.4 Summary of main observations**

As is clear from the reviews above, there are submitted works of high quality in several areas. Furthermore, as has also been pointed out in the reviews, although there are less ambitious submitted works, most of the submitted works are competently written and show good scholarship. One striking and commendable fact is that many successful efforts have been made to communicate with a wider audience outside philosophy and even outside



academia. It is of concern to the committee that a rather small number of the submitted works are published in high-ranking journals or in books issued by well-known international publishers. The impact of the results of Norwegian research in philosophy on international debates is thereby rather limited.

History of philosophy and ethics have emerged above as the two quantitatively dominant sub-fields with respect to the number of submitted works, but this is a rather artificial result, created by the classification that we have used when describing the research. A less fine-grained division, in particular not distinguishing between the closely connected branches of what is traditionally counted as theoretical philosophy (epistemology, logic, metaphysics, philosophy of language and philosophy of science), would have resulted in three main areas — history of philosophy, practical philosophy (ethics, social and political philosophy, and philosophy of education), and theoretical philosophy — with almost the same number of submitted works, indicating that these three main areas have had roughly the same share of Norwegian research during the period in question. Wittgenstein studies could also be divided under these titles, in which case aesthetics, phenomenology and existential philosophy and gender studies would remain as small sub-fields.

A number of research fields deserve special attention. Within the history of philosophy, ancient philosophy and Kantian studies stand out as especially productive branches with a considerable number of works showing very good international quality, some works even being outstanding. Most of these works are published in books by well-known international publishers or in highly ranked international journals. Many of the studies of ancient philosophy deal with happiness and virtue and are related to the internationally active “Oslo happiness project”, which has brought together scholars from Classics and Ancient Philosophy. Other internationally significant research topics involve theoretical issues of Neoplatonic philosophy and Kant’s philosophy of knowledge, consciousness and beauty. Researchers in the history of philosophy have also published introductions and commentaries on historical texts and other philosophical works in Norwegian.

We also consider applied ethics to be a strong field. Researchers from all of the reviewed departments have done work in this area and their efforts have led to a large number of publications, including some that make significant contributions to international debates, in high-ranking journals.

Within theoretical philosophy, the strongest branches are philosophy of language, philosophy of mind and philosophy of biology (within philosophy of science). Some of the works in philosophy of language have had a significant impact on contemporary international discussions. It should be noted, however, that much of the research in this sub-field that has been evaluated here has not been carried out in Norway but at philosophy departments abroad. Several works in the philosophy of science and philosophy of mind, including studies on causality and ontological aspects of mind and body, are in-depth studies containing original ideas.

In this connection, we would also like to stress that many of the finest contributions stem from quite limited research contexts. These are cases where a small number of philosophers who share an interest in certain topics have formed a group that has then proved to be a fruitful context for research. In some of these cases, the work and collaboration have been formalised, perhaps as an effect of a successful joint application for a research grant, whereas, in other cases, the collaboration has remained more informal.

Although most central areas of philosophy are covered by Norwegian researchers during the period in question, we have identified a number of areas where there is remarkably little or almost no research, at least judging from the submitted works. One example is meta-ethics, another is logic. Of all the submitted works, less than a handful, all by scholars at the University of Oslo, have been classified here as falling under the heading of logic. It is also surprising that there is hardly any research on the history of philosophy between ancient philosophy and late eighteenth century, nothing on medieval philosophy or Renaissance philosophy, and very little on the philosophy of the modern period before Smith and Kant. Other areas that could be mentioned in this connection are non-Western philosophy, philosophy of the social sciences and philosophy of religion. Of course, while it is not reasonable to require Norwegian researchers to cover all philosophical disciplines, we see some of these areas as being so central that the lack of attention to them should be noted.

As for the separate evaluation of research in the history of ideas, we find that, from a comparative Scandinavian perspective, the reviewed research holds good quality and the productivity is very high. A relatively small number of the works in this area are published internationally. But this is due to the fact that a large proportion of the research is oriented towards Norwegian culture and is therefore primarily of interest to a Norwegian audience. This means that the low number of international publications may be of limited relevance to an evaluation of the research done in this field.

## 5 Conclusions and recommendations

Our task has been to review and evaluate the research carried out in the selected environments during the relevant period (2004-2008). We have not been instructed to also consider the quality of the teaching offered in these environments (at least besides the teaching given at the graduate level). However, the dual roles of an academic (being a researcher as well as a teacher) are obviously related in various ways. Therefore, some of our comments and recommendations also have implications for issues related to teaching. Below, we identify and describe what we see as the main problems and challenges facing Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas. We also make some suggestions about how these problems might be addressed.

### *Collaboration*

Challenges relating to collaboration have figured prominently, both in the self-evaluations and in the committee's meetings with department representatives. All departments have stated that, while their international collaboration was satisfactory, they would welcome more collaboration at the national level.

In reflecting on why national collaboration seems to present a special challenge for Norwegian philosophy, the committee has noted that clear prioritisation of what should be gained from national collaboration and international collaboration, respectively, may help to focus efforts on activities that have an immediate, positive outcome.

As noted in Section 3.3, one important focus point for increased national collaboration seems to be to provide critical mass for PhD training. Similarly, collaborations on activities such as workshops, invitations to guest lecturers etc. may enable small departments to benefit from activities that they would not be able to initiate themselves.

It is important to note here that there is a crucial difference between big units that do not suffer from "critical mass issues" and small units for which resources are a recurrent challenge. To ensure that Norwegian philosophy develops as strongly as possible, it is necessary that strong units shoulder their share of the responsibility for increased national collaboration and do not leave this task exclusively to those that have a need but not the resources.

Internal collaboration has likewise been a recurrent topic in self-evaluations and the committee's meetings with department representatives. On the one hand, there is a clear perception that increased internal collaboration promotes scholarly debate and thereby helps maintain a stimulating environment and a high quality of research, but, on the other hand, it is no easy task to develop the right forums that are seen as relevant and rewarding for all involved. In particular, the committee has noted that multidisciplinary settings that

have not developed from the bottom up face special challenges and that collaborations have to originate in genuinely shared intellectual interests.

In view of these problems, we recommend increased collaboration on PhD education as well as increased collaboration between big and small units to help small units reach critical mass for further activities. One possibility is to establish a system of national PhD courses. The idea is that each department offers one or two such courses every year and that these courses will be open to all Norwegian PhD students whose travel and accommodation costs will be covered by the home department. The committee also urges the individual units to continue developing their internal collaboration.

### *Dissemination*

Many Norwegian researchers in philosophy have been diligent in getting their results published. As we noted above, it is also commendable that so many have made efforts to communicate with a wider, non-philosophical audience. However, there is room for improvement regarding international publication, especially (but not exclusively) at the smaller departments. In particular, as we also pointed out above, it is noteworthy that so few articles are published in the most high-ranking international journals and other visible publications. An improvement along that dimension would obviously increase the chances of having an impact on international debates. By distinguishing between “level 1” and “level 2” journals, the Norwegian performance-based budgeting system (“Tellekant-systemet”) creates some incentive to publish internationally. However, since the level 2 category groups together journals that differ quite significantly in terms of status and significance, it does not favour publication in the best and most important channels. Perhaps this will provide motivation for a revision of the system. Another obstacle to improvement as regards international publication seems to be a lack of training in or experience of writing in English and other foreign languages.

To promote international publication, we recommend that funds be provided for translation and proof-reading and also to help researchers to improve their proficiency in English and other foreign languages (for example by giving them the opportunity to take courses in academic writing during their doctoral studies). We also recommend that the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions (UHR) takes the initiative to seriously re-evaluate the performance-based budgeting system (“Tellekantsystemet”) with the aim of creating clearer incentives to choose the most high-ranking avenues of publication, perhaps by setting up a committee. Another issue to address in such an evaluation is how to acknowledge the high number of publications that do not fit the current system, including textbooks and publications for a non-professional Norwegian audience.

### *Examen philosophicum*

Ex.phil. creates a unique situation and is an important asset for Norwegian philosophy, partly because it introduces all university students to philosophical ideas and methods, and

partly because it supports a much larger community of university employed philosophers than would otherwise be the case. However, the special character of the ex.phil.-related teaching load is an important challenge for the philosophy departments: uneven distribution of the teaching load over the academic year leads to unstable working conditions, and the huge amount of teaching at an introductory level has led to deviations from the standard requirement that university teaching be research-based.

The problems relating to ex.phil. have been observed to lead to tensions and frustrations in several departments, and it is the committee's impression that these challenges need to be reviewed in an effort to find viable solutions. A primary concern must be to ensure that ex.phil., as all other university education, is research-based, and that the potential for further refinement of this particular kind of philosophy teaching is fully developed. It must also be a priority to provide stable and transparent working conditions for ex.phil. teachers as well as a clear and transparent distribution of teaching and research among faculty members. The committee recommends that the RCN should help the universities to set up a committee with the task of reviewing ex.phil. activities, including examining the research basis of ex.phil. teaching, analysing how to develop the available potential for didactical reflection on this particular kind of philosophy education, analysing working conditions and career opportunities for ex.phil. teachers, and analysing how teaching and research is best divided between faculty members.

### *Mobility*

The negligible collaboration between the philosophical departments should be seen in relation to the low mobility between them — the two phenomena may causally influence each other, and, not least, exacerbate each other. The lack of mobility is especially striking as regards recruitment to the University of Oslo from the other three universities. As was seen in Section 3.2.1, a large proportion of the staff at the University of Oslo have a doctoral degree from abroad, but there is no one with a doctoral degree from the other Norwegian universities and hardly anyone with any other degree (Cand. philol., Mag.art. or Master) from another Norwegian university.

There is some mobility from the University of Oslo to the University of Tromsø and NTNU, but at the University of Bergen one again finds that the influx from the other universities is very low (see Table 3.2).

It is generally believed that the circulation of ideas is furthered by there being a certain circulation of people, and, for this and other reasons, mobility between academic institutions is generally seen to be a good thing. At the same time, however, there is a tendency at many institutions to favour one's own people when it comes to recruiting. In most countries, efforts have therefore been made to develop mechanisms that compensate for that tendency. Open advertisements for new positions and a system of external experts to evaluate candidates are among such mechanisms. It is obvious that they have been weakened in Norway by the system of personal promotion to full professor; there is no

longer a need to move to another university in order to advance to a higher position. Since the effects of this fairly new system have not yet culminated, one may expect the proportion of the philosophy staff at the smaller universities that come from the University of Oslo to decline even further.

Of course, the pattern of mobility of philosophers between the four universities must also be seen as a reflection of the lack of equality between the four philosophy environments. The chance of philosophers from the smaller universities winning a position at the University of Oslo is probably quite small. This imbalance is also discussed in other sections of our report.

The lack of mobility is a problem it is difficult to do anything about directly. One would expect that the situation would improve if there were greater equality between the departments, but the negative effects of the promotion system should also be considered. We do recommend, however, that the departments ensure that new positions are widely advertised, also in international forums. This is a measure that would also have other benefits.

### *Post-graduate training*

In the last decade and half, Norway, like the other Nordic countries, has been engaged in the process of professionalising training in philosophy and history of ideas. The results of this process have been uneven, with a great deal of variation within and between local environments. The situation for PhD students varies greatly, with some of them engaged in stimulating environments for discussion, while others are either isolated or caught in a school-like programme that is not conducive to independent reflection.

There is also great divergence in the nature and relevance of the courses that are mandatory for PhD students. In particular, students of the history of ideas in Oslo are required to participate in courses with students from musicology, theatre, aesthetics and art history that have little direct relevance to their field. Some students in philosophy programmes also find the PhD courses to be too general to be valuable for their own sub-field specialisation.

Not only are there variations in the local environments and the PhD courses, there is also considerable variation in the quality of the supervision, with some students receiving no face-to-face supervision.

Against this background, the committee has both specific and far-reaching recommendations. Firstly, we want to repeat our suggestion (the section on collaboration above) that it is important to establish a system of national PhD courses. Secondly, we recommend that students of the history of ideas in Oslo be offered a more appropriate programme of courses that are relevant to their field. Thirdly, we recognise the importance of developing international networks for individuals at this stage in their career, and hence the necessity of travel funds enabling PhD students to participate in international seminars

and conferences, or to spend research periods abroad. In particular, the financial crisis in the Humanities Faculty at the University of Bergen has put students in Bergen in an untenable position, and we recommend that travel funds should be made available to them through alternative channels if necessary. Fourthly, we urge departments to carry out an informal review of PhD supervision in order to ensure that students have adequate contact with supervisors.

Fifthly, we recommend that the standard period of PhD studies should be four years with one year of teaching instead of the current three years without teaching. This model has already been used with great success in some departments in Norway. It is important to give all doctoral candidates solid teaching experience at both BA and MA levels; many of them have experience at the ex.phil. level but not at higher levels. Furthermore, to sandwich the writing of the thesis and teaching is a way of letting the thesis work mature over a longer period. To choose a four-year programme should be optional for the doctoral candidate, but all of them should be offered this opportunity.

Sixthly, we think it is important to improve career options for those who have completed PhD and postdoc training. A great amount of resources are currently committed to this training, without comparable resources being available for follow-up positions. One possibility is to introduce a new category of position between postdoc and permanent position, which could lead to a permanent position.

#### *Research resource allocation*

Some questions are raised about the way in which resources for research are allocated. As we have noted several times above, a substantial grant has been awarded to the University of Oslo for the establishment of the CSMN. This grant gives a significant boost to the conditions for research in Oslo and will probably have positive implications for Norwegian philosophy in general. However, there are also problems.

Some worries concern the fact that the philosophical activities of the centre have yet to be well integrated in the department (see Section 3.1.3). Another worry is that the grant further emphasises the strikingly uneven distribution of research resources between the Oslo department and the other research environments in Norway. There is general frustration in the smaller departments about the difficulties of getting research grants, postdoc positions and the like. The representatives of these departments reported that, in spite of the fact that a significant amount of time and energy has been spent on applying for funds, the result has often been disappointing (to the extent that efforts in that direction seem pointless). The existence of a number of different research environments in a country — environments that can develop in slightly different directions, methodologically and topic-wise — has a certain value, not least because it gives prospective doctoral students more choice. We believe that, to achieve or promote such a many-sided end, one must address the unevenness in the distribution of research resources in some way.

The scheme that led to the establishment of the CSMN illustrates a general tendency in many countries: to concentrate research resources instead of spreading them over the whole research community. The probable source of inspiration is the way resources are allocated within the natural sciences. Whether this strategy will also prove efficient in the humanities is yet to be seen. However, in this connection, we would like to repeat the previous observation that some of the finest works from Norwegian philosophers during the relevant period stem from relatively limited research contexts. It would be unfortunate if the presently popular idea of concentrating resources makes it less likely that such groups and traditions will emerge.

In order to address the uneven distribution of research resources, and also the lack of collaboration between departments, we recommend that incentives be provided that can motivate researchers to become more active in forming cross-departmental networks that can provide a basis for joint applications for project-funding. On the basis of our observation about limited research contexts, we also wish to stress the importance of continued support for smaller projects.



## References

- Langfeldt, Liv and Antje Klitkou (2009), *Faglige og institusjonelle avgrensninger. Bakgrunnsdata til Norges forskningsråd for evaluering av fagene filosofi, rettsvitenskap, sosiologi, sosialantropologi og samfunnsgeografi*. Oslo, NIFU STEP rapport 1/2009.
- Norges forskningsråd (2009), *Rettsvitenskapelig forskning i Norge. En evaluering*. Oslo, Norges forskningsråd.
- Norges forskningsråd (2006), *Evaluering av norsk historiefaglig forskning. Bortenfor nasjonen i tid og rom: fortidens makt og fremtidens muligheter i norsk historieforskning*. Oslo, Norges forskningsråd.
- Schwach, Vera and Tor Borgar Hansen (2009), *Norwegian philosophy: Institutions, personnel and economic resources. Paper to the panel evaluating Norwegian philosophy*. Oslo, NIFU STEP, June 2009.

## Appendix 1 Terms of Reference

# Mandat for evaluering av filosofi- og idéhistoriefaglig forskning

## I Innledning

Divisjon for vitenskap i Norges forskningsråd har besluttet å evaluere et utvalg filosofi- og idéhistoriefaglige forskningsmiljøer i Norge.

### Formål

Evalueringen skal gi et bilde av kvaliteten på den filosofi- og idéhistoriefaglige forskningen som utføres i de utvalgte miljøene. Evalueringen skal bidra til læring og egenutvikling for fagmiljøene, og gi innsikt i styrke, svakhet og utfordringer for forskningen i filosofi og idéhistorie. Evalueringen skal være med på å identifisere forhold som bidrar til å fremme kvalitet. Evalueringen skal også utvide og styrke Forskningsrådets og forskningsmiljøenes kunnskapsgrunnlag.

Den endelige evalueringsrapporten skal være offentlig tilgjengelig. Brukerne vil være ledelsen og de ansatte ved det enkelte fagmiljø, fakultetene og ledelsen ved institusjonene, samt forskningspolitiske myndigheter. For å oppnå størst mulig læring fra evalueringen er det viktig at resultatene gjøres kjent, slik at de gruppene som måtte være interessert i forskningsevalueringen, får kjennskap til den.

Forskningsrådet vil ta initiativ til oppfølging av evalueringen så snart rapporten er ferdig og forelagt miljøene. Den viktigste oppfølgingen vil miljøene selv måtte ta ansvar for gjennom sitt arbeid med fagutvikling, rekruttering og forskeropplæring, forskningsledelse og forskningsorganisering.

Fra Forskningsrådets side vil evalueringssopplegget inngå i en langsiktig strategi for kvalitetssikring. Evalueringen vil gi viktige innspill til arbeidet med å utvikle gode forskningsmiljøer, og videreutvikle samarbeidet og arbeidsdelingen mellom Forskningsrådet og institusjonene. Evalueringen vil dessuten danne grunnlag for videre utvikling av evalueringssystemet.

### Organisering

Det nedsettes et evalueringsutvalg med internasjonal representasjon. Utvalgets oppgave er å gi en samlet vurdering av det nasjonale fagmiljøet i henhold til mandatet.

*Evalueringsperioden er de siste fem års produksjon og virksomhet, dvs. 2004 – 2008.*

Evalueringen skal finne sted i dialog med fagmiljøene. Evalueringsrapporten forelegges miljøene for kvalitetssikring av faktabeskrivelser før ferdigstilling. Deretter legger evalueringsutvalget rapporten fram for divisjonsstyret. Den endelige rapporten vil være offentlig tilgjengelig

Evalueringsutvalget vil få administrativ støtte fra Forskningsrådet, og det vil bli engasjert et faglig sekretariat fra NIFU STEP som skal bistå utvalget i dets arbeid.

Arbeidet igangsettes ved årsskiftet våren 2009 og skal være avsluttet etter ca ett år. Utvalget skal utarbeide en framdriftsplan for arbeidet tidlig i prosessen.

## **II Mandat for evalueringsutvalget**

Utvalget bes om å gi en samlet vurdering av kvaliteten på den norske forskningen og de norske fagmiljøene i filosofi og idéhistorie, vurdert ut fra en internasjonal standard.

Evalueringen skal konsentrere seg om forskningsmiljøene innenfor filosofi og idéhistorie ved Universitetet i Oslo, Universitetet i Bergen, NTNU og Universitetet i Tromsø. I disse miljøene inngår postdoktorstipendiatene og alle fast ansatte med minimum førstestillingskompetanse i evalueringen.

Utvalget skal evaluere forskningen mht kvalitet og relevans, samt nasjonalt og internasjonalt samarbeid. Utvalget bes også om å evaluere hvordan forskningsvirksomheten i de aktuelle miljøene er organisert og ledet. Utvalget bes i sin evaluering om å ta hensyn til miljøenes ulike størrelse og ressursituasjon.

Utvalget bes om å vurdere om det er disipliner eller underdisipliner hvor filosofi- og idéhistoriefaglig forskning står sterkt internasjonalt sett, og tilsvarende om det er vesentlige deler av fagene som er svakere dekket.

Evalueringsutvalget kan i samråd med Forskningsrådet innhente annen informasjon eller dokumentasjon. Det kan også forfølge eventuelle andre problemstillinger enn de som nevnes i mandatet, dersom slike behov avdekkes underveis i evalueringsprosessen.

Utvalgets konklusjoner skal munne ut i anbefalinger om oppfølgingstiltak, både på institusjonsnivå og i nasjonal sammenheng.

## **III Vurderingsgrunnlag**

Evalueringsutvalget bes om å gi en samlet vurdering av forskningen og forskningsmiljøene på grunnlag av følgende elementer:

- a) faglig produksjon (tre utvalgte arbeidere fra de siste fem år og publikasjonslister for de siste ti årene)
- b) miljøenes egenvurderinger
- c) skriftlig dokumentasjon av instituttets/ avdelingens virksomhet (siste fem år)
- d) høringer/møter med fagmiljøene

### **a) vurdering av den samlede faglige produksjonen**

#### **- på grunnlag av publiseringlister**

For at evalueringsutvalget skal kunne danne seg et bilde av hele den faglige virksomheten, må utvalget foreta en analyse av miljøenes samlede faglige produksjon. Fullstendige publiseringlister for de siste ti år skal danne grunnlag for analyse av publiseringsmønsteret og forskningsproduksjonen i faget. Utvalget må foreta en gjennomgang med særlig henblikk på å vurdere faglig bredde og fornyelse. En slik gjennomgang bør kunne gi svar på spørsmål om hvilke fagfelt, teorier, metoder eller temaer man finner representert. Avslører en kritisk gjennomgang noen mangler? Finnes det viktige sider ved faget og

fagtradisjonene som ikke er dekket? Finnes det informasjon om publiseringssamarbeid med forskere fra eget fag eller fra andre fag? Er de faglige arbeidene først og fremst rettet mot andre forskere, eller er den vitenskapelige produksjonen mer allmennrettet? Hvilke publiseringsskanaler er valgt; internasjonale, nasjonale eller lokale/ interne?

- på grunnlag av tre utvalgte faglige arbeider fra den enkelte forsker

Fagmiljøene legger etter eget skjønn fram et utvalg faglige arbeider. Utvalget skal bestå av tre publiserte arbeider fra de fast vitenskapelig ansatte med førstestillingskompetanse og postdoktorstipendiatene i hvert miljø. Med faglig arbeid menes artikler og andre bidrag i vitenskapelige tidsskrifter, antologier, avhandlinger og monografier.

De utvalgte faglige arbeidene skal, sammen med fullstendige publikasjonslister, danne grunnlag for utvalgets vurdering av miljøenes faglige kvalitet og produksjon, vurdert opp mot en internasjonal standard.

### **b) egenvurdering**

De utvalgte fagmiljøene utarbeider en egenvurdering med utgangspunkt i en mal. Punkter som vil bli berørt i egenvurderingene er blant annet forskningsaktivitet, nasjonal og internasjonalt forskningssamarbeid, institusjonenes forskningsstrategi, rekrutteringssituasjon, forholdet mellom forskning og utdanning, samt interne og eksterne finansieringskilder for forskning. Formålet med egenvurderingen er å få fram både sterke og svake sider ved forskningsaktiviteten i faget, og vurderingen skal representere en kritisk gjennomgang av virksomheten.

### **c) skriftlig dokumentasjon av fagmiljøets virksomhet**

Den faglige virksomheten også vurderes i lys av de opplysninger om virksomheten som kommer fram i innsendte årsrapporter, årsplaner etc. Evalueringen skal blant annet reflektere betydningen sentrale rammebetingelsene har for forskningsaktiviteten:

- Organisering av forskningsaktiviteten
- Virksomhetens finansieringsstruktur
- Stillingsstruktur (alders- og kjønns sammensetning)
- Forskermobilitet
- Rekrutteringssituasjon; gjennomstrømning i doktorgradsutdanningen, kjønnsfordeling, veiledningssituasjon, erstatningsbehov med mer
- Forholdet mellom utdannings- og forskningsaktivitet

### **d) høringsmøter med fagmiljøene**

Hensikten med høringene er gjennom samtale å utdype forhold som har å gjøre med fagmiljøets formål, rammebetingelser og oppgaver. Forholdet mellom forskning og undervisning må vies spesiell oppmerksomhet, dvs. undervisnings- og veiledningsaktivitetens betydning for forskningsmessig utvikling. Høringene er også tenkt å skulle belyse spørsmål vedrørende organisasjon, forskningsledelse og forskningsaktivitet. Det kan ta opp forhold knyttet til undervisning, samarbeidsformer, rekrutteringssituasjon eller publisering, og kan gi anledning til å drøfte situasjoner beskrevet i egenvurderingen.

## Appendix 2 Template for the self-evaluations

### Bestilling 2: Fagmiljøenes egenvurdering og dokumentasjon av fagmiljøenes virksomhet

Egenvurderingen skal være på *maksimalt 10 sider pluss vedlegg*. Frist for innlevering er **30. september 2009**.

#### A. Mal for fagmiljøenes egenvurdering

Følgende spørsmål bør berøres:

##### 1. Forskningskvalitet og -aktivitet

- a. I hvilke deler av fagmiljøet er det særlig høy aktivitet?
- b. Hvor ligger fagmiljøets forskningsmessige styrke og svakhet?
- c. Hvordan definerer fagmiljøet sin egen rolle i en nasjonal kontekst?
- d. Hvordan bidrar fagmiljøet til allmennformidling? Gi gjerne eksempler.
- e. Hvilke fremtidsvisjoner har fagmiljøet for den samlede forskningsaktiviteten? Vær gjerne konkrete.

##### 2. Nasjonalt og internasjonalt forskningssamarbeid

- a. Vurder omfanget og betydningen av prosjektsamarbeid med fag og emner på egen institusjon og andre norske institusjoner.
- b. Vurder omfanget og betydningen av prosjektsamarbeid med internasjonale fagmiljøer.
- c. Vurder erfaringene med andre typer nasjonalt og internasjonalt samarbeid (f.eks konferanser, gjesteforskere).

##### 3. Fagmiljøets (enhetens) strategi for forskning

- a. Kommenter styrkeforholdet mellom arbeid og initiativer hos enkeltforskere og fagmiljøets eventuelle felles satsingsområder.
- b. Hva er styrkeforholdet mellom individuell versus gruppe/prosjektbasert forskningsorganisering?
- c. Hvordan ivaretas forskningsledelse og kvalitetssikring?
- d. Hvordan vil dere karakterisere initiativ til og grad av forskningssamarbeid mellom seniorer og forskerrekutter, og mellom eldre og yngre forskere? Nevn eksempler på slike samarbeidsprosjekter.
- e. Hvilke felles fora, seminar og lignende for stimulering av forskning, kvalitet, diskusjon og samarbeid internt finnes i miljøet? Hvordan arbeides det konkret i slike felles fora?
- f. Hva er forholdet mellom fagmiljøets (enhetens) og fakultetets strategi for forskning?

##### 4. Rekrutteringssituasjonen i faget i perioden fra 1.1.2004 -31.12.2008

- a. Hvor mange har disputert for doktorgraden i perioden?
- b. Hvor lang tid brukte den enkelte kandidat på arbeidet med doktorgraden?
- c. Hvor mange av enhetens doktorgradskandidater har fått tilsetning i stilling internt?
- d. Hvor mange er rekruttert til stillinger fra andre institusjoner?

- e. Hvordan er forholdet mellom doktorstudentenes faglige profil og innretningen på forskningen i fagmiljøet (doktorstudentenes faglige rolle i miljøet)?
  - f. Hvordan er fagmiljøets strategi for rekruttering tilpasset videre fagutvikling og -dimensjonering?
5. **Hvordan vil dere karakterisere**
- a. forholdet mellom undervisning/veiledning/administrasjon og den tiden som er satt av til forskning?
  - b. graden av forskningsfrihet?
6. **Betydningen av ressurser fra Forskningsrådet og andre eksterne finansieringskilder**
- a. Hvor stor andel av den samlede forskningsaktiviteten er finansiert over grunnbudsjettet og hvor stor andel er eksternt finansiert?
  - b. Hvilke eksterne kilder har størst betydning?
  - c. Hvorfra og på hvilke områder er finansieringen tilfredsstillende og hvor er den mindre eller lite tilfredsstillende?
  - d. På hvilken måte preger ekstern finansiering forskningsprofilen?
  - e. Gjør rede for eventuelle strategier for å skaffe forskere, forskergrupper og enheten ekstern finansiering
8. **Er det andre forhold som fremmer eller hemmer forskningen i fagmiljøet?**

## **B. Dokumentasjon av fagmiljøets virksomhet**

Egenvurderingen skal suppleres med følgende skriftlige dokumentasjon av fagmiljøets virksomhet fra og med 2004 til og med 2008:

- A. Årsplaner og årsrapporter fra femårsperioden
- B. Eventuelle strategiske planer/handlingsplaner for samme periode
- C. Andre opplysninger, hvis dette ikke dekkes på en oversiktlig måte gjennom årsplanene og rapportene:
  - Oversikt over enhetens eksterne og interne inntekter i perioden
  - Oversikt over alle ansatte i vitenskapelige stillinger fordelt etter stillingskategori, alder, kjønn, fagfelt og ansettelsesperiode
  - Oversikt over antall studenter ved enheten, fordelt etter studietrinn og kjønn
  - Oversikt over alle nåværende og uteksaminerte doktorgradsstipendiater i perioden. Listen skal inneholde navnet på hver enkelt stipendiat og tittel på avhandlingen. For doktorgradsprosjekter som er under arbeid angis tidspunktet for når stipendiaten ble tatt opp på doktorgradsutdanningen, samt antatt tidspunkt for disputas.
  - Oversikt over antall postdoktorstipendiater i perioden fordelt på faglig temaområde og kjønn
  - Faglig ansattes gjesteforskeropphold i utlandet i perioden
  - Faglig ansattes deltakelse i større prosjekter nasjonalt / internasjonalt
  - Faglig ansattes deltakelse på nasjonale og internasjonale konferanser i perioden

## **Appendix 3 Publication analysis**





NIFU STEP, June 2009/June 2010

Antje Klitkou and Liv Langfeldt

# Scholarly publications in Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas 2004- 2008

*Report prepared for the panel evaluating Norwegian philosophy and  
history of ideas 2009-2010*

# The background and purpose of the report

The Research Council of Norway regularly conducts evaluations of research disciplines. This working paper was commissioned by the Research Council of Norway and prepared as a background document for the expert panel (2009-2010) evaluating Norwegian research within philosophy and history of ideas.

## Acronyms: Norwegian and English names

### *Institutions*

NTNU: Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet/Norwegian University of Science and Technology  
UiB: Universitetet i Bergen/University of Bergen  
UiO: Universitetet i Oslo/University of Oslo  
UiT: Universitetet i Tromsø/University of Tromsø

### *Departments and research units included in the evaluation*

UiB: Institutt for filosofi og førstesemesterstudium (FoF)/Department of Philosophy  
UiO: Institutt for filosofi, ide- og kunsthistorie og klassiske språk (IFIKK)/Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas. Included parts of the department:  
1) Philosophy unit  
2) History of Ideas unit  
UiT: Institutt for filosofi/Department of Philosophy  
NTNU: Filosofisk institutt/Department of Philosophy

### *Databases*

Frida: Forskningsresultater, informasjon og dokumentasjon av vitenskapelige aktiviteter/  
Research results, information and documentation of scientific activities  
DBH: Database for statistikk om høgre utdanning/Information on Research and Higher Education

# Contents

Executive summary .....	90
1 Data sources and included publications .....	92
2 Overall figures and trends .....	96
3 Publication profiles: Frequently used journals, language and co-authorship.....	98
4 Number of publications per scholar .....	103
References .....	108
Appendix 1 Journals.....	109

## Executive summary

The present study encompasses scholarly publications by the 104 scholars to be included in the evaluation of Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas in 2009-2010 (Chapters 3 and 4), as well as some overall analysis of all registered publications from the four university departments selected for the evaluation (Chapter 2). When including all publications registered at the four departments, a total of 620 *publications* are found in the studied five-year period (2004 to 2008). When limiting the search to publications by the 104 scholars to be evaluated, our sample consists of 336 *publications*.

The analyses (both the sample of 620 publications and the sample of 336 publications) are based on data registered for the performance-based budgeting of Norwegian higher education institutions. Some test comparisons with publication lists provided by the departments to be evaluated indicate some discrepancies between the data for the performance-based budgeting and the scholars' individual publication lists. The departments are encouraged to examine these discrepancies to ensure that they get the credit for the scholarly publications they are entitled to.

### *Journal profile: Norwegian and mixed*

In the period 2004 to 2008, the 104 studied scholars have published a total of 197 articles in 69 different journals. Of these journals, 46 are only used once. The three most frequently used journals are Norwegian journals in philosophy and the history of ideas, accounting for 41 per cent of the 197 articles in the period (81 of 197 articles). There are few international philosophy/history of ideas journals among the most frequently used journals. In addition to philosophy/history of ideas journals, the studied scholars have published in journals in a broad range of fields, ranging from medicine to law, sociology and literature. Twelve per cent of the journal articles are in highly ranked journals (level 2 in the performance-based budgeting for Norwegian higher education institutions), and 34 per cent are in English.

### *Differences between departments*

In total, 15 per cent of the publications are at level 2, which is considerably lower than the defined 20 per cent threshold for level 2. There are, however, large differences in level 2 publication between the departments. UiO/Philosophy scores considerably higher than the other departments with 29 per cent at level 2. At NTNU and UiT, only four per cent are at level 2, while UiB has 15 per cent, and UiO/History of Ideas has nine per cent of its publications at level 2.

### *Language: 37 per cent English*

The proportion of publications in English also varies between the four departments. UiO/Philosophy and UiB have the highest proportion of publications in English (55 and 46 per cent, respectively). UiO/History of Ideas has the lowest proportion of publications in English (nine per cent). In total, 37 per cent of the studied publications are in English, 58 per cent in Scandinavian languages, and five per cent in other languages (German and French). The proportion of publications in English was considerably higher in 2008 (48 per

cent) than the other years studied. This might be a one-year phenomenon or part of a change in publication patterns. It is notable that the youngest scholars publish more in English than their elder colleagues, which points towards a change in publication patterns.

### *Limited co-authorship*

Eighteen per cent of book articles, 17 per cent of monographs and 11 per cent of journal articles are co-authored. Somewhat surprisingly, there has been a *decrease* in the proportion of publications that are co-authored from 2004 to 2008. Comparing with figures from a study of publications in Norwegian philosophy in 1979 to 1981, we still find an increase in co-authorship. Comparing departments, we find significantly more co-authorship at the two departments with the fewest scholars, the Departments of Philosophy at UiT and at NTNU, than at the larger departments at UiO and UiB. Within the history of ideas, however, co-authorship seems to be non-existent.

### *Differences between scholars*

The average publication per scholar is relatively stable for the period 2005 to 2008, at around one article equivalent<sup>1</sup> per scholar per year. There is great variety in publication activity, both between scholars and between departments. Twenty-six per cent of the scholars have no article equivalent in the period. Forty per cent have one to four article equivalents, 25 per cent have five to nine article equivalents, seven per cent have 10 to 19 article equivalents, and two per cent have 20 or more article equivalents. At the Department of Philosophy at NTNU, all the included scholars have classified publications in the period, and this department gets a high score, with an average of 6.1 article equivalents per scholar in the five-year period. However, history of ideas at UiO has the highest productivity, with as many as 8.9 article equivalents per scholar in the five-year period. Overall, the highest proportion of scholars with more than 10 article equivalents is found among the associate professors. Moreover, the highest average publication activity is found in the age group 50 to 59 years.

Female scholars seem to be somewhat more productive than their male colleagues; 15 per cent of females and six per cent of males have above 10 article equivalents in the five-year period. The average number of article equivalents is only slightly higher for the female than for the male scholars (4.2 women for and 4.1 for men). Notably, there are a substantial number of female scholars with high publication activity in lower positions, but none at full professor level.

---

<sup>1</sup> See explanation in Chapter 1.

# 1 Data sources and included publications

## *Data sources*

The analyses in this paper are based on the publications registered in the publicly accessible database Frida,<sup>2</sup> and *not* on the comprehensive publication lists compiled for the evaluation. Frida is a joint registration system for scientific publications employed by several Norwegian universities and other higher education institutions, and it includes the scholarly publications for all the institutions evaluated.<sup>3</sup> The Frida publication data are summarised in the Norwegian DBH database (see explanation of acronyms on page 2) and are used in the calculation of the performance-based budgeting for Norwegian higher education institutions.

In addition to Frida, we have used the NIFU STEP Doctoral Degree Register to identify doctoral dissertations by the evaluated 104 scholars, and also included these dissertations in parts of the analysis.

## *Included departments and scholars*

The analysis encompasses scholarly publications by the 104 scholars at the five scholarly units to be included in the evaluation (Table 1.1), as well as some overall analysis of the publications from the four university departments concerned. That is, in addition to the publications of the selected 104 scholars, all the Frida registered scholarly publications of the four university departments are included in the overall analysis in Chapter 2. Chapters 3 and 4 include the publications from the 104 scholars alone, not from the other scholars at the departments (insofar as they are not co-authored with any of the scholars to be included in the evaluation).

---

<sup>2</sup> At <http://wo.uio.no/as/WebObjects/frida.woa/5/wa/fres?la=en>. We received all data directly from Frida and did not search the publications through this public site.

<sup>3</sup> Frida also includes three other modules, which have not been used for this report.

**Table 1.1** *Evaluation of Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Number of included scholars by department and position.*

<b>Department</b>	<b>Full professor</b>	<b>Associate professor</b>	<b>Postdoc</b>	<b>**Senior lecturer</b>	<b>Total</b>
NTNU: Department of Philosophy	6	9	0	0	15
UiB: Department of Philosophy	13	7	0	7	27
UiO: IFIKK/Philosophy	*20	*6	13	1	40
UiO: IFIKK/History of Ideas	6	2	1	0	9
UiT Department of Philosophy	8	3	2	0	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>104</b>

Source: Personnel lists from the included departments, April 2009.

\* Some of these professors at UiO do not have regular professor positions; they have the same teaching obligations as lecturers.

\*\* Senior lecturers ("Førstelektorere") are positions mainly oriented towards teaching.

### *Categories of scholarly publications included*

The analysis is limited to the publication categories included in the Norwegian performance-based budgeting of higher education institutions; monographs and contributions to anthologies (book articles) published by publishing houses classified as scientific by the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions (UHR), and articles<sup>4</sup> in series and journals classified as scientific by UHR. UHR classifies all relevant journals/series and publishers at two levels: the normal level (level 1) and the high quality level (level 2), and it revises the lists of classified journals and publishers annually. Several journals and publishers are not classified as scientific and are listed as such in the register.<sup>5</sup> The annual revisions mean that the quality level of a journal or publisher may change from one year to the next. When "quality level" is included in the analysis, the level in the year of publication applies.

In sum, the analysis covers all articles in journals/series classified as scientific and monographs, as well as articles in anthologies published by publishers classified as scientific. All analyses are limited to the period 2004 to 2008. In addition, doctoral dissertations in the period (by the evaluated 104 scholars in the period 2004 to 2008) are identified and included in parts of the analysis.

### *Article equivalents and co-author weighting*

In some parts of the analyses the publications are counted as "article equivalents". One article equivalent equals one scholarly article authored by one scholar. Articles (in

<sup>4</sup> Including regular articles and review articles, but not book reviews, editorials or letters. Conference reports are not included unless they are published by publishers classified as scientific.

<sup>5</sup> The register is publicly available at <http://dbh.nsd.uib.no/kanaler/>. See Appendix 2 on the basis for classification.

scholarly journals or books) count 1, whereas monographs and doctoral dissertations are given greater weight and count 5.

Moreover, the figures are weighted for co-authorship by dividing the publications scores by the number of contributing authors. In this way, an article co-authored by two persons counts as 0.5 (that is, 0.5 for each of them if both scholars are in the analysed sample).

Article equivalents and co-author weighting are used in the last table in Chapter 2 and in all tables in Chapter 4. For the remaining analyses, simple publication counts are used.

### *Data limitations*

Even though unique, and a large improvement for bibliometric analysis, the Norwegian publications databases used in the performance-based budgeting – and in our analysis – are not without shortcomings. Some test comparisons with individual publication lists provided by the departments to be evaluated indicate discrepancies between the data for the performance-based budgeting and the philosophers' individual publication lists. Several of the philosophers for whom no publication points emerge from the Frida data have a substantial number of publications on their lists. The reason for these discrepancies may be that what appear in individual publication lists as publications by publishers classified as scientific, are for various reasons not defined as scholarly publications in the performance-based budgeting. Textbooks, for instance, are not defined as scholarly publications,<sup>6</sup> even when published by scientific publishers. Moreover, some publications may not be registered in Frida because the author had no (primary) affiliation to any of the institutions at the time of publication, and there might be different practices, e.g. concerning the registration of publications by professor emeriti. On the other hand, there are also some cases of publications registered in Frida that are missing in the individual publication lists, indicating that the individual publication lists are also incomplete. Overall however, some scholars seem to have more scholarly publications on their “private” publication lists than are registered for the performance-based budgeting. The departments should examine these discrepancies to ensure that they get the credit for the scholarly publications they are entitled to.<sup>7</sup>

Concerning the present analyses, it should also be noted that the data for the introduction/test year 2004 of the register seem to be incomplete. This year's data were only of limited use in the performance-based budgeting, and the coverage for 2004 seems not to be as good as for the following years. Moreover, double listing of publications<sup>8</sup> and

---

<sup>6</sup> The definition requires that the publication presents new insight, see Appendix 2.

<sup>7</sup> Commenting on the draft version of this report, UiB notes that it has found 35 scholarly publications in the relevant period that are missing in the databases used for the performance-based budgeting. Compared to their number of registered publications analysed in this report, the number of publications that are not registered is very high.

<sup>8</sup> For example because of misspelling of article titles.



registration of the same scholars with different IDs were found. As far as possible, duplicates and inconsistent IDs have been identified and corrected in the present analysis. However, the classification of publications has not been checked, but is based solely on the classifications in the data obtained from Frida. For example, a publication classified as a journal article is analysed as a journal article, even if the title indicates that it might be a book review.

## 2 Overall figures and trends

This chapter covers all publications registered for the selected 104 scholars in the period 2004 to 2008, as well as all other registered publications from the selected four departments.

Table 2.1 shows the development in the number of publications by type for each year of the period covered. The numbers of publications in 2004 are rather low and should be interpreted with caution (see Chapter 1). The higher numbers from 2005 onwards, with the introduction of performance-based budgeting, may be due to both stronger incentives to publish and stronger incentives to systematically register all scientific publications.

In the period 2005 to 2008, the number of journal articles is relatively stable, at between 71 and 85 per year. The number of book articles varies somewhat more, and has increased from 45 in 2005 to 62 in 2008. The number of books/monographs is generally low, varying between four and 13 per year.

*Table 2.1 Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Number of publications by type and year 2004-2008*

<b>Publication type</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Total</b>
Books/Monographs	3	13	4	10	8	38
Book articles	15	45	50	44	62	216
Journal articles	50	85	76	71	84	366
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>620</b>

Source: Frida. The sample includes publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation and all other publications registered at the four departments to be evaluated.

Journals are the most frequently used publishing channel. Fifty-nine per cent of the publications are journal articles (Table 2.2, total for the period). In particular, the Department of Philosophy at NTNU has a high proportion of journal articles; 70 per cent of its scholarly publications are journal articles. IFIKK at UiO has the highest proportion of book articles (39 per cent), whereas the Department of Philosophy at UiB has the highest proportion of monographs (10 per cent). The Department of Philosophy at UiT is the smallest of the four, and it has the lowest number of scholarly publications (in total 39 classified publications in the five-year period).

**Table 2.2** *Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Number of publications by type and department (totals for 2004-2008).*

Department	Books/Monographs		Book articles		Journal articles		N
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
NTNU: Department of Philosophy	2	1.6	35	28.0	88	70.4	125
UiB: Department of Philosophy	10	9.9	30	29.7	61	60.4	101
UiO: IFIKK*	24	6.8	137	38.6	194	54.6	355
UiT Department of Philosophy	2	5.1	14	35.9	23	59.0	39
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>620</b>

Source: Frida. The sample includes publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation and all other publications registered at the four departments to be evaluated.

\*IFIKK (Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas) consists of four previously separate departments, merged into one department in 2005. When including all publications registered at the department, as we have done in this chapter, some of the included publications will be outside the field of philosophy and history of ideas.

In Table 2.3, the publications are counted as article equivalents, showing the weighted sum of scholarly publications for each year for each of the four departments (for an explanation of article equivalents, see Chapter 1 and the note to the table). Also in the case of such weighted sums, there is considerable variation in the amount of publications from year to year. UiB and UiO had their “peak productivity” in 2005, whereas NTNU published much more in 2006 than in the other years, and UiT most in 2007.

The differences between the departments’ total number of publications (Table 2.2) and their total number of article equivalents (Table 2.3) reflect their different publication profiles in terms of co-authorship (studied in Chapter 3) and the proportion of monographs versus articles. A high proportion of monographs and little co-authorship result in higher scores on article equivalents compared with unweighted publication counts. Except for NTNU, which has an especially low proportion of monographs, all departments score higher on article equivalents than on publication counts.

**Table 2.3** *Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Number of article equivalents\* by department and year 2004-2008.*

Department	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Total
NTNU: Department of Philosophy	13.4	19.2	<b>32.5</b>	22.8	25.6	113.6
UiB: Department of Philosophy	13.8	<b>34.9</b>	11.4	28.8	29.1	117.8
UiO: IFIKK**	40.5	<b>117.8</b>	82.8	78.8	105.8	425.8
UiT Department of Philosophy	3.0	8.0	10.0	<b>17.0</b>	6.0	44.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>70.7</b>	<b>180.0</b>	<b>136.7</b>	<b>147.4</b>	<b>166.5</b>	<b>701.2</b>

Source: Frida. The sample includes publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation and all other publications registered at the four departments to be evaluated.

\*The table includes the same 620 publications as the previous table, weighted as article equivalents. One article equivalent equals one scholarly article authored by one scholar: Articles (in scholarly journals or books) count 1, and monographs count 5. The figures are weighted for co-authorship by dividing the publications scores by the number of contributing authors.

\*\*IFIKK (Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas) consists of four previously separate departments, merged into one department in 2005. When including all publications registered at the department, as we have done in this chapter, some of the included publications will be outside the field of philosophy and history of ideas.

### 3 Publication profiles: Frequently used journals, language and co-authorship

This chapter studies the publication patterns of the 104 scholars included in the evaluation, in terms of frequently used journals, publication language and co-authorship.

In the five-year period studied, the 104 scholars have published in 69 different journals. Of these, 46 journals are used only once. Table 3.1 shows the number of journal articles by journal and department, including all journals with at least two articles. The two most frequently used journals (with 32 articles each), are the Norwegian journals *Norsk Filosofisk Tidsskrift* and *Arr*.<sup>9</sup> Two Norwegian non-philosophy journals are also among the six most frequently used journals: the multidisciplinary journal *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* (main target group in history, philosophy, political science and law) and *Tidsskrift for Den norske lægeforening* (The Journal of the Norwegian Medical Association).<sup>10</sup> *Ancient Philosophy* is the most frequent level 2 journal, and also the most frequent non-Nordic journal, with five articles in the period, all authored by scholars at UiO/IFIKK.

**Table 3.1** Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Frequently used journals, by department and journal level, 2004-2008

Journal	Level*	NTNU	UiB	UiO Phil	UiO Hol	UiT	Total
Arr. Idéhistorisk tidsskrift	1		1	2	29		32
Norsk Filosofisk Tidsskrift	1	12	5	12		3	32
Agora: Journal for metafysisk spekulasjon	1	8	2	4		3	17
Tidsskrift for Den norske lægeforening	1	10					10
Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift	1	3	1	1	1	2	8
Sats: Nordic Journal of Philosophy	1	2	3	2		1	8
Ancient Philosophy	2			5			5
Ethics and Information Technology	1	5					5
European Journal of Palliative Care	1	5					5
Phronesis: A Journal for Ancient Philosophy	1 and 2			3			3
Analecta Husserliana: The Yearbook of Phenomenological Research	1		2				2
Edda. Nordisk tidsskrift for litteraturforskning	2				2		2
Etikk i praksis	1	1		1			2
Hugur: tímarit um heimspeki	1		1	1			2
Journal of Philosophical Research (JPR)	1 and 2		2				2
Kirke og kultur	1			1		1	2
Lov og rett: Norsk juridisk tidsskrift	1		2				2
Osiris	1			2			2
Palliative Medicine: A Multiprofessional Journal	1	2					2
Philosophy	2	1	1				2
Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research	1			1	1		2
Tidsskrift for rettsvitenskap	2		2				2
Zeitschrift für Palliativmedizin	1	2					2
11 level 2 journals with 1 article each	2	2	2	5	2		11
35 level 1 journals with 1 article each	1	10	8	12	3	2	35
<b>Total</b>		<b>63</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>197</b>
Total Level 2	2	3	6	11	4		24
Total Level 1	1	60	26	41	34	12	173

Source: Frida. The sample includes the publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation. See Appendix 1 for a full list of the journals. \*Due to the annual level revisions, one journal may be rated at both level 1 and level 2.

<sup>9</sup> Twenty-one of the articles in Arr are written by the same scholar.

<sup>10</sup> In this journal, the articles by the philosophers mainly deal with ethical issues.

Table 3.1 shows the different journal profiles of the five units/departments. In our sample, all the articles in two journals of ancient philosophy (*Ancient Philosophy* and *Phronesis*) are authored at the philosophy unit at UiO. Nearly all the articles in *Arr* (29 of 32) are authored at the history of ideas unit at UiO. Moreover, all the articles in *Tidsskrift for Den norske lægeforening*, as well as all the articles in three international medical journals (on palliative medicine), are authored at NTNU. The UiB philosophers, on the other hand, are the only ones with articles in two of the international philosophy journals (*Journal of Philosophical Research* and *Analecta Husserliana*), as well as in two Norwegian law journals. UiT has few articles and no particular journal profile.

There are also some mutual channels. All four philosophy units have articles in the three Norwegian/Nordic philosophy journals: *Norsk Filosofisk Tidsskrift*, *Agora* and *Sats*. All five units publish in *Nytt norsk Tidsskrift*.

A low proportion of the journal articles, 12 per cent, are published in level 2 journals (Table 3.2). A considerably higher proportion of the monographs, 28 per cent, are published by level 2 publishers. The number of monographs is limited, however, at 18 books in the five-year period. Seventeen per cent of the book articles are published by level 2 publishers, and, *in total*, 15 per cent of the publications by the 104 scholars are published at level 2. As level 2 is defined to cover up to 20 per cent of the publications in a field/discipline,<sup>11</sup> the proportion of level 2 publishing among the included scholars may be considered to be low.

**Table 3.2** Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Scholarly publications by outlet/journal level and year (2004-2008), percentage

Type	Publication level	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2004-2008
Monographs	Percentage level 1	-	40.0	100.0	87.5	50.0	72.2
	Percentage level 2	-	60.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	27.8
N (publications)		0	5	3	8	2	18
Book articles	Percentage level 1	92.9	82.6	86.2	76.0	83.3	83.5
	Percentage level 2	7.1	17.4	13.8	24.0	16.7	16.5
N (publications)		14	23	29	25	30	121
Journal articles	Percentage level 1	91.7	86.5	86.7	85.3	88.9	87.8
	Percentage level 2	8.3	13.5	13.3	14.7	11.1	12.2
N (publications)		36	37	45	34	45	197
Total	Percentage level 1	92.0	81.5	87.0	82.1	85.7	85.4
	Percentage level 2	8.0	18.5	13.0	17.9	14.3	14.6
N (publications)		50	65	77	67	77	336

Source: Frida. The sample includes the publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation.

<sup>11</sup> If it covers more, some journals/publishers are excluded from the level 2 list.

### *The language of the publications*

The majority of the journal articles are in a Scandinavian language (63 per cent), and a third are in English. Among the book articles, we find a somewhat higher proportion in English (43 per cent). In total, 37 per cent of the publications in the period are in English and 58 per cent in Scandinavian languages. The remaining five per cent are mostly in German as well as a few publications in French.

**Table 3.3** *Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: The language of the publications (totals for 2004-2008). Percentage.*

Type	Scandinavian	English	Other languages	N
Monographs	61.1	38.9	.0	18
Book articles	49.6	43.0	7.4	121
Journal articles	62.9	33.5	3.6	197
<b>Total</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>336</b>

Source: Frida. The sample includes the publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation.

The proportion of publications in English was considerably higher in 2008 than in the other years studied (48 per cent English in 2008, versus 31 to 37 per cent in the preceding years). The coming years will show whether or not this is a one-year phenomenon. When compared with a 30-year-old study of publications in Norwegian philosophy, a considerable increase is found in the use of non-Scandinavian languages. In 1979-1981, 28 per cent of the article equivalents were in a non-Scandinavian language (Kyvik 1991:54); corresponding figures from the present data show that 42 per cent of the article equivalents were non-Scandinavian. Dividing the data by the age of the scholar, there are also indications of generation differences. The very youngest scholars publish considerably more in English than those over 40 (63 per cent in English vs. around 35 per cent in English for those aged 40 or more).

**Table 3.4** *Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Language of the publications by author age (totals for 2004-2008). Percentage.*

Age (in 2008)	Scandinavian	English	Other languages	N
30-39	36.8	63.2	0.0	19
40-49	59.1	36.4	4.5	132
50-59	59.0	34.3	6.7	105
60 and above	60.0	36.3	3.8	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>336</b>

The proportion of publications in English varies somewhat between the four departments. The philosophy unit at UiO has the highest proportion of publications in English, at 55 per cent, followed by UiB at 46 per cent (Table 3.5). On the other hand, the history of ideas unit at UiO has the lowest proportion of publications in English (nine per cent). It can also be noted that an increase in English in 2008 is only found at NTNU and UiO.

**Table 3.5** *Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: The outlet/journal level and language of the publications by department (totals for 2004-2008). Percentage.*

Department	Percentage English	Percentage level 2	N
NTNU: Department of Philosophy	34.0	4.3	94
UiB: Department of Philosophy	46.4	16.1	56
UiO: IFIKK/Philosophy	54.8	28.8	104
UiO: IFIKK/History of Ideas	8.6	8.6	58
UiT Department of Philosophy	20.8	4.2	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>336</b>

Source: Frida. The sample includes the publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation. Included publications: Monographs, Book articles and Journal articles.

There are large differences in level 2 publication between the departments. UiO/Philosophy scores considerably higher than the other departments, with 29 per cent at level 2. At NTNU and UiT only four per cent are at level 2, while UiB has 16 per cent of its publications at level 2, and UiO/History of Ideas nine per cent (Table 3.5)

#### *Co-authorship*

Table 3.6 shows the proportion of the different kinds of publications that have more than one author. Eighteen per cent of book articles, 17 per cent of monographs and 11 per cent of journal articles are co-authored.

**Table 3.6** *Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Co-authorship of scholarly publications: Proportion of co-authored publications by type and year, 2004-2008. Percentage.*

Type	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2004-2008
Monographs	-	20.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	16.7
Book articles	35.7	13.0	27.6	16.0	6.7	18.2
Journal articles	16.7	10.8	11.1	5.9	8.9	10.7
<b>Total per cent co-authored</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>13.7</b>
<i>Total number of publications</i>	50	65	77	67	77	336

Source: Frida. The sample includes the publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation.

Somewhat surprisingly, there has been a *decrease* in the proportion of publications that are co-authored. This departs from the general trend of increased co-authorship of scientific publications, both in Norway and internationally.<sup>12</sup> Compared with figures from a previous study of publications in Norwegian philosophy, we find an increase in co-authorship, however. In 1979-1981, seven per cent of the publications in Norwegian philosophy were co-authored (Kyvik 1991: 53), and, as shown in Table 3.6 below, the total for the period

<sup>12</sup> By comparison, the recent analysis of publications in law in Norway showed an increase in co-authorship (nine per cent co-authored in 1998 and 17 per cent in 2007), but a similar total proportion of co-authored publications in the period studied, 13 percent (Norges forskningsråd 2009).

2004 to 2008 is 14 per cent. Moreover, in our dataset for 2004 to 2008, the younger scholars co-author substantially more than the older scholars, making a decrease in co-authorship less likely to be an enduring trend.

Table 3.7 shows that there is significantly more co-authorship at the two philosophy departments with the fewest scholars, the Departments of Philosophy at UiT and at NTNU (21-23 per cent), than at the larger philosophy units at UiO and UiB (11-14 per cent). Within the history of ideas at UiO, however, there are no co-authored scholarly publications at all.

*Table 3.7 Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Co-authorship of scholarly publications: Proportion of co-authored publications by type and department, totals for 2004-2008. Percentage.*

Department	Monographs		Book articles		Journal articles		Total publications	
	#	Percentage co-authored	#	Percentage co-authored	#	Percentage co-authored	#	Percentage co-authored
NTNU: Department of Philosophy	2	50.0	29	27.6	63	20.6	94	23.4
UiB: Department of Philosophy	4	25.0	20	15.0	32	12.5	56	14.3
UiO: IFIKK/Philosophy	8	12.5	44	13.6	52	7.7	104	10.6
UiO: IFIKK/History of Ideas	3	0.0	17	0.0	38	0.0	58	0.0
UiT: Department of Philosophy	1	0.0	11	45.5	12	0.0	24	20.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>13.7</b>

Source: Frida. The sample includes the publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation.



## 4 Number of publications per scholar

This chapter analyses possible differences in publication activity by department, position, age and gender. Publications are weighted for co-authorship and type in order to have a comparable measure for publication activity, a measure called *article equivalents*. The *article equivalents* are divided by the number of scholars included in the evaluation, resulting in an average measure for publication activity per scholar (see explanation in Chapter 1 and in the notes to the tables).

Table 4.1 shows that publication per scholar is relatively stable in the five-year period studied, except for 2004, for which the data are less complete. For 2005 to 2008, the average number of article equivalents is around one per year (1.05 to 1.07), dropping to 0.83 in 2008. Most of these are articles in journals and books. Monographs and doctoral dissertations<sup>13</sup> account for a very small proportion of the publications.

*Table 4.1 Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Number of publications per scholar by year 2004-2008 (weighted for co-authorship)*

Type	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	**2004-2008
Monographs		4.5	3	6.8	2	16.3
Number of scholars	85	89	93	98	104	85-104
<i>Average publications per scholar</i>	0.00	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.17
Book articles	11.1	21.5	25	22.8	28.8	109.2
Number of scholars	85	89	93	98	104	85-104
<i>Average publications per scholar</i>	0.13	0.24	0.27	0.23	0.28	1.15
Journal articles	32.8	34.4	42.5	32.7	42.7	185
Number of scholars	85	89	93	98	104	85-104
<i>Average publications per scholar</i>	0.39	0.39	0.46	0.33	0.41	1.97
Doctoral dissertations	1	3	3	3	1	11
Number of scholars	85	89	93	98	104	85-104
<i>Average publications per scholar</i>	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.12
*Article equivalents	48.9	93.4	97.5	104.5	86.5	430.7
Number of scholars	85	89	93	98	104	85-104
<i>Average article equivalents per scholar</i>	0.58	1.05	1.05	1.07	0.83	4.57

Sources: Frida and NIFU STEP Doctoral Degree Register. The sample includes the publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation.

\* An article equivalent equals one scholarly article authored by one scholar: Articles (in scholarly journals or books) count 1, monographs and doctoral dissertations count 5. The figures are weighted for co-authorship by dividing the publications scores by the number of contributing authors.

\*\* Averages for the period are calculated as the average of the averages for the five years multiplied by five.

There is great variety in publication activity, both between scholars and between departments. It should also be noted that there are some variations in the departments' personnel structure, as well as in the kind of scholars included in the evaluation. UiB has included several lecturers with doctoral-level competence in the evaluation, some of whom

<sup>13</sup> To obtain a better measure for scholarly publication per scholar, this chapter also includes doctoral dissertations in the five-year period. Only dissertations by any of the 104 scholars completed while affiliated to their present institution are included in the analysis (to make the sample of dissertations similar to the sample of Frida publications).

only hold part-time positions.<sup>14</sup> UiO has included several professors without time reserved for research. However, when excluding scholars without a research position from the analysis (Table 4.2, last columns), the average publication activity does not increase. This indicates that scholars without a research position also publish, and some of them extensively.

There are no lecturers (or other scholars without a research position) included at the Department of Philosophy at NTNU, and all the included scholars have registered scholarly publications in the period. This department achieves a high score, with a total of 6.1 article equivalents per scholar in the period (Table 4.2). Three of the NTNU philosophers have 10 or more article equivalents in the period. At the three other departments, there are several scholars without any registered scholarly publications in the five-year period.<sup>15</sup> UiO has a high score, particularly in the history of ideas, but it also scores higher than both UiB and UiT in philosophy (with 9.9 article equivalents per scholar in the history of ideas and 4.1 in philosophy). Several of the scholars at UiO/IFIKK have high publication activity (three in philosophy and two in the history of ideas have 10 or more article equivalents in the period).

UiT and UiB have higher percentages of philosophers without any registered publications, and they score lower than NTNU and UiO, regardless of whether or not the philosophers without any registered publications are included. UiB has an average of 2.4 article equivalents per scholar in the period (3.9 when only philosophers with registered publications are included, Table 4.2, middle columns). Two of the UiB philosophers have more than 10 article equivalents in the period. UiT also has an average of 2.4 article equivalents per scholar in the period (3.8 when only philosophers with registered publications are included). None of the 13 UiT philosophers has more than 10 article equivalents in the period, but one of them has nine.

---

<sup>14</sup> Two of these were included even though their publications are registered at other units/institutions, implying that they appear in the analysis without publications.

<sup>15</sup> Twenty-six percent of the scholars selected for the evaluation have no registered scholarly publications.

Table 4.2 Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Article equivalents per scholar by department (totals for 2004-2008).

Department	Total number of *article equival.	Including all 104 scholars		Including only scholars with publications in the period		Including only scholars with a research position**		
		# scholars	Article	# scholars	Article	# article researcher	# researcher	Article
			equival. per scholar		equival. per scholar			equival. per researcher
NTNU: Department of Philosophy	90.95	15	6.06	15	6.06	90.95	15	6.06
UiB: Department of Philosophy	66.00	27	2.44	17	3.88	47.00	20	2.35
UiO: IFIKK/Philosophy	163.00	40	4.08	29	5.62	108.83	28	3.89
UiO: IFIKK/History of Ideas	80.00	9	8.89	8	10.00	80.00	9	8.89
UiT: Department of Philosophy	30.50	13	2.35	8	3.81	30.50	13	2.35
<b>Total</b>	<b>430.45</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>5.59</b>	<b>357.28</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>4.20</b>

Sources: Frida and NIFU STEP Doctoral Degree Register. The sample includes the publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation.

\*One article equivalent equals one scholarly article authored by one scholar: Articles (in scholarly journals or books) count 1, monographs and doctoral dissertations count 5. The figures are weighted for co-authorship by dividing the publications scores by the number of contributing authors.

\*\*Figures excluding lecturers and other scholars without research assigned to their positions (i.e. full and associate professors at IFIKK/Philosophy with teaching obligations).

In Table 4.3, the scholars are categorised by their total number of article equivalents in the five-year period.<sup>16</sup> Twenty-six per cent of the scholars have no classified publications in the period. A large percentage (40 per cent) have one to four article equivalents, 25 per cent have five to nine article equivalents, seven per cent have 10 to 19 article equivalents, and two per cent have 20 or more article equivalents.

<sup>16</sup> In others words, unlike the other tables in this paper, the scholars, and not the publications, are the primary units of the analysis.

**Table 4.3** Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Number of publications per scholar by academic position and gender (totals for 2004-2008). Percentage.

Position*	Gender	***Article equivalents 2004-2008					**Mean	N (scholars)
		0	1-4	5-9	10-19	20-		
Full professors	Females	42.9	28.6	28.6	0.0	0.0	2.43	7
	Males	21.7	43.5	26.1	4.3	4.3	4.91	46
	Total	24.5	41.5	26.4	3.8	3.8	4.59	53
Associate professors (førsteamanuenser)	Females	12.5	50.0	12.5	25.0	0.0	5.31	8
	Males	26.3	36.8	31.6	5.3	0.0	3.49	19
	Total	22.2	40.7	25.9	11.1	0.0	4.03	27
Postdocs	Females	37.5	12.5	37.5	12.5	0.0	4.81	8
	Males	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	2.63	8
	Total	31.3	31.3	31.3	6.3	0.0	3.72	16
Senior lecturers (førstelektorer)	Females	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	4.00	3
	Males	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.40	5
	Total	37.5	50.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	2.38	8
<b>Total</b> (per cent)	Females	30.8	30.8	23.1	15.4	0.0	4.23	26
	Males	24.4	43.6	25.6	3.8	2.6	4.11	78
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>40.4</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>104</b>

Sources: Frida, NIFU STEP Doctoral Degree Register and personnel lists from the four included departments. The sample includes the publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation.

\*According to lists from the institutions, April 2009.

*Explanation:* In this table the unit of analysis is scholars, *not* publications. The table shows the proportion of scholars with 0-1, 2-4, 5-9 etc. publications in the period (row percentages).

\*\*The second last column shows the average number of article equivalents per scholar, *not* percentages.

\*\*\*An article equivalent equals one scholarly article authored by one scholar: Articles (in scholarly journals or books) count 1, monographs and doctoral dissertations count 5. The figures are weighted for co-authorship by dividing the publications scores by the number of contributing authors.

Table 4.3 also shows figures by gender and position. Among the senior lecturers, there is a high proportion with low publication activity (i.e. among the “førstelektorer”, whose main task is teaching, not research). The associate professors and the full professors have quite similar productivity profiles: 22-25 per cent without any publications, 41 per cent with one to four article equivalents, 26 per cent with five to nine article equivalents, and 8-11 per cent with 10 or more article equivalents. The gender profiles within these two groups are very different, however. Among the full professors, the male average is far better than the female average, whereas the female associate professors perform much better than the male associate professors. Moreover, all full professors with high publication activity are males, while, among the associate professors, postdocs and lecturers, there are higher proportions of females with high publication activity. In other words, there are a substantial number of female scholars with high publication activity in the lower positions, but *none* at full professor level.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, only 13 per cent of the full professors in the sample are females.

Looking at the overall figures in Table 4.3, female scholars seem to be somewhat more productive than their male colleagues; 15 per cent of females and six per cent of males have more than 10 article equivalents. The average number of article equivalents is only slightly higher for the females than the males (4.2 for women and 4.1 for men). As shown in Table 4.4, the publication activity varies by age, but somewhat differently for men and

<sup>17</sup> High publication activity defined as 10 or more article equivalents in the five-year period.

women. Among the youngest scholars (30-39 years), males and females are about equally productive, and, as they have recently started their careers, the figures are low. In the age group 40-49 years, the females are more productive than the males, whereas in the age group 50-59 years, the males are more productive than the females. Among those in their 60s and older, the productivity is generally lower. In all age categories, there are both men and women without any classified publications in the five-year period.

It should be noted that, in line with general findings in the study of academic publication, the publication activity is highly skewed. In addition, the number of scholars in the different age and gender categories is rather low, and consequently the average values in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 are highly dependent on the publication activity of individual scholars. Note also that all the 104 scholars are included in the calculations, even though only 85 of them were affiliated to their institution at the beginning of the period studied.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, some of the included scholars do not have research positions, and some have part-time positions (including some professor emeriti).

**Table 4.4** *Norwegian philosophy and history of ideas: Average number of article equivalents per scholar by age and gender (totals for 2004-2008). Means.*

Age (in 2008)	Gender	Article equivalents*				N (researchers)
		Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation	
30-39	Females	2.83	0	8.5	3.502	6
	Males	2.71	0	7.0	2.928	7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>3.066</b>	<b>13</b>
40-49	Females	6.14	0	16.0	5.814	11
	Males	4.51	0	25.0	6.189	21
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5.07</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>6.020</b>	<b>32</b>
50-59	Females	3.30	0	6.5	2.540	5
	Males	6.60	0	32.0	7.666	16
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5.82</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>6.888</b>	<b>21</b>
60 and above	Females	2.25	0	5.0	2.630	4
	Males	2.98	0	15.5	3.694	34
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>3.575</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Total</b>	Females	4.23	0	16.0	4.550	26
	Males	4.11	0	32.0	5.477	78
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>5.239</b>	<b>104</b>

Sources: Frida, NIFU STEP Doctoral Degree Register and NIFU STEP Research personnel Register. The sample includes the publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation.

\*An article equivalent equals one scholarly article authored by one scholar: Articles (in scholarly journals or books) count 1, monographs and doctoral dissertations count 5. The figures are weighted for co-authorship by dividing the publications scores by the number of contributing authors.

<sup>18</sup> The exception is Table 4.1 which shows the average by years, only including affiliated scholars for the separates years. The total average for the period is then 4.6 article equivalents for the five-year period, which is somewhat higher than the non-adjusted averages in Tables 4.2 and 4.4 (4.1 article equivalents for the five-year period).

## References

Kyvik, Svein (1991): *Productivity in Academia. Scientific Publishing at Norwegian Universities*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.


Norges forskningsråd (2009), *Rettsvitenskapelig forskning i Norge. En evaluering*. Oslo, Norges forskningsråd.

# Appendix 1 Journals

Table A 1 Journals in which the included scholars have published, 2004-2008

Journal title	Level 1	Level 2	Total
Agora : Journal for metafysisk spekulasjon	17		17
Analecta Husserliana :The Yearbook of Phenomenological Research	2		2
Analysis		1	1
Ancient Philosophy		5	5
Arr. Idéhistorisk tidsskrift	32		32
British Journal of Aesthetics		1	1
DIN: Religionsvitenskapelig tidsskrift	1		1
Edda. Nordisk tidsskrift for litteraturforskning		2	2
Endeavour	1		1
Ethics and Information Technology	5		5
Etikk i praksis	2		2
European Journal of Palliative Care	5		5
Foundations of Science	1		1
Genomics, Society and Policy	1		1
Heimen	1		1
Historisk Tidsskrift		1	1
Hugur : tímarit um heimspeki	2		2
Human IT	1		1
Ibsen Studies		1	1
Ideas in History	1		1
Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics	1		1
Journal of Human Rights	1		1
Journal of Literary Theory	1		1
Journal of Medical Ethics		1	1
Journal of Military Ethics	1		1
Journal of Philosophical Research (JPR)	1	1	2
Jussens venner	1		1
Kirke og kultur	2		2
Kritisk juss	1		1
Kunst og kultur	1		1
Kvinneforskning	1		1
Lecture Notes in Computer Science	1		1
Literary & Linguistic Computing	1		1
Lov og rett: Norsk juridisk tidsskrift	2		2
Materialisten. Tidsskrift for forskning, fagkritikk og teoretisk debatt	1		1
Metaphilosophy		1	1
Metaphysica	1		1
Minds and Machines	1		1
Nordisk Pedagogik	1		1
Norsk Filosofisk Tidsskrift	32		32
Norsk tidsskrift for migrasjonsforskning	1		1
Noûs		1	1
Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift	8		8
Omsorg: Nordisk tidsskrift for Palliativ Medisin	1		1
Osiris	2		2
Palliative Medicine : A Multiprofessional Journal	2		2
Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige	1		1
Phenomenology & Practice	1		1
Philosophical Perspectives	1		1
Philosophisches Jahrbuch		1	1
Philosophy		2	2
Phronesis : A Journal for Ancient Philosophy	2	1	3
Retfærd. Nordisk Juridisk Tidsskrift		1	1
Sats: Nordic Journal of Philosophy	8		8
Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research	2		2
Simone de Beauvoir Studies	1		1
Sosiologi i dag	1		1
Sosiologisk Tidsskrift	1		1
Synthese		1	1
The European Legacy	1		1
Theoria	1		1
Tidsskrift för politisk filosofi	1		1
Tidsskrift for Den norske lægeforening	10		10
Tidsskrift for erstatningsrett	1		1
Tidsskrift for kjønnsforskning	1		1
Tidsskrift for rettsvitenskap		2	2
Vigiliae Christianae, Supplements		1	1
Zeitschrift für Palliativmedizin	2		2
Årbok / Fortidsminneforeningen	1		1
<b>Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>197</b>

Source: Frida. The sample includes publications by the 104 scholars selected for the evaluation.



This publication may be downloaded from  
[www.forskningsradet.no/publikasjoner](http://www.forskningsradet.no/publikasjoner)

**The Research Council of Norway**  
P.O. Box 2700 St. Hanshaugen  
NO-0131 Oslo

Telephone: +47 22 03 70 00  
Telefax: +47 22 03 70 01  
[post@rcn.no](mailto:post@rcn.no)  
[www.rcn.no](http://www.rcn.no)

Cover design: Design et cetera AS  
Printing: Allkopi  
Number of copies: 450

Oslo, September 2010

ISBN 978-82-12-02823-4 (printed version)  
ISBN 978-82-12-02824-1 (pdf)