



SAES

Société des Anglicistes de l'Enseignement
Supérieur

**SOCIÉTÉ DES ANGLICISTES
DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR**

<http://saesfrance.org>

**WHITE PAPER ON RESEARCH
IN ENGLISH STUDIES**

Editor: Anne Dunan-Page
SAES Vice-President for Research
Aix-Marseille University, Institut Universitaire de France

Contributors: Christian Auer (University of Strasbourg), Catherine Bernard (Université Paris Diderot), Susan Finding (University of Poitiers), Manuel Jobert (Université Jean-Moulin Lyon 3), Guyonne Leduc (Université Charles de Gaulle Lille 3), Laure Gardelle (ENS Lyon), Mathilde Rogez (Université Toulouse Jean-Jaurès), Clément Oudart (Université Paris-Sorbonne), Michel Van der Yeught (Aix-Marseille University)

June 2016

English version: MIRREL, Aix-Marseille University, January 2017

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------|
| Acknowledgments | |
| Foreword | p. 4 |
| 1. The White Paper's contextual framework | |
| 1.1 The SAES | p. 5 |
| 1.2 Levels of organisation in English Studies research | p. 5 |
| 1.3 Objectives and methodology | p. 6 |
| 2. The learned societies (<i>Catherine Bernard and Michel Van der Yeught</i>) | |
| 2.1 Overview | p. 9 |
| 2.2 The general profile of the learned societies in English Studies | p. 9 |
| 2.3 Conclusion | p. 14 |
| 3. The research units: data | |
| 3.1 Overview | p. 15 |
| 3.2 Structuration and content of research (<i>Laure Gardelle and Guyonne Leduc</i>) | p. 15 |
| 3.3 Funding and means (<i>Anne Dunan-Page and Manuel Jobert</i>) | p. 23 |
| 3.4 Training programmes and doctoral students (<i>Christian Auer and Susan Finding</i>) | p. 26 |
| 3.5 Research publications and dissemination (<i>Clément Oudart and Mathilde Rogez</i>) | p. 31 |
| 4. Analytical approach | |
| 4.1 Interdisciplinarity and interculturality | p. 36 |
| 4.2 Structuration and calls for papers (CFPs) | p. 38 |
| 4.3 Research environment | p. 40 |
| 4.4 Publications, research products and dissemination | p. 41 |
| Conclusion | p. 44 |
| Appendices | |
| 1. Members of the SAES Research Commission (2016) | p. 47 |
| 2. Questionnaire addressed to the chairs of SAES-affiliated learned societies | p. 48 |
| 3. Questionnaire addressed to the directors of research units | p. 51 |
| 4. Responding SAES-affiliated learned societies | p. 56 |
| 5. Responding research units | p. 58 |
| 6. Journals associated with responding affiliated learned societies | p. 61 |
| 7. Journals associated with responding research units (units in alphabetical order) | p. 64 |
| 8. Journals associated with responding research units (journals in alphabetical order) | p. 68 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The White Paper on research is a piece of collective work produced by the Research Commission of the SAES (Society for English in Higher Education). We are grateful to the President and members of the SAES Board, particularly to Carle Bonafous-Murat (Vice-President for Research 2008–2014), Pierre Lurbe (President), Wilfrid Rotgé (Vice-President for Training) and Martine Yvernault (Vice-President for Scientific Affairs); to the President and members of the Board of the AFEA (French Association for American Studies), notably Sylvie Bauer (Vice-President for Research) and Nathalie Caron (President); to the scientific delegates of the HCERES (Higher Council for the Evaluation of Research and Higher Education) from the Department for the Evaluation of Research, Martine Schuwer and Laurence Talairach-Vielmas; to the members of the Board of the 11th Section¹ of the CNU (National Council of Universities), notably Agnès Celle (Vice-President of Section 11, college A) and Jean Viviès (SAES President 2008–2012 and President of Section 11); to Professor François Laroque (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3) and Professor Jean Kempf (Université Lumière Lyon 2), who wrote the previous white papers; and to all the directors of the research units and presidents of the learned societies who accepted to respond to the respective surveys.

¹ The National Council of Universities (Conseil national des universités/CNU) is a national body which represents academic disciplines in French higher education and research institutions. In January 2017, there are 87 registered disciplinary sections and Section 11 represents English Studies. (Translator's note)

FOREWORD

The White Paper on Research of the SAES synthesises available information on the research units and learned societies that conduct research in English Studies. This discipline gathers and enriches the body of knowledge that is harnessed for a deeper knowledge and understanding of English-speaking communities. Notably, it studies their language, literature, history, culture, civilisation and activities, both in their unity and diversity.

Because it occupies a unique position at the crossroads where all the domain's actors meet, the SAES wished to publish a White Paper as early as 2001. Its purpose was "to take stock of research in English Studies and to establish a cartography of the domain". The paper was edited by François Laroque (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3, Vice-President of the SAES), under the presidency of Michel Morel. It contained an overview of 21 disciplines and thematic fields classified by periods (from the Middle Ages to the 20th century), by geographic areas (the United States, Great Britain, Ireland, the Commonwealth) and disciplines (literature, civilisation, linguistics, stylistics, translation studies, history of ideas, information technologies, English for Specific Purposes, didactics...).

<http://saesfrance.org/recherche/commission-de-la-recherche-de-la-saes/recherche-etats-des-lieux-sur-langlistique-et-recommandations-de-la-saes/livre-blanc-sur-la-recherche-angliciste-en-france-en-2001/>

Also in 2001, the Report on North American Studies in France was published under the editorship of Jean Kempf (Université Lumière - Lyon 2).

<http://saesfrance.org/recherche/commission-de-la-recherche-de-la-saes/recherche-etats-des-lieux-sur-langlistique-et-recommandations-de-la-saes/rapport-sur-les-etudes-nord-americaines-en-france/>

Over the last fifteen years, wide-ranging institutional evolutions have included the creation of evaluation and means agencies (notably the ANR/National Research Agency), the Act granting more management freedom to universities, the development of European calls for projects (CFPs), the Programme for investments for the future, the structuration of the EPSCP (public scientific, cultural and professional establishments) and the rise of digital technologies. These changes encouraged the SAES to envisage a revised version of the White Paper. However, because these evolutions have been so far-reaching, it proved inconvenient to use the former template in its identical form. This White Paper therefore adopts new organisational guidelines which are detailed in Part 1.

After 2012, under President Jean Viviès, the Research Commission of the SAES was chaired by Carle Bonafous-Murat, and it examined what could be the function, outline and purpose of the next White Paper. Exchange of views on that line continued in 2014, under President Pierre Lurbe and with Anne Dunan-Page acting as chair of the Research Commission. From then on, other contributors were introduced in the preparation of the document. They included the scientific delegates of the HCERES, the Board of Section 11 of the CNU, the learned societies affiliated to the SAES together with the AFEA whose Vice-President for Research is an ex-officio member of the Research Commission of the SAES (see Appendix 1).

Thus, the purpose of the White Paper on Research is to propose the first stage of a stock-taking effort that will lead to more focused and fine-tuned approaches thanks to the routine updating of questionnaires and data. It is distinct from a mission report and its aim is not to present conclusions or put forward a set of proposals for public policy. Its objectives are to equip the SAES with a piloting and analytical instrument and to underline how English Studies have taken up the challenge of the recent evolutions in research in an increasingly competitive environment. Finally, it highlights the structuring function of our learned societies in enhancing the visibility of research in English Studies.

PART 1

THE WHITE PAPER'S CONTEXTUAL FRAMEWORK

1.1 The SAES

The Society for English in Higher Education (SAES) is a non-profit association founded in compliance with the Act of 1901 on associations. It was established in 1960 and has some 2,400 members who teach English or conduct research in English Studies in higher education. The SAES regroups 28 specialised learned societies (see Appendix 4). It is composed of a Board of 10 elected members, of a Research Commission and of a Training Commission. Every year, and jointly with the AFEA (<http://www.afea.fr>), it awards a Prize for Research following a selection process carried out by a jury. Since 2014, the SAES has sponsored its own journal, *Angles: French Perspectives on the Anglophone World* (<http://angles.saesfrance.org>). Of late, the SAES has established its own doctoral college and, jointly with the AFEA, it proposes grants for doctoral theses and HDRs (the degree of Habilitation to Direct Research). Besides, it has its own documentary holdings stocked at the library of the University of Avignon and Vaucluse territory (<http://bu.univ-avignon.fr/collections/fonds-specialises/fonds-saes/>). It is enriched every year by about one hundred books published by the members of the association. Since its inception, the SAES has staged an annual conference. The association is affiliated to ESSE, *The European Society for the Study of English* (<http://essenglish.org>).

1.2 Levels of organisation in English Studies research

English Studies are characterised by the diversity of the disciplinary domains they cover and they are at the crossroads of several types of organisations: on the one hand, permanent structures (research units, learned societies, thematic research groups and networks) and non-permanent ones (research groupings [GDR], scientific interest groups [GIS], research federations...) on the other. Moreover, there are teams involved in funded projects which are not supposed to extend their activities beyond pre-determined contracts.

Both types may collaborate, for example when research units develop axes or programmes that result from provisional answers to calls for projects (CFPs). These various structuring levels are complemented by international collaborations and partnerships between research units (international research groups [GDRI], Hubert Curien partnerships [PHC]...).

1.2.1 Permanent structuring elements in France

- Research units in institutions (hosting teams and mixed research units);
- National research networks and groups in English Studies (e.g. “Culture and Religion in English-speaking countries”, “Network for the European development of the history of Young America”...);
- CADIST (Centre for the acquisition and dissemination of scientific and technical information) on the Languages, Literatures and Civilisations of the English-speaking worlds (universities Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3 and Charles de Gaulle - Lille 3);
- Learned societies whose purpose is to federate our professional sector: SAES and AFEA;
- 28 specialised learned societies affiliated to the SAES;
- Other national learned societies.

1.2.2 Non-permanent structuring elements

- GIS and GDR (e.g. GIS “Institut du Genre” [Genre Institute], GIS “Institut des Amériques” [Institute of the Americas], GDR “Mondes Britanniques” [British Worlds]);
- Research federations that include English Studies units;

- National or European funded projects (including ANR/ERC).

1.3 Objectives and methodology

The objectives of the White Paper on Research are:

- to collect for the first time quantitative data from permanent structures – research units and learned societies – in the domain of English Studies, without distinguishing between geographic areas, historical periods or disciplines;
- to provide the public with a cartography of the field for analytical and comparison purposes;
- to give an overview of research in English Studies to assess its impact and evolutions;
- to specify the role of learned societies as structuring factors for research;
- to identify the assets and present risks in the domain of English Studies and to offer food for thought on strategic perspectives.

The document is on open access on the SAES website and is aimed at SAES members and affiliated learned societies. It is also open to national and international associations (Groupement des Associations de Langues et d'Études Étrangères [Group of associations in foreign languages and studies], ESSE...). Besides, the White Paper will be forwarded to the Ministry of national education, higher education and research, to research organisations, to the ATHENA Alliance, to the Cléo (Centre for open electronic edition), to Section 11 of the CNU, to the CPU (Commission of university presidents), to the IUF (Institut Universitaire de France [French University Institute]), and to the departments of English Studies in French-speaking countries. A partly translated version in English will be made available for international circulation.

The White Paper's format is based on two questionnaires.

a- A questionnaire addressed to the presidents of the specialised learned societies affiliated to the SAES (see Appendix 2)

This questionnaire was drawn up in 2015 by the SAES Research Commission (which included three acting presidents of learned societies at the time). It was put online through the *Survey Monkey* polling application. It comprises 15 questions on the societies' *modus operandi*, international partnerships, initiatives supporting Master's and doctoral students, publications, etc. It is the first time a survey of that type has been specifically targeted to all specialised societies in English Studies.

The link to the questionnaire was directly transferred to the mailing lists of the presidents of the SAES-affiliated learned societies. When the questionnaire's answers were processed, there were 27 affiliated societies (a 28th society joined the group following the survey). The rate of answers was 100%. Although responding took time and writing effort, the high rate indicates that the societies were in need of a cartography of the field of their activities. Most answers were drawn up by the societies' boards of directors and voted in their general meetings.

Data were processed by Catherine Bernard (Université Paris Diderot, the President of the Société d'Études Anglaises Contemporaines [Society for Contemporary English Studies]) and Michel Van der Yeught (Aix-Marseille University, the President of the Groupe d'Étude et de Recherche en Anglais de Spécialité [Group for Studies and Research on English for Specific Purposes]) and the results are presented in Part 2 of the Paper.

b- A questionnaire addressed to the directors of the mono- or multi-section research units where the CNU's Section 11 teachers and teacher-researchers collaborate (see Appendix 3)

The main difficulty in this case comes from the lack of a comprehensive data base on research units hosting English Studies scholars and activities. Starting from the SAES directory of

research units and the various evaluation missions carried out by the HCERES,² 77 research units (hosting teams and mixed units) were identified and classified into three categories to facilitate processing:

- mono-section research units (only composed of teachers and teacher-researchers who belong to the CNU's 11th Section);
- multi-section research units composed of a majority of teachers and teacher-researchers who belong to the CNU's 11th Section (over 50% of the total number of their permanent acting members);
- multi-section research units composed of a minority of teachers and teacher-researchers who belong to the CNU's 11th Section (less than 50% of the total number of their permanent acting members).

The questionnaire was drawn up following a list of questions compiled by the previous Research Commission; it features a total of 25 questions. The aim was not to make it exhaustive, but rather to achieve a mix of questions that was limited enough to be processed within reasonable deadlines, and yet wide enough to cover the main fields of our activities.

The questionnaire was first tested on three directors of research units and some headings and questions were reformulated. Then it was put online and the link was forwarded to the 67 representatives of the SAES local branches for dissemination to the directors of their institutions' research units, notably to non-English scholars. Finally, the questionnaire was circulated through the mailing lists of the SAES and AFEA. A four-month responding time was proposed (June-September 2015) and individual reminders were sent until December 2015.

The Research Commission identified four vast domains that cover the main structuring factors of research in English Studies:

- Research structuration and content (8 questions)

The purpose of this section is to clarify how research is carried out in English Studies and to assess the proportion of transversal projects and the development of interdisciplinary research. Other points of interest include the structuring functions of research networks, national and international CFPs and the role played by units within institutional projects.

- Funding and means (5 questions)

The purpose of this section is to quantify the financial aid received by teacher-researchers and unit directors within their respective missions and to assess its impact on the development of research projects.

- Training programmes and doctoral students (5 questions)

The purpose of this section is to collect data on master's and doctoral students in English Studies over the last three years (2013, 2014 and 2015), especially on the development of international training programmes. Besides, it assesses the impact of the preparation for the recruitment competitive exams leading to secondary education.

- Research publications and dissemination (7 questions)

The purpose of this section is to compile the main publications produced by researchers and teacher-researchers in English Studies, to assess the proportion of personal and collective contributions to the "products" of research, and to gather data on the development of digital means of information and on incentive policies to develop open access.

45 research unit directors then responded online to the questionnaire (see Appendix 5).

² Besides, the ATHENA Alliance has developed an Observatory of Human and Social Sciences. This portal notably offers a directory of research units that can be updated by the units themselves (SHSlab').
<http://www.observatoire-shs.org/unites-de-recherche?discipline=2699>.

Units can be classified as follows:

| | Mono-section units (CNU Section 11) | Multi-section units (majority of Section 11 members) | Multi-section units (minority of Section 11 members) |
|--|--|--|--|
| Total number of units identified by the Research Commission | 18 | 11 | 48 |
| Number of responding units | 18 | 8 | 19 |
| Percentage of responding units | 100% | 72.7% | 39.6% |

Answers were deemed representative because all mono-section units and over than 70% of multi-section units with a majority of English Studies scholars responded to the survey. The directors of multi-section units where Section 11 is not statistically predominant were less sensitive to a campaign initiated by the SAES (although some of these units may host up to 20 Section 11 members depending on their sizes). Yet, nearly 40% of them responded and their feedback was included in the data-processing operations.

The 45 responses were then processed and dealt with by four pairs of Research Commission colleagues. Their results are presented in Part 3 of this document.

PART 2

THE LEARNED SOCIETIES

(Catherine Bernard and Michel Van der Yeught)

2.1 Overview

This synthetic part presents the main characteristic features of the twenty-seven learned societies in English Studies that have responded to the questionnaire (see Appendix 4). It details the factual components of their profiles and examines their policies in terms of research and recognition.

2.2 General profile of the learned societies in English Studies

2.2.1 Historical and legal profiles

Most learned societies were founded in the late 20th century. The oldest one dates back to 1970 and the most recent to 2013 (a society devoted to biographical studies was established in 2015 and it has not been possible to include its data in the document). The distribution of the societies' founding dates over successive decades attests to a sustained trend of dynamic creativity. An average of seven or eight societies were created every ten years, except in the 1990s (only two), and eight since 2000.

All learned societies are non-profit associations registered under the status provided for by the Act of 1901 on associations. The "Société d'Études des Pratiques et Théories en Traduction" (SEPTET [Society for the Studies of Practices and Theories in Translation]) is an exception to the rule and has a special local status specific to the Alsace-Lorraine jurisdiction.

2.2.2 Thematic profiles

The societies' themes of study and research cover a wide range of vast and diversified domains. Overall, they may be classified following six main determining elements: historical or aesthetic periods (the Middle Ages, the Victorian and Edwardian Era, the Romantic period...), geographical areas (Commonwealth, Canada, Scotland, Ireland...), authors (William Shakespeare, Joseph Conrad, Virginia Woolf...), disciplinary sectors (civilisation/cultural studies, stylistics, linguistics, translation, didactics...), media of expression (cinema, spoken language, texts and images, theatre...), specific subjects (women and genres, travelling...).

Over time, increasing subject segmentation has generated more and more specific theme slots. Linguistic studies have expanded towards spoken language and English for Specific Purposes. Media of expression, once mostly textual, have gradually incorporated theatre, cinema, pictures... Literary studies have focused on certain themes (travelling...). The resulting scientific mesh gains in density and is the vehicle of complementary dialogues between societies, even if some go as far as specifying the limits of their areas of interest in relation to others.

2.2.3 Number and characteristics of members

Societies number highly variable volumes of members. The smallest ones count from twenty to thirty, and the largest up to 200. Data naturally depend on the vastness of the object of study. Societies focusing on one single author generally number fewer members, although the "Société Française Shakespeare" (SFS) (French Society for Shakespearean Studies) stands out as an exception with 120 members. The average volume of members in English Studies societies is about 85.

Some societies feature a significant number of expatriate members. For example, the “Centre de Recherches et d’Études en Civilisation Britannique” (CRECIB) (Centre for Research and Study on British Civilisation) numbers 40 foreign members out of a membership of 200, i.e. 20% of its total. Similarly, the “Association Française d’Études Canadiennes” (AFEC) (French Association for Canadian Studies) counts one third of non-French members. These data suggest that these societies enjoy international recognition as reference groups in their domains.

An overwhelming majority of learned societies in English Studies (89%) welcome non-academic members.

2.2.4 Partnerships

Most societies have partnership agreements with their national and international scientific environment. As many as 63% are related to organisations, networks and research groups, both at national (89%) and international (74%) levels. International ties naturally connect them to partners in English-speaking territories (Great Britain, North America...), but significant relations also link them up with non-English-speaking countries (Italy, Germany...), or involve supranational organisations, mostly European ones.

Partnerships vary in nature, but mainstream ones are built around one-off collaborations on specific projects (e.g. publications) or regular conferences. Interpersonal relations generally play a key role in these ventures. Forms of collaboration may include: mutual invitations, exchanging information, co-creating e-journals (e.g. “Association des anglicistes pour les études de Langue Orale dans l’Enseignement Supérieur, secondaire et élémentaire” [ALOES]), crossed participations in peer-review committees (“Société d’Études et de Recherche sur le Cinéma Anglophone” [SERCIA]), summer universities (SEPTET), networks of sister societies (“Association pour la Recherche en Didactique de l’Anglais et en Acquisition” [ARDAA]) or of international correspondents (“Groupe d’Étude et de Recherche en Anglais de Spécialité” [GERAS]).

2.2.5 Organisation of scientific activities

Colloquia or lectures are the preferred forms of scientific activities for all societies (100%) although conditions may vary to a large extent. These events may either take place as part of annual institutional conferences (often that of the SAES), or during annual or twice-yearly symposia; or again by combining both options.

Many societies set up workshops in other conferences in France (those of SAES, among others) and abroad (notably ESSE’s). Other formats are widely used: seminars (41%), study days, doctoral sessions, lectures and workgroups.

2.2.6 Financial support to research events

Up to 78% of societies provide research events in their fields with financial support, but their means remain modest. Contributions over €1,000 are uncommon (“Société Française d’Études Victoriennes et Édouardiennes” [SFEVE], CRECIB) and they are applied to major events such as conferences. In most cases, financial help is a one-off instance and ranges between €100 and €500 (funding provisions to publish conference proceedings, to finance workgroups or conference participants...).

2.2.7 Research and recognition policy

2.2.7.1 Policy regarding master’s and doctoral students

The level of the societies’ commitment to the benefit of master’s and doctoral students is strikingly high.

- 47% contribute to finance the missions of master’s students in their domains;
- 42% contribute to finance the missions of doctoral students in their domains;
- 23% have created master’s awards to promote upcoming research in their domains;

- 18% have created thesis awards.

These data illustrate the engagement of societies to make sure future generations will take over research as well as their long-term investment to promote their scientific domains. These promotion policies imply that students are guided and supported during their research.

Some societies offer thesis awards. This is the case of the “Société d’Étude du Commonwealth” (SEPC [Society for Commonwealth Studies]), of the AFEC, of the “Société d’Étude de la Littérature de Voyage du monde Anglophone” (SELVA [Society for the Study of Travel Writing in the English-speaking World]), of the “Société d’Études Anglo-Américaines des XVII^e et XVIII^e Siècles” (SEAA XVII-XVIII [Society for the Anglo-American Studies of the 17th and 18th Centuries]).

Financial support for this upcoming research is crucial and this explains the large number of master’s and thesis awards that societies have initiated. Similarly, travel bursaries are made available for mature students who intend to do research at archive holdings, libraries abroad or to carry out field work research.

Specific juries have been nominated to award these grants. They promote the innovative aspects of the research and students have to write a detailed report when the mission comes to an end.

Doctoral students are also encouraged to present their work in the annual conferences organised by societies. Seminars are often specifically opened for them. Several societies have initiated doctoral sessions to bring together doctoral students who are otherwise dispersed over many units.

These support operations come as complements to similar initiatives within units and Doctoral Schools (DS); they also add up to the doctoral grants jointly allocated every year by the SAES and the AFEA. Societies are not supposed to collaborate with DSs; still they take an active part in training by encouraging doctoral students to present papers in their conferences, by opening specific venues for their scientific conversations and by providing financial support. Societies are indeed major supporting actors of English Studies research in France. In the context of doctoral studies they provide a crucial milieu where young researchers can progress in various environments: conferences, workshops, doctoral seminars, publishing (journals, collective works).

2.2.7.2 Editorial policy

Most societies have created their own journals to disseminate their members’ papers in France and abroad (see Appendix 6). These journals have played a key role in developing the research domains which are specific to English Studies. In many cases, they started when the society was founded and many have existed for almost 40 years. This is the case of *Études canadiennes-Canadian Studies*, AFEC’s journal which was launched in 1975, and of *Études stylistiques anglaises*, the journal of the “Société de Stylistique Anglaise” (SSA [Society for English Stylistics]), established in 1978.

The journals’ publishing periods vary a lot. Many publish two issues per year, but others have opted for less regular releases which are linked to specific activities (conferences, seminars).

85% of journals have a reviewing committee.

80% of journals have an international reviewing committee.

These journals respect the standards of international scientific publishing. They have set up reviewing committees in charge of assessing papers. These follow a double-blind review process and the editorial teams make sure papers are properly edited and improved as the case may be. In addition to reviewing committees, most journals nominate international scientific committees. Their purpose is to strengthen the journals’ international scientific authority and visibility, and to help them conform more closely to international scientific requirements. Thanks to these provisions, it may safely be assumed that these journals enjoy full legitimacy on

the international publishing scene. Finally, these journals keep an active scientific watch by publishing *varia* issues, special issues and large sections devoted to book reviews.

The journals' editorial policy does not stop at the publication of their members' papers. They also attract work from foreign colleagues who are informed of the journals' news updates through CFPs disseminated by large international research networks. Because of the intensification of their international reach, most journals publish a lot in English. Some of them are English-only publications, e.g. the *French Review of English Linguistics* produced by the "Association des Linguistes Anglicistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur" (ALAES [Association of English Linguists in Higher Education]). The SAES's own journal, *Angles: French Perspectives on the Anglophone World*, is also 100% in English.

Most of these journals started as print publications, but an increasing number are migrating towards the digital revues.org platform or are already hosted on the Persée platform, e.g. SEAA XVII-XVIII. Other journals have opted for online publications on their own websites (e.g. SERCIA). Some are also accessible on the ProQuest (Europe and North America) and Informat (South Pacific) websites, e.g. papers produced by SEPC. The digitalisation of publication supports improves the journals' visibility, particularly among international and non-academic readers.

To protect their print issues, several journals have opted for a two-year embargo period before open access. Others have directly gone online-only with no embargo. The latter choice requires funding to be permanent and independent of sales. This business model may be recommended as a way to ensure the immediate dissemination of the most recent papers produced by the societies' members. Still, it makes journals more heavily dependent on societies' financing.

Additionally, numerous societies publish papers within collections of general or specialised publishing houses (Belin, Garnier in the case of SEPTET, L'Harmattan, Michel Houdiard...). These issues play a vital role as go-betweens connecting state-of-the-art research and the general public and they are instrumental in spreading research results further afield.

12% of societies publish collections within an academic publishing house;
75% of societies disseminate their works through other publishing channels.

Finally, of special interest is research-blog publishing on the hypotheses.org platform, e.g. "Société Anglophone sur le Genre et les Femmes" (SAGeF [Anglophone Society on Genres and Women]).

2.2.7.3 Scientific recognition and partnerships

Learned societies collaborate closely with research units (mixed research units and hosting teams), notably within the annual conferences they organise and in the research seminars they implement.

All the conferences organised by societies are international and they are widely open to participants who are not society members. This policy enhances the international visibility of societies.

A very large number of societies have set up partnerships with research institutes and learned societies in France and abroad. This illustrates their capacity to weave a dense research mesh in the domain of English Studies. Among historical partners, we can mention the "Institut des Amériques" (Institute of the Americas) which is associated with AFEC, and numerous reputable North American and British societies: e.g. The North American Society for the Study of Romanticism, associated with the "Société d'Études du Romantisme Anglais" (SERA [Society for the Study of English Romanticism]) or The Association for Scottish Literary Studies which is linked to the "Société Française d'Études Écossaises" (SFEEc [French society for Scottish Studies]). The SFEVE is currently establishing ties with The British Association of Victorian Studies and The North American Victorian Studies Association.

An increasing number of societies are also members of European and international networks and they routinely collaborate with partner societies abroad. Examples include The European Federation of Associations and Centres for Irish Studies for the “Société Française d’Études Irlandaises” (SOFEIR [French society for Irish Studies]); The European Shakespeare Research Association and The International Shakespeare Association for SFS; The European Network of British Area Studies for CRECIB; The International Virginia Woolf Society for the “Société d’Études Woolfiennes” (SEW [Society for Woolfian Studies]); Contemporary Drama in English (a German society that works with the “Recherches sur les Arts Dramatiques Anglophones Contemporains” (RADAC [Research on Contemporary Dramatic Arts in English])); The British Society of Eighteenth-Century Studies for SEAA XVII-XVIII. In the future, the SAES and its affiliated societies will fine-tune queries to collect more accurate data on co-authored papers as indicators of these international developments.

Some societies have also developed networks of international correspondents. This is the case of GERAS in the domain of research in English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Most societies are also *de facto* associated with ESSE activities; some organise workshops in ESSE’s biennial conferences. As may be expected, the partnership mesh includes societies which work on other area-related studies. For example, in the field of Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP), GERAS collaborates closely with associations of French researchers in German and Spanish languages and in didactics.

These institutional and scientific relationships are evidence of the excellent visibility now enjoyed abroad by French research in English Studies. International correspondent networks are being built and the key role played by the scientific committees of the societies’ journals in densifying our research mesh is to be emphasised (see above).

Several societies have also initiated actions targeted at a wider audience. In that perspective, they act as mediators between high-level research and the general public. This is notably the case of RADAC, SFS, SEAC and of the Thomas Hardy Society whose journal releases unpublished translations of texts by Thomas Hardy in open access.

91% of societies welcome non-academic members.

Quite logically, some societies have also developed actions specifically aimed at their secondary education colleagues to share with them the latest advances in research. This is the case of ALOES which schedules regular study days for these colleagues.

Others take part in summer universities, such as SEPTET which also regularly contributes to the World Congress on Translation Studies.

To make sure reliable information reaches an ever more diversified public, 80% of societies have created their own websites which update scientific news (calls for papers, editorial watch...).

2.3 Conclusion

The learned societies in English Studies have been formed over the last fifty years at a regular and continuous pace. More than half a dozen have appeared since the turn of the century. Their average memberships range between 50 and 100 (with the largest featuring 200 members or more) and they enjoy the Association Act 1901 status. In English Studies proper, they cover a wide range of increasingly specific subjects. They keep close ties with national and international research groups and weave a dense mesh of multi-type collaborations: conferences, publications, invitations. On a modest scale but with a committed determination, they contribute to the funding of scientific events and publications.

The learned societies in English Studies have been successful in implementing an integrated support policy for research: they offer decisive help to young researchers (at Master's and doctoral levels), they develop international partnerships, they structure their editorial policies and build high-performance information tools. They operate as key partners for research units (mixed research units and hosting teams) with whom they regularly co-organise conferences. They take an active part in the international circulation of the results of the units' members. They also contribute significantly to the support of young researchers, especially in terms of international mobility.

Overall, the role played by the learned societies proves crucial as showcases of the specific advances of French research in the culture, language and societies of the English-speaking world. This domain is internationally strategic for the literature and human sciences sector as English, and English-speaking countries in more general terms, occupy leading positions in today's globalised world. The international reach and recognition of French research as a whole benefits strongly from the societies' activities as evidenced by the increasing visibility of their specialised journals and their substantial international partnerships.

PART 3

THE RESEARCH UNITS: DATA

3.1 Overview

The purpose of this section is to present the data collected from 45 research directors who accepted to answer our questionnaire. It follows the survey's framework mentioned above. Each subsection opens on a General Summary and then goes on detailing the answers to the main questions.³

3.2 Structuration and content of research (*Laure Gardelle and Guyonne Leduc*)

General Summary

Research in English Studies is generally conducted within hosting teams ("Équipe d'Accueil", EA). Mixed research units ("Unité mixte de recherche", UMR) are far less numerous since just one is devoted to the studies of CNU Section 11, even if scholars in English Studies are members of multi-section UMRs.

Most of the domain's units are organised around research "axes". These are combined with general subjects which are wide-embracing enough to allow for collective work in the unit and occasionally for one or two transversal programmes. These subjects basically deal with the study of the English-speaking worlds in the general sense, interdisciplinarity, concepts, and sometimes corpora. Contrary to some other domains, most Section 11 units therefore contain no internal teams. Inter-axes research is federated by subjects and half of the units show no other form of transversality. In multi-section units, axes and transversal or "transverse" programmes are proportionally more numerous and they materialise under the form of common events and participation in funded projects.

Within units structured by axes, general subjects and/or transverse programmes, the field is characterised by the diversity of events on offer. Seminars often take place twice a month and they represent the major part of the work carried out in the units, notably in multi-section ones. Yet, most units have adopted the following formats:

a- study days (fewer than 20 presentations) are more formal events than seminars but they face little constraints in terms of funding and organisation;

b- conferences take place at least once a year to materialise the visibility of the units, especially at the international level.

Study days and conferences are the formats of choice for collective work in the domain of English Studies and they generate numerous collective works (or subject-specific journal issues). Half the responding units do not spontaneously mention other forms of recurring events, except events such as "doctoral sessions".

Of note, the workshop model is not a familiar format in the field.

Interactions with the economic, social and cultural environment are widespread, especially in Section 11 units. Yet, they preferably emerge in one-off, rather than recurring collaborations, except when partnerships are explicitly mentioned in external funding schemes. The most frequently cited partners are national and university theatres, town and university libraries, festivals, museums and cultural facilities. Interactions with economic partners are still few and

³ For clarity's sake, "Paris" includes universities situated in the City of Paris and in the Paris area.

far between, but translation, translation studies and audiovisual practices have an edge in that respect.

Two thirds of Section 11 units are directly impacted by institutional policies geared towards interdisciplinarity, but by far most respondents mention projects linked to sectors such as literature, languages, human and social sciences. Research projects in mono-section units which relate to science, medicine/health or law are still rare. Finally, it seems that when a project, in its very unity, is tackled through a plurality of methodological approaches, it favours the development of interdisciplinary collaborations. Examples include genre studies, medieval studies or the study of cognitive systems in languages.

Forty-five per cent of units declare they are directly influenced by external calls for projects, whether local or national ones (notably in the case of ANR projects). Yet, only a minority says they respond “on a regular basis”. When they face rejects, few units seize the opportunity to create a structuring axis (which means that scientific projects are determined by submitted projects). The rate of failures in ANR applications is seen as a discouraging factor by an overwhelming number of units. Most are keen to propose submissions and they have submitted or are about to submit projects. However, when submissions are rejected, related projects lack in structuring force and carriers do not wish to apply again because of the procedural red tape they anticipate.

International projects (such as European Research Contracts, ERC) only exert marginal influence on the scientific projects of units, both mono- and multi-section ones. A number of directors observe that their subjects are “inadequately” related to external CFPs, which means that structural decision-making at research-unit level sometimes seems to be counterproductive to project submission.

Some directors think that priority has to be given to units, to their projects and structural subject options. They favour a bottom-up logic rather than a top-down obligation to structure their work following the norms imposed by CFPs in a competitive environment.

3.2.1 Membership of units (question 1)

Out of 45 units that responded to question 1, 18 (40%) are exclusively Section 11; 27 (60%) are multi-section.

Among the latter, 8 (30%) comprise a majority of scholars in English Studies, and in 19 (70%) scholars in English Studies number fewer than 50% of the unit’s total membership of teacher-researchers.

3.2.2 Analysis of the 18 mono-section units (i.e. 40%) (11th Section of CNU)

17 units are hosting teams (Équipes d’Accueil, EA) and one is a Mixed Research Unit, UMR (Paris).

Among them, only 3 units (16.66%) work on one research field only: one in literature (Paris), two in civilisation studies (of which, 1 in Paris).

2 units (11.11%), out of Paris, combine literature and civilisation studies.

7 units (38.88%) complement these two disciplines with linguistics.

6 units (33.33%) complement these three disciplines with picture studies (1), with phonetics and cinema studies (1), with visual arts and history (1), with translation and cinema studies (1), with translation studies and English for Specific Purposes (1), with translation studies and a cultural area (Ireland) (1).

Only one team (in Paris) (5.55%) focuses on one period, the Middle Ages.

3.2.3 Analysis of the 27 multi-section units (i.e. 60%)

UMRs are more numerous in this group (6 vs 21 hosting teams).

As a rule, Section 11 teacher-researchers are a minority in their units. Out of 26 responding teams, only 6 count at least 50% of Section 11 members, and 8 count fewer than 20%. The range of associated disciplines varies a lot:

- the majority of units (18, i.e. 67% of multi-section units) tend to separate linguistics on the one hand (5 units), and literature and civilisation on the other (9 units). Not a single unit appears to be exclusively literature-centred, and just one focuses on civilisation studies (in that case, other members are specialists in politics, economics, etc.). Didactics appears in one case only and is explicitly mentioned in 3 units only.

- in other units, 7 (26% of multi-section units) regroup literature, civilisation and linguistics, and sometimes didactics. In those cases, non-English scholars are specialists in other languages only (5 units with French and, for 1 unit, with ancient languages); alternatively in other languages with geographers (1) or philosophers (1). All these units are EAs, 6 outside Paris and 1 in.

One additional unit centres its interests on one geographic area (Breton and Celtic research) and 1 on a period (medieval studies). As a result, these two units combine literature, civilisation and linguistics/philology all of which are related by a specific common point.

3.2.4 Internal structuration (question 2)

Most units are structured around research “axes”, or “poles”, or “themes”, and these regroup researchers and teacher-researchers in various numbers.

Among the 16 responding mono-section units (88.88%), 9 (50%) use the term “axis”, 3 (16.66%) use “team” (2 in Paris, 1 outside), 2 (11.11%) use “pole” and 1 (5.55%) uses “centre”.

A majority of multi-section units (17, 63%) define axes (from 3 to 7), while 2 mention themes (which seem similar to axes). Only 1 unit (a UMR) defines itself in terms of poles.

Transversality is mostly achieved around a general theme shared by the research unit as a whole. Three mono-section units (16.66%) (of which 1 in Paris) did not respond and 2 (11.11%) of which 1 in Paris, have none, but the 13 remaining mono-section units (72.22%) mention one. These themes may refer to:

- a theme in the strict sense of the word: “Representations and ideologies”, “Studies on the English-speaking world”, “Controversies”, “Myths and rewriting”, “Identity and citizenship”, “Centre(s) and margin(s)”;
- a methodological approach: “Interdisciplinarity”;
- the designation of a corpus “The Auchinleck manuscript, National Library of Scotland”.

Most multi-section units are also organised around a general subject (74%), sometimes themes (e.g. “interculturality”, “politics and configuration of identities”) or, in two cases, objects of study (“language units”, “philology of the Middle Ages, textual criticism, editing work”).

In 9 cases (50%, including 2 in Paris) the question of the existence of transversal programmes elicited no answer, which is clear evidence, no doubt, that there are none. The remaining half (50%, including 4 in Paris) mention some under the form of “transversal axes” (1) or transversal seminars, either on a regional basis or with a centre for human sciences (2). Themes include, e.g. “Democracy and society”, “The Media”, “Sense and sensations”, “Scandal” or “Writing and violence”. A larger number of multi-section units are inclined to identify some direct form of transversality (18 units, 77% of multi-sections), which appears under various aspects: mostly events (seminars, conferences), or common participation in ANR projects or IDEX projects.

3.2.5 Types of events (question 3)

a- Research seminars

Sixteen units (88.88%) declare they organise research seminars. Two units (12.5% of answers) propose seminars twice a month, 5 (31.25%) once a month, 1 (6.25%) once every three months,

and 1 (6.25%) four times a year. Seven units (43.75% of answers) mention no particular periodicity.

Seminars also play a central role in multi-section units all of which organise some. Most generally take place every month or every two months, but some have no specific schedule. When respondents mention rates, seminars represent roughly 30-40% of unit activity (with a 20%-to-50% range). Most seminars are backed by training programmes and may have a structuring effect depending on the size of units: the more numerous the members, the more research is structured by seminars.

b- Study days (on 1 or 2 days, < 20 presentations)

All 18 Section 11 units organise study days. This is the most common type of event and, as a rule, study days include a lower proportion of international participants than colloquia or conferences. Organising study days is also common to all multi-section units. Respondents who provide numbers mention 3 to 4 study days per year (with a 2-to-5 range); 1 unit mentions 12 study days. Percentage data average 30 to 50% of overall activity (with a 10%-to-60% range).

c- Workshops

Ten mono-section units did not respond (55.55%) and 2 (11.11%) gave negative answers. So, 12 units out of 18 (66.66%) organise no workshops which are, by far, the least popular activity.

Definitions may vary, but as a rule workshops attempt to conduct targeted explorations of a theme or a concept. They may also consist of software presentations or meetings of researchers who want to prepare applications for CFPs. Workshops operate as places to exchange views with a strong emphasis on exploratory and experimental ventures.

Among the 6 units that organise workshops (33.33%), 4 specify that they represent: 3% (1), 10% (2, 1 in Paris and 1 outside) and 30% (1, Paris) of their activities. The remaining 2 units (outside Paris) mention 5 workshops over 5 years for one, 2 to 3 per year for the other.

Among multi-section units, workshop formats are not widespread. Eighteen units (67%) use none and other answers do not distinguish between workshops and seminars.

d- Colloquia or conferences (> 20 presentations)

Just one (5.55%) out of the 18 mono-section units did not respond. For 4 units out of 17 (23.52% of positive answers, including 2 in Paris), colloquia represent 30% of organising activity. Five units (2 in Paris) indicate from 30 to 50% in that respect. For 4 units (1 in Paris), colloquia represent from 10 to 30%. Three units (all outside Paris) mention no percentage data but specify the annual number of colloquia (between 1 and 4). Finally, one unit (outside Paris) mentions neither percentage nor number.

A larger proportion of multi-section units do not organise colloquia with more than 20 presentations (5, 18%), but most units regard colloquia as powerful magnets of scientific activity. Over 50% of colloquia are international and they attract a very high rate of researchers from abroad.

Some respondents provide annual quantitative data while others indicate a rate of research activity. In both cases, results vary widely, from 1% (or activity below 1 colloquium per year) to highly dynamic activities (3 to 4 colloquia per year or 50% of the unit's activity). Most units mention at least an annual colloquium. Seven units (2 in Paris, 5 outside) measure that colloquia with more than 20 presentations make up at least 27% of their activity.

e- Other formats

Half of mono-section units (50%) provided positive answers and mentioned implemented activities. Out of 9 units, 3 propose doctoral sessions (1 in Paris, 2 outside) and 1 (in Paris) mentions "actions for doctoral students" with no other comment. Other activities are quite diversified: they include setting up a forum devoted to the unit and its axes (1), participating in

cultural lectures (1) or in radio programmes (1), inviting international keynote speakers (1) organising workshops in international conferences (1), co-operating with a theatre (1) organising a short story writing contest for students (1). A single unit may provide several answers which exemplify the range of its other activities. In all cases, percentage data, when available (for 3 units out of 9), are fairly low: 3% (outside Paris), 5% (Paris) and 10% (Paris).

Apparently, multi-section units are more rarely involved in activities of this type. Only 6 (22%) mention some which include: setting up doctoral sessions or colloquia for doctoral students (3), presenting books (1) inviting keynote speakers (1) or participating in local or regional events (1).

f- Economic, social and cultural partnerships

Responses reveal that the way the question was expressed (scientific project “determined or influenced” by cultural institutions or the social and cultural world) was rejected or amended in many answers. Namely, 15% of responses are negative, 45% insist on the punctual character of links and partnerships (which often *result from* unit policies and not the other way around), while 40% of responses are positive and acknowledge the influence of various institutions on the units’ projects.

Two LABEX programmes are mentioned and responses recall that obtaining the LABEX label was conditioned by such partnerships in the first place and only strengthened various links in the long term.

Links with the social and economic world are more limited (10%), and most cases refer to activities in the field of translation and translation studies (e.g. software design), or to a programme in visual culture and links with the world of communication, notably through professional Master’s degrees (2.5%).

The most widely mentioned cultural institutions (for both punctual and “key” partnerships) include national (and university) theatres, town (and university) libraries, festivals (theatre, cinema, fiction, poetry), museums (temporary exhibitions or permanent collections), cultural spaces and urban planning (1 case, 2.5%). Responses show that Research Masters and Doctoral Schools also link up with social and cultural partners.

3.2.6 Links of projects with the institutions’ strategies geared towards the development of interdisciplinarity (question 4)

Two mono-section units (11.11%) (1 in Paris, 1 outside) provided no answer and 4 (all outside Paris) answered negatively (22.22%), totalling 33.33%.

In 66.66% of mono-section units (12 units out of 18), institutional interdisciplinary projects have a direct impact on the way units are structured. Still, 2 out of these 12 units offer more nuanced answers: “yes, but...”, “[these are not initial co-operations] to understand the unit’s projects”. Yet, it may be observed that concerned disciplines include literature, other languages and social and human sciences (philosophy, history and sociology, geography...).

Most multi-section units (78%) tend to build their projects in relation to institutional strategies. Other concerned disciplines exclusively include languages and social and human sciences (generally literature and/or history) except in the case of one unit working on the subject of language and the brain which collaborates with medicine among others. As a rule, collaborations bear on the project as a whole, but one unit mentions more punctual transversal collaborations. Units are in various situations when they implement partnerships outside the field of English Studies. When units are already interdisciplinary – the director of such unit explains – partnerships prove easier to implement. Other units have to regroup highly heterogeneous components: e.g. one unit intends to unite “social and human sciences in general”. It is interesting to observe that 6 units mention institutional support or work on interdisciplinarity within larger institutions: these may be universities (Paris Diderot,

Montpellier 3), centre for human and social sciences (Poitiers, Dijon), research centre in human sciences (Le Havre), MILC (Lyon 2), intersectoral and interdisciplinary research poles (Aix-Marseille).

3.2.7 Institutional influence on units' projects (question 5)

Among mono-section units, one unit provides no answer (in Paris) and 3 (outside Paris) declare they are not influenced. Fourteen units mention some form of influence: 2 (outside Paris) are influenced both by the doctoral school and the centre for human sciences; 1 (Paris) is influenced by the doctoral school and the COMUE (association of universities).

One doctoral school (including doctoral contracts), a COMUE and a centre for human sciences influence 5 units each (in Paris and outside). 2 GISs (group of scientific interest), one on genre studies, the other is unspecified, influence one unit each (one in Paris, one outside).

One GDR (group of research) influences one unit (Paris), one LABEX (laboratory of excellence) influences one unit (outside Paris) and one network (Flora Tristan).

The same type of diversity characterises multi-section units. Four declare they are not subjected to any of these influences and 2 only acknowledge mild influence when it comes to adapting projects to funding applications. Other units acknowledge the influence of the following institutions: of a centre for human sciences (7 units), doctoral school (6 units), COMUE (4 units), federative structure (5 units), group of scientific interest (3 units).

The following limited indications are to be added: group of research; City of Genre (Paris), IDEX (initiative of excellence, ongoing application). Some units are deeply involved with several of these external institutions: for example one centre for human sciences, one group of scientific interest, one doctoral school, the COMUE. For respondents who specify the role of each institution, it comes as no surprise that the doctoral school mainly provides doctoral contracts and transversal training – and, for one unit, it contributes to internal and external mobility; that the centre for human sciences offers funding for projects – and, for one unit, it helps in developing digital platforms.

Of note, the following remarks from two unit directors: in this section, questions are inadequately expressed since various CFPs and institutions should have no structuring effects on units, it should be the reverse.

3.2.8 Influence of CFPs on unit projects (question 6)

a- Local and national (ANR-type) CFPs

For 3 mono-section units: no answer (outside Paris); for 4 (2 in Paris, 2 outside): no influence. Seven units (38.88%) out of 18 therefore mention no direct influence from CFPs. 3 other units (16.66%) (outside Paris) mention “limited influence”.

Overall, 55% of Section 11 units acknowledge little or no influence on the way they manage their scientific project over the years.

Seven units (38.88%) (3 in Paris, 4 outside) acknowledge some influence.

Two units mention failure (outside Paris) and 3 several failures (2 outside Paris, 1 in).

For multi-section units, responses are similar:

For 8 units (29.4%), funded local or national CFPs exert no influence; + 3 “are thinking about it”, and 4 mention “sometimes/extremely limited”. Overall, 55% of multi-section units acknowledge little or no influence on the way they manage their scientific project over the years. Apparently, more than half of the units conceive their projects independently from their environment.

Other funding schemes are mentioned, but by one single unit in all cases: call from the region, project linked to the doctoral school, local policy to allocate funds to doctoral research.

Four units only mention they routinely submit to ANR-type CFPs (ANR: National Agency for Research). For one, it is an opportunity to create a structuring axis, even if the submission is rejected (in that case, the scientific project is determined by the submitted project).

b- European CFPs

7 units (38.88%) gave no answers (6 outside Paris, 1 in) and 4 (22.22%) say they are not influenced. So, overall, 11 units (61.11%) think they are not influenced by European CFPs of that type.

3 units (16.66%) (2 outside Paris, 1 in) mention limited influence and 1 unit (5.55%) (Paris) admits to keeping a watch (i.e. for 22.22% of units, projects exert little influence).

3 units (16.66%) mention some influence (2 outside Paris, 1 of which specifies “2 or 3 ongoing applications”).

Multi-section units express similar views:

- 13 units (48%) provide no answer at all and 5 have not submitted yet or have an ongoing submission or some intention to submit. One unit deplors limited support and as a result, a high reject rate.

- 3 units declare an ongoing ERCs (European Research Council) and 1 unit mentions “numerous European projects” around which research subjects are articulated.

Other types of internationalisation processes are mentioned (but in single cases only): CERCLES (Confédération Européenne des Centres de Langues de l’Enseignement Supérieur [European Confederation of Language Centres in Higher Education]), contribution to the establishment of a European Master’s degree...

c- LABEX/IDEX/EQUIPEX Funding

3 mono-section units (16.66%) (outside Paris) gave no answer and 9 gave negative answers (50%) (including 1 in Paris). So, 66.66% of units are not concerned in that respect.

3 responding units (16.66%) (including 1 in Paris, 2 outside) belong to a LABEX.

4 responding units (22.22%) (all in Paris) belong to an IDEX.

1 unit (Paris) is related both to a LABEX and an IDEX.

Overall, 6 units (33.33%) are concerned in this type of funding and Paris regroups most responding units.

Multi-section units benefit from such fundings in even lower numbers: 21 (78%) use none and 2 have on-going IDEX applications but use no such funding for the time being. In other words, only four benefit from such fundings today (2 mixed research units and 2 hosting teams).

- LABEX: 3
- IDEX: 1
- EQUIPEX: 1 (also within a LABEX and an IDEX)
- 1 unit is “indirectly” involved in these projects *via* OpenEdition.

d- Hindering factors to national or international project application filing

There were many responses to the question: 17 of 18 mono-section units (94.44%), 25 of 27 multi-section units (92.6%). These high rates show genuine interest for projects of that type, but answers also highlight a form of discouragement caused by the difference between committed energy and uncertain results. Discouraging factors mostly include the following ones – sometimes with several motives mentioned by the same unit:

- File management is burdensome/complex: 7 mono-section units, 9 multi-sections
- Time consuming tasks: 6, 7
- Lack of administrative support: 6, 4

- “Ridiculously low” admission rates: 4, 4 (including one multi-section unit which mentions several successive rejections)
- Teacher-researchers are overworked (administrative duties): 3, 6
- Unit has no critical mass: 2 (no multi-section unit)
- “Inadequacy between their axes and our major interests”: 2 (no multi-section unit)
- Interdisciplinarity of projects: 2 multi-section units
- Difficult to enter projects (e.g. Horizon 2020) for letters and human sciences research teams: 1 multi-section unit
- Hindering factors: “convert fundamental research into applied research”: 1 (no multi-section unit)

One director mentions higher rates of success for international projects than for national ones.

3.2.9 Support services for project application filing (question 7)

Seventeen mono-section units out of 18 responded (94.44%) that they benefited from a support service dedicated to project filing and applications. In 11 cases (61.11%), respondents say these services are dynamic and efficient (9 outside Paris, 2 in). In 6 cases (33.33%), they are said to be short-staffed (3 outside Paris, 3 in). The affiliation of these services is rarely specified: sometimes, it is a shared service in a centre for research (1); one consists of 2 staff for the whole university (1); other services are shared by the whole university (2).

The same can be observed in multi-section units. Twenty-three units out of 27 benefit from such support services and most respondents (21) say they provide valuable and efficient assistance. The services’ affiliations vary a lot too and are rarely specified. One COMUE employs one staff full-time; one service is shared by several labs in the same institution; one is an inter-university service (Paris); one belongs to a centre for human sciences.

3.2.10 Influence of CNRS and IUF⁴ delegations (question 8)

Three mono-section units (all outside Paris) (16.66%) did not respond and 4 (22.22%) mention “limited influence”, in that respect, i.e. overall, 7 units (all outside Paris) (38.88%) are in that case.

Four units (22.22%) count at least one academic with CNRS delegate status. Eight out of 16 CNRS delegates (50%) are in Paris. One unit (5.55%) (Paris) has 10 teacher-researchers with CNRS delegate status, i.e. 62.5% of all delegations.

Responses also mention 11 IUF delegations distributed in 7 units. As many as 38.88% of teams count at least one IUF member. Six out of 11 IUF delegates (54.54%) are in Paris.

In multi-section units, 14 (52%) mention no influence and 1 specifies that such delegations contribute to individual projects only. To be on the safe side, it should be added that some respondents mention the number of delegations without specifying their likely *influence* on the collective achievements of the unit.

As regards the number of delegations, it is lower than in mono-section units: 3 CNRS delegations (2 outside Paris, 1 in) and 2 IUF delegations (1 in Paris, 1 outside). Overall, it may be observed that most delegations are obtained by teacher-researchers working exclusively in Section 11 units.

⁴ CNRS: Centre national de la recherche scientifique (National Centre for Scientific Research); IUF: Institut Universitaire de France (French University Institute). CNRS and IUF are high-level national research and academic institutions. Contributing university academics enjoy CNRS or IUF delegate status. (Translator’s note)

3.3 Funding and means (*Anne Dunan-Page and Manuel Jobert*)

Overview

Most English Studies units or units mostly devoted to English Studies still operate on recurring contractual credits. Acceptance in CFP applications therefore becomes crucial, except for linguistics which attracts more external funding than other disciplines. The size of units exerts little influence on recurring allocations in proportion to the number of teacher-researchers; yet, Paris-based institutions enjoy better funding than non-Paris ones.

Research production by scholars in English Studies still requires frequent travelling abroad. Scholars take part in international events that are beneficial to the recognition of French research; they work in the libraries of English-speaking countries, or they build networks that will help in the development of projects. The huge increase in available digital resources in the last few years has not totally liberated scholars from the need to spend time consulting documents on site in well-equipped institutions situated in their geographical areas of scientific interest. Besides, the study of primary sources (manuscripts, archives) and the interdisciplinary nature of contemporary cultural studies increasingly require on location fieldwork and questionnaire management that make these journeys indispensable.

Teacher-researchers benefit from schemes ensuring delegate status with mixed research units (UMRs) and the IUF. Still, the number of available delegations is low and cannot make up for the absence of systematic and well-designed sabbatical policies. Such policies would enable teacher-researchers to devote more free time to research at regular intervals, especially abroad, and help them to implement collaborative projects and international partnerships. Whatever their sizes and their geographical locations, institutions play a vital role in that respect alongside the CNU 11th Section, but the number of sabbaticals remains excessively low. So low indeed that selection criteria have to be applied. These are necessary due to the limited number of opportunities, but they prove unsatisfactory to provide teacher-researchers with more research time: even when they produce sustained, regular and innovating research, overwork prevents them from filing projects.

In conclusion, the number of one-semester sabbaticals has to be significantly increased. This would be a decisive factor in encouraging both academic production and efforts to find external funding.

Most English Studies units or units mostly devoted to English Studies share their staff with other units since many staff activities can be shared over several Arts and Human Sciences departments with no discontinuity in service. More than half of units benefit from one shared personnel, with no observable difference due to the sizes of units with 20–40 or 40+ teacher-researchers.

As a rule, the number of administrative staff varies between 1 and 2 personnel shared with several units. This does not meet the real needs of research units, because they face new development challenges such as campaigns to find external funds and the expansion of international co-operation.

Workload reduction schemes are used by unit directors to make up for staff shortage. Most directors' workload reductions (80%) are not shared with other colleagues, which gives evidence that the workload of unit directors is clearly a more individual than a collective burden.

The general impression is that staff shortages lead directors away from piloting missions by obliging them to focus on more clerical tasks.

3.3.1 Funding data (questions 9 and 11)

The first comment concerns the wide discrepancies observable in fund allocations. Therefore, the following average data only provide a largely approximate picture and large disparities existing between units and institutions have to be taken into account.

Units' recurring funding ranges between 100% and 60% of overall funding. Most institutions offer research quality bonuses/performance bonuses that may increase funding on local criteria by 10% to 25% of recurring funds. Other funding resources include regional or international financing – submissions to bids – that provide from 0% to 25% of funds. Seven units mention external funding that vastly exceeds recurring funds, including 2 on linguistics-related projects.

On average, for the 34 responding units, recurring funds calculated in proportion to the number of teacher-researchers amount to €1,142 per head. That is just a rough estimate since fund allocations are used for collective projects as well as individual missions. Yet, data suggest that unit funding discrepancies range from €300 to €2,45. On that basis, practically all institutions in or around Paris enjoy allocations exceeding €1,000 per teacher-researcher.

- 1 unit totalling fewer than 20 teacher-researchers (section 11): €1,000 per head;
- 18 units totalling 20–40 teacher-researchers (mono- and multi-sections): €1,056 on average;
- 13 units totalling over 40 teacher-researchers (mono- and multi-sections): €1,224 on average;⁵
- Average for institutions outside Paris: €956;
- Average for institutions in and around Paris: €1,485.

3.3.2 Research sabbaticals and leave for subject conversion (question 10)

Among responding units, 90.91% declare they benefited at least from one sabbatical⁶ over a period of three years (2013, 2014, 2015), and 86.36% from sabbaticals granted by the CNU 11th Section.

Data provided by the CNU 11th Section are the following:

- 2013: 10 semesters for 70 candidates (50 senior lecturers and 20 professors);
- 2014: 9 semesters for 70 candidates (50 senior lecturers and 20 professors);
- 2015: 9 semesters for 69 candidates (56 senior lecturers and 13 professors).

The number of sabbatical semesters granted by the CNU's 11th Section is low (28 semesters for 209 candidates), particularly for professors. It only amounts to 40% of sabbaticals granted by institutions.

The number of sabbaticals is correlated to the sizes of units, but it may be observed that the larger units in terms of number of academics obtain a larger proportion of sabbaticals from the CNU's 11th Section. There is practically no difference between sabbaticals granted by institutions in and outside Paris. Yet responding units in and around Paris enjoy better opportunities to obtain sabbaticals from the CNU's 11th Section.

⁵ This survey does not cover two units where funded contracts were added to recurring funds.

⁶ Sabbaticals generally go under the name of CRTC in France. CRTC roughly means "sabbatical for research and subject conversion", i.e. leave of absence to carry out research or to opt for a new subject of scientific investigation. (Translator's note)

3.3.3 Administrative staff (question 12)

Out of 21 responding units, 3 (14%) declare they have 1 dedicated administrative staff: 2 mono-section units (numbering 56 and 31 teacher-researchers respectively) and 1 multi-section unit, mostly in Section 11 (40 teacher-researchers).

Two mono-section units (numbering 3 and 24 teacher-researchers respectively) have no staff at all.

Thirty-five units declare they share personnel with several laboratories. Numbers vary between 1 and 3 personnel. Two units declare they have their own staff (14 and 15 personnel), but their operating situation appears to be widely different from most units. Out of 33 units, 8 have 3 personnel (24.24%), 8 have 2 personnel (24.24%), 15 only have 1 personnel (45.45%).

The average is 1.5 shared staff per unit if units with exceptionally high staffing rates are not taken into account.

- Units numbering fewer than 20 teacher-researchers (mono-section): average is 0.5 shared staff (1 unit has 0; 1 unit has 1);
- Units numbering 20–40 teacher-researchers (mono- and multi-sections): average is 1.23 shared staff;
- Units numbering over 40 teacher-researchers (mono- and multi-sections): average is 2.05 shared staff.

The 3 units declaring 3 shared staff, including one mixed research unit (UMR), have 34, 41 and 42 teacher-researchers respectively.

Among units declaring only shared staff, staff numbers in/out of Paris are distributed as presented in the table below:

| Number of shared staff | Number of units in Paris | Number of units out of Paris |
|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 3 | 1 | 2 |

3.3.4 Workload reductions and bonuses (question 15)

Out of 39 responding unit directors, only 1 mentions he/she accepted a salary bonus (€1,000 for a unit of 42 teacher-researchers) rather than a workload reduction, and 7 (18%) mention they share their workload reductions with their deputy director or with several of the unit's members or heads of scientific projects.

- Units numbering fewer than 20 teacher-researchers (2 Section 11 units): workload reduction of 0 hour (1 unit) and 12 hours (1 unit);
- units numbering 20–40 teacher-researchers: average annual workload reduction of 36 hours, i.e. about 1/6 of teaching time;
- units numbering over 40 teacher-researchers: average annual workload reduction of 52 hours, i.e. somewhat less than 1/3 of teaching time;
- four directors (of units numbering 25, 40, 41 and 47 teacher-researchers) benefit from workload reductions higher than 90 hours, 3 in Paris institutions and 1 outside.

The in-Paris/out-of-Paris distribution is as follows:

In Paris

- average annual workload reduction of 44.25 hours, all academics included;
- units numbering 20–40 teacher-researchers: average annual workload reduction of 36 hours;

- units numbering over 40 teacher-researchers: average annual workload reduction of 52.5 hours.

Outside Paris

- average annual workload reduction of 33 hours, all academics included;
- units numbering 20–40 teacher-researchers: average annual workload reduction of 32 hours;
- units numbering over 40 teacher-researchers: average annual workload reduction of 66 hours.

Overall, there is no noticeable difference between workload reduction times in units in, around or out of Paris. Outside Paris, the limited number of directors of units counting over 40 teacher-researchers is not representative. Yet, they mention workload reductions which are higher than the average of those offered in and around Paris for same-size units.

3.4 Training programmes and doctoral students (*Christian Auer and Susan Finding*)

Overview

In responding units, the number of doctoral students in English Studies is stable or increasing in the period, with no difference relative to the units' status, a clear sign that English Studies are an attractive domain. Still, it may be observed that Paris-based institutions attract about twice as many doctoral students as institutions elsewhere, whatever the sizes of units.

The number of cotutelles with English-speaking countries is still low, showing how difficult it is to implement agreements. The number of cotutelles remains too low with Great Britain and North American countries. They are non-existent with some Commonwealth countries. Conversely, cotutelles are more numerous with Mediterranean countries.

About 40% of units mention they engage in joint supervisions between research supervisors and senior lecturers without habilitations, which shows the important part played by joint supervisions in senior lecturers' careers.

The main problem is the exceedingly limited number of doctoral contracts (except for funded projects) granted to doctoral students in English Studies. Average data indicate that 17% of these are financed, with only 12% in Section 11 units.

3.4.1 Backing units on master's degrees and on secondary education recruitment competitive exams (question 14)

Most research units highlight links existing between their scientific projects and research master's degrees, since masters are "backed" by units. Units emphasise tight and tangible links which did not necessarily exist before. Today, master's students are fully involved in the units' activities, which only was the case for doctoral students a few years ago. Most units not only invite them to attend the various events they organise, but they also encourage them to take an active part in them. Some units give students the opportunity to coordinate their own scientific events (called "master sessions" modelled on "doctoral sessions"), to disseminate their research through blogs or research logbooks and to communicate on social media. Connections also operate through master's seminars which are directly related to the work of research directors. Finally, digital technologies enable units to offer open-access storage solutions for master's reports. Closer links between research units and masters are highly visible everywhere and act as driving forces for the domain, as are their efforts to disseminate master's results and activities.

As regards secondary education recruitment competitive exams, close to 90% of units mention there are no links between their scientific projects and the *agrégation* programmes. Still, data indicate that many units set up study days on questions posed by the *agrégation* programme. Thus, slight discrepancies appear between declarations insisting there are no direct links between units and the *agrégation* programmes, on the one hand, and *agrégation*-related events organised by research units (as opposed to units in charge of training) on the other. The scientific status of events related to the curricula of competitive exams remains unspecified, notably when it comes to defining the influence of exam reference books and their particular standing among other publications by teacher-researchers.

3.4.2 Number of English Studies doctoral students since 2013 (question 15)

The responses of the 45 research directors are distributed as follows:

| Number of doctoral students per team | Number of teams | Percentage data |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| no number | 1 | 2% |
| 0 (doctoral student) | 2 | 4% |
| 1 to 5 (doctoral students) | 9 | 20% |
| 6 to 10 | 11 | 24% |
| 11 to 15 | 5 | 11% |
| 16 to 20 | 3 | 6% |
| 21 to 25 | 5 | 11% |
| 26 to 30 | 2 | 4% |
| 31 to 35 | 1 | 2% |
| 36 to 40 | 2 | 4% |
| 41 to 45 | 1 | 2% |
| 46 to 50 | 2 | 4% |
| 60+ | 1 | 2% |
| | 45 | 100% |

Fifty-nine percent of teams have 15 doctoral students or fewer; 12% of teams have 36 doctoral students or more.

There is no noticeable difference in the number of doctoral students in hosting teams (EAs) (16 on average) and mixed research units (UMRs) (14 on average): the 7 responding UMRs have doctoral students numbering between 0 and 60 each.

The average number of doctoral students in Paris-based units is 20 while it is 9 elsewhere.

The average number of doctoral students per teacher-researcher in research units is 0.7 (on the total number of teachers with senior lecturer and professor status). Data indicate wide variations ranging between 0.1 and 2. As a rule and unsurprisingly, the higher the number of academics the higher the number of doctoral students, even if some units with limited numbers of members boast high ratios.

Evolution on 2013–2015 period

- Increasing number of doctoral students: 14 31%
- Decreasing number of doctoral students: 6 13%
- Stable number of doctoral students: 15 33%
- Information missing: 10 22%

Sixty-four percent of responding directors, in mono- or multi-section units, mention that the total number of doctoral students in English Studies is either stable or increasing, which illustrates the attractiveness of the domain and the dynamism of supervision.

The domain's visibility is supported by thesis awards offered by learned societies and various institutions. Besides, national visibility is ensured by the SAES/AFEA research prize which sometimes distinguishes books stemming from theses and by the prize awarded by "Le Monde de la Recherche Universitaire en Sciences Humaines et Sociales" (examples include Christine Geoffroy, *La Mésentente cordiale. Voyage au cœur de l'espace interculturel franco-anglais*; Claire Arènes, *Le programme Prevent et les musulmans en Grande-Bretagne, enjeux et contradictions de la 'prévention du terrorisme'*).

3.4.3 Cotutelles since 2013 (question 16)

The distribution of the 41 responses are distributed as follows – they only concern English Studies doctoral students engaged in cotutelles with foreign universities, for any type of unit:

| | | |
|-------------------|------------|-----|
| No cotutelle | 20 (units) | 48% |
| 1 cotutelle | 9 (units) | 21% |
| 2 to 5 cotutelles | 8 | 19% |
| 5+ cotutelles | 4 | 9% |

Concerned countries and number of cotutelles:

| Countries | Cotutelles | | |
|---------------|------------|------------|---|
| Algeria | 2 | India | 2 |
| Germany | 2 | Ireland | 1 |
| Australia | 3 | Israel | 1 |
| Belgium | 1 | Italy | 3 |
| Benin | 1 | Macedonia | 1 |
| Brazil | 2 | Madagascar | 1 |
| Canada | 4 | Poland | 2 |
| Congo | 1 | Romania | 1 |
| Spain | 2 | Senegal | 1 |
| United States | 4 | Slovakia | 1 |
| Great Britain | 7 | Tunisia | 4 |
| Greece | 2 | | |

The number of thesis cotutelles does not seem to be linked to the number of teacher-researchers, the units' status (hosting teams or mixed research units), or the geographical positions of the institutions concerned. The number remains low since half of units have no cotutelles. Still, data suggest that implementations are feasible even with countries where tuition fees are high. The proportion of units with no cotutelle or just one reaches 70%. Conversely, just 4 units account for 21 cotutelles on the period concerned, which indicates wide disparities among units.

Quite naturally, anglophone countries (the United States, Great Britain, Ireland and Commonwealth countries such as Canada, India and Australia) are well represented although the number of cotutelles per geographical area never exceeds 7 for the whole territory. Some linguistically or traditionally anglophone countries (South Africa, New Zealand ...) are totally absent. In North America, the number of cotutelles with Canada equals that of the United States. The number of thesis cotutelles with institutions in Mediterranean countries (13 for Spain, Italy,

Greece, Algeria and Tunisia) is proportionally high while they are practically non-existent with North European countries. Therefore, cotuelles are being engaged in Europe (the exception is Germany) and in the Maghreb, with no direct link with geographical and linguistic areas in the English-speaking world.

3.4.4 Thesis joint supervisions between research supervisors (professors and senior lecturers with habilitations) since 2013 (question 17)

Nineteen out of 44 responding units (i.e. 43%) mention that thesis joint supervisions between research supervisors and senior lecturers without habilitations are currently engaged.

Out of these 19 units, 10 have over 20 teacher-researchers in Section 11. Two mixed research units out of 7 mention on-going joint supervisions of that type.

Six of the 18 Section 11-only units (33%) are under joint supervisions, 4 of 8 mostly-Section-11 units (50%), and 8 of 19 multi-section units (42%).

Five units numbering over 20 doctoral students (in Section 11 and mostly in Section 11) out of 26 respondents are under joint supervisions (i.e. 19%).

Nine units with fewer than 20 doctoral students out of 29 respondents are under joint supervisions (i.e. 31%).

Joint supervisions between professors and senior lecturers with and without habilitations account for about 40% of thesis supervisions within polled units. The assumption that smaller units would resort to joint supervisions out of necessity (because they may be short of professors and senior lecturers with habilitations) is not supported by the facts. Conversely, multi-section units are more inclined to use joint supervisions than units that are solely composed of Section 11 teacher-researchers. As a rule, units with 20+ doctoral students (Section 11 and mostly Section 11) rarely resort to joint supervisions while units with more doctoral students use them more extensively.

3.5.5 Doctoral contracts since 2013 (question 18)

Overall, for about 700 doctoral students in English Studies, there are 105 institutional and 13 project-based doctoral contracts.

- 61 institutional doctoral contracts (i.e. 58%) and 7 project-based doctoral contracts (i.e. 54%) are allocated to doctoral students in Section 11 units where 435 doctoral students are enrolled, i.e. 61% of the total number of doctoral students.
- 25 institutional doctoral contracts (i.e. 24%) and 3 project-based doctoral contracts (i.e. 23%) are allocated to units mostly composed of Section 11 members where 145 doctoral students in English Studies are enrolled (i.e. 20% of the total number of doctoral students).
- 15 institutional doctoral contracts (i.e. 14%) and 3 project-based doctoral contracts are allocated to multi-section units where 136 doctoral students in English Studies are enrolled (i.e. 19% of the total).

The allocation of doctoral contracts by institutions neither depends on the type of structure (hosting team or mixed research unit), on the unit's size, nor on the number of English Studies scholars.

Funding rate of English Studies doctoral students per unit type

- Mono-section units: 12%
- Multi-section units, mostly Section 11: 37%
- Multi-section units, marginally Section 11: 31%

Over all responding units, only 16.8% of doctoral students benefit from funding. Data reveal a crucial shortage of contracts for doctoral students in English Studies. The trend is particularly blatant in mono-section units. Cumulative data show that multi-section units with a majority of scholars in English Studies benefit from the best funding conditions.

3.5 Research publications and dissemination (*Clément Oudart and Mathilds Rogez*)

Overview

Researchers and teacher-researchers in English Studies are prominent and recognised in international publications. Among the best-ranked academic publishers, their publishing share and influence is increasing, notably in Great Britain among university publishing houses (Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, Manchester University Press, Edinburgh University Press ...) as well as among commercial firms (Ashgate, Routledge, Palgrave Macmillan ...).

An overwhelming proportion of units devote a large part of their funding to direct or indirect publications, notably under the form of financial support to duplication, translation or copy-editing.

Besides, publishing is also encouraged through the units' journals (in 15 years, more than 20 unit-based journals have been launched and as many as 14 since 2010) or through series devoted to English Studies at university press publishing centres.

Today, research units therefore play a key role in the dissemination of research in English Studies through the creation and/or funding of specialised journals. Yet, these journals are most often managed by the teacher-researchers themselves as editors lack dedicated secretarial services.

OpenEdition platforms have also facilitated the transition towards digital supports: units appreciate the revues.org site to create their journals or host them online. Today, 76% of unit directors say they encourage the publication of research blogs on hypotheses.org.

Collections are currently emerging on HAL-SHS, but the main issue for hosting teams is the retrospective online publication of meta data and of documents in full text versions, even if teacher-researchers seem increasingly inclined to publish online, for example after previous papers have been put online by administrative staff. Of note, the fact that doctoral students are aware of the online publication issue as they may act as role models. Research units operate as key mechanisms to improve research dissemination for scholars.

3.5.1 International publications (question 19)

In the present period, academics are increasingly urged to publish abroad, especially those who face the specific challenges of English Studies which are naturally inclined towards international publishing. In that context, close to 50% of units declare 25 to 50% of international publications and 14% of them mention more than 50% of publications abroad.

| Response options | Responses | Number of units |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Fewer than 25% | 37.21% | 16 |
| Between 25% and 50% | 48.84% | 21 |
| Over 50% | 13.95 | 6 |
| Total | | 43 |

Apparently, the size or composition of research units has little influence on the variation in international publishing, even though some researchers in multi-section laboratories may feel more isolated because of their specialisation and seem to be encouraged to publish abroad as a result. Besides, it may be noted that most research units publish one or even several journals, or

benefit from one or several series devoted to English Studies within the university presses of their institutions.

Most university presses or international journals frequently mentioned in responses are particularly famous. French researchers in English Studies are well positioned in series published by Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, Edinburgh University Press, Manchester University Press, to mention only the main ones, but also in rigorous, demanding publishing houses or in international journals with a pioneering role in their domains (linguistics, drama studies ...).

3.5.2 Research unit journals (question 21, Appendices 7 and 8)

Close to 95% of Section 11 units state they have their own journals. These journals are flourishing, which is due, no doubt, to the development of digital supports. Data indicate that 23 journals have been launched since 2000 (and 14 since 2010), including one journal especially devoted to work published by doctoral students. Some of the domain's best-known journals such as *Études anglaises* are associated with no particular learned society or research unit. Yet, publishing data revealed by the SAES two questionnaires show that more than 50 journals are related to units hosting English Studies. Twenty-four of those specifically publish on this domain and should consequently be added to the journals of learned societies. Besides, some journals (*Études britanniques contemporaines*, *Cahiers Victoriens et Édouardiens* ...) are both associated with a society and a unit. Data are sometimes insufficiently detailed to provide fine-tuned analysis, but numerous pluridisciplinary journals seem to be primarily driven by English Studies scholars or feature these studies as prominent domains, even if the fields covered by the publications are more widely diversified.

By correlating these data with those collected in 3.3.3 on personnel associated with research units, it is obvious that most hosting teams have no editing secretarial service to cater for their journals. Since editing work is taken on by the teacher-researchers themselves, their commitment in journals' editorial teams should be taken into account when assessing their careers.

Data reveal the resilience of recognised journals that have sometimes been in existence for more than 50 years. A case in point is *Caliban*, the longest-established journal mentioned in English Studies, with *RANAM*, *Cahiers élisabéthains* and several other journals as close followers. Once again, they illustrate the high quality of English Studies research conducted in France and recognised internationally.

Journals are most often extremely rigorous in their editorial policies and they use peer-reviewing committees with double blind reviewing. Most are migrating or have migrated online, a move which replaces paper version in the great majority of cases; in rare cases only are the online and paper versions maintained in parallel. Most online journals have opted for the revues.org platform (23 out of 40 identified online journals). That figure may prove higher however since a newly launched journal generally looks for an independent support before filing an application with the revues.org scientific committee.

Yet, these results need fine-tuning to capture significant differences that exist among research units depending on their compositions. Indeed, a single unit, out of 18 with Section 11 members only, has no journal and no series at a university press. On the other hand, out of 8 multi-section units with a majority of Section 11 members, 3 are in that case with a fourth one publishing, quite logically, a pluridisciplinary journal not exclusively devoted to English Studies. Quite logically too, these pluridisciplinary journals are to be found in units where Section 11 scholars are less numerous and are regrouped with other disciplines. Still, most of these latter units do not benefit from series devoted to English Studies at their university presses.

Data show that highly specialised journals (in anglophone linguistics, in Elizabethan, Lawrencian, Victorian or in short story studies) are mostly, if not exclusively, published in Section 11 units. These journals also often enjoy the highest international visibility.

Thus, when regroupings in multi-section units are being considered, great care should be given to preserve diversity among publications so that English Studies research conducted in France may disseminate and defend strong and internationally recognised specialties. The policy may even extend to preserving specific Section 11 units, which may warrant the continuity of such specialisations. Certain units have obviously proved successful in that respect by preserving their specialisations while joining teacher-researchers of other disciplines. Still, these on-going evolutions should inspire caution.

| <i>Units with associated journal</i> | |
|--|--------|
| Yes | 80% |
| No | 20% |
| <i>Breakdown data depending on unit type</i> | |
| Section 11 units | 94.44% |
| Multi-section units (mostly Section 11) | 62.50% |
| Multi-section units (marginally Section 11) | 78.94% |

3.5.3 Support to publications (question 22)

In terms of support to publications, most research units' policies express generosity. Yet, it is a rare unit that systematically subsidises publishing (3%), since most requests (95%) are examined on a case-by-case basis by laboratory boards. Most units implement fair policies thanks to package fundings of €500 to €1,000, which may occasionally reach €1,500 or even €2,000. The average funding cap per project is €1,00.

Publishing support may cover financial contributions which publishers sometimes require, paying for copyrights or, more rarely, for copy-editing (20%). Co-funding schemes – they often take the form of partnerships with institutions' research or publishing commissions, or with local authorities – mostly concern collective works involving several unit members and resulting from locally organised events. Most units mention this type of support to collective works stemming from their study days or conferences. These publications are not “proceedings”, but edited volumes comprising selected presentations which are rearranged after reviewing. Still, despite that support, these volumes do not rank among the best disseminated productions by French publishers.

3.5.4 English Studies series at university presses (question 23)

Support granted by university presses to research units varies a lot, and so do the particular situations of units. However, more than half of responding units (51.16% and two thirds of Section 11 units) mention series specifically devoted to English Studies in their institutions. This is a clear sign of their close collaboration with university presses (such as Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, Presses universitaires de Paris Ouest, Presses universitaires de Nancy, Presses de la Méditerranée, Presses universitaires de Nancy-Éditions Universitaires de Lorraine, Presses universitaires du Midi). Some research unit may even count on several mono- and pluridisciplinary series and two new creations are expecting confirmation. About half of units benefit both from a journal and a series hosted in their university presses to publish works on the English-speaking world.

However, the reason why units do not mention English Studies series is that previous series were suppressed. So, certain recent journals were created to replace disappearing dedicated series. It may be supposed that these swaps result in declining support to the promotion and dissemination of papers published in this new way since university press services are in a better position to do the job than generally understaffed research units.

| <i>University presses with one series dedicated to English Studies</i> | |
|---|--------|
| Yes | 51.16% |
| No | 48.84% |
| <i>Breakdown data depending on unit type</i> | |
| Section 11 units | 66.6% |
| Multi-section units (mostly Section 11) | 75% |
| Multi-section units (marginally Section 11) | 42.10% |
| <i>Units with one associated journal or with one English Studies series in institutions</i> | |
| Yes | 88.8% |
| No | 11.11% |
| <i>Breakdown data depending on unit type</i> | |
| Section 11 units | 94.44% |
| Multi-section units (mostly Section 11) | 62.50% |
| Multi-section units (marginally Section 11) | 93.73% |

3.5.5 Blogs, notebooks and open archives (questions 24 and 25)

Units encourage the publication of their works and results through:

- research notebooks (76%);
- expert blogs (67%);
- other (38%).

Data point to the high proportion of research units that encourage researchers to create notebooks on the hypotheses.org platform, which confirms the prominence of OpenEdition platforms in the field.

The question about self-archiving works on the HAL-SHS platform was asked (1) to identify units that created series dedicated to their works and hosted them on HAL, (2) then to assess the nature and range of their incentive policies. However, responses more generally focused on self-archiving and on local institutional archives hosted on HAL. Although the accuracy of some responses may be qualified, 10 to 14 responses were positive out of a total of 39 responses. Consequently, about 30% of units mention they have their own series on HAL.

As regards incentive policies, 60% of respondents answered negatively (23 units). So, a majority of units, of all sections, do not seem to encourage willing researchers and teacher-researchers to deposit their works on open archives, whatever their types. Difficulties arise, especially among hosting teams: because they are understaffed, self-archiving does not always reach priority status and teacher-researchers sometimes see uploading as an extra chore on top of their daily work burden. Data suggest that the directors of hosting team and mixed research units generally see no objection in the use of open archives for evaluative bibliometric purposes even if their units do not promote HAL deposits. Yet, they find these facilitate stock taking preparation. One director points to the reluctance of teacher-researchers in that respect because of the lack of quality control, but underlines that doctoral students are keen depositors.

In certain cases, data reveal clearly voluntaristic policies:

- training workshops are set up to facilitate uploading works online, both for teacher-researchers and doctoral students;
- short-term staff are recruited over several months to deposit all publications before the members themselves take over;
- HAL resource persons and/or series managers are nominated;
- self-archiving is encouraged when units need it to obtain a performance bonus and/or the institution has clearly made it a matter of policy;

- one unit declares it has made it compulsory to deposit works on HAL.

Moreover, about half of negative answers mention that incentive projects are on-going or likely to emerge shortly.

PART 4

ANALYTICAL APPROACH

4. 1. Interdisciplinarity and interculturality

Historically, English Studies have structured themselves from literature, notably from British literature, and then they evolved towards a plurality of domains and cultural areas. In the first edition of the White Paper (2001), more than twenty domains were mentioned: literature, civilisation, translation studies, didactics, linguistics, stylistics, history of ideas, art history, cinema studies, etc., many domains that teachers and teacher-researchers regard as their “disciplines”.

This multiplicity has therefore helped in the understanding of interdisciplinarity first and foremost in the very field of English Studies. Units where research is conducted on Shakespeare, Brexit and Pop Art are justified when they consider that they have already engaged in a conversation between various “disciplines”. Evidence of this is provided by the numerous applications for dual accreditations by the CNU (notably with the sections of history, philosophy, language sciences and comparative literature). Actually, even in multi-section units, most English Studies scholars collaborate with teacher-researchers in the domains of arts, human and social sciences. Consequently, units are not always considered to be “interdisciplinary” if the term only refers to interactions with other large sectors of research with a view to fostering methodological and conceptual cooperation between different disciplines in order to contribute to the evolution of each discipline’s perimeter through common projects.

The paradox is that crossing domains of studies may have hindered off-field scientific partnerships in the last few years, even though such moves are inherent in the history and development of English Studies which stand at the crossroads of numerous methodologies.

However, certain types of reconfiguration have already led to tangible consequences and have revisited the way frontiers between various domains are represented, only to remove them better.

- *Regrouping mono-section units.* The SAES has identified only 18 research units exclusively composed of Section 11 teachers and teacher-researchers, including 7 in Paris (and just one mixed research unit). So, most researchers and teacher-researchers in English Studies conduct their research in multi-section units which often result from mergers of several previous research units. These mergers generally involve linguistics, French literature, philosophy and other modern languages, and less frequently history.

- *Interculturality.* Consequently, numerous comparative projects have emerged, particularly on cultural transfers between two – or several – geographical areas. As a result, research units are often engaged in intercultural projects, rather than interdisciplinary ones.

Interculturality has also spread towards mono-section units since today solely a minority of units remain structured through cultural areas (Great Britain, North America, Commonwealth): research axes have become theme-based and regroup various areas of the English-speaking world while units have developed innovative transversal programmes.

Beyond units, these forms of interculturality materialise in funded projects (for example in ANR “Agon”), less formal theme-oriented networks, research groups (for example, the “Instituts des Amériques”) or federative structures (for example, CRISIS in Aix-Marseille University).

Intersectoral projects with hard sciences, information technology or law studies remain few and far between even if progress in that sense is obvious (e.g. OBVIL, ANR Emphiline, ANR Transread, Chaire Polyre, Labex BLRI, etc.).

- *The role of learned societies.* The SAES survey reveals that specialised societies fully assume their disciplinary share of research. Despite the spread of research networks and more or less formal international partnerships, they still operate as forums of research where Section 11 teacher-researchers can sometimes conduct state-of-the art investigations.

As specified in Part 2 of the White Paper, learned societies devoted to domains in English Studies are being created regularly at a rate of around eight per decade. The domains' geographical, chronological or thematic specialisations are on the rise, which proves that societies have found leading and structuring roles in the disciplinary fields they cover. These advances have been helped by societies' determined policies regarding publications and assistance to young researchers.

This dynamic impulse cannot leave certain issues in the shadows. The question of free access to journals is a case in point: learned societies have to tackle the problem to find an adequate business model that combines preserving income flows generated by journal sales with wider access to research work. Another issue concerns funding master's and doctoral students: financial assistance is all the more necessary in the present context since the survey highlights the limits of financial backing for theses. Adequate positioning in potentially competitive contexts is also a challenge, for today scientific affinities may aggregate in virtual spaces.

In the domain of English Studies, learned societies bring experience – some have been active for more than forty years – as well as scientific networks, annual meetings in colloquia or conferences, enduring and international research journals. They also offer awards for masters or theses which prove crucial for career beginners and to help to hire young doctors in higher education.

Conclusion

Today, English Studies think of themselves as a pluri-dimensional field equipped with particular expertise in intercultural phenomena. Increasingly numerous interactions with other disciplines and cultural areas have resulted from the mergers of certain Section 11 units with units devoted to Arts and Languages, and from research and CFP regroupings. Concomitantly, some thirty learned societies specific to the English Studies domain welcome more cutting-edge disciplinary subjects and, together with the doctoral schools and research units, they act as driving forces to supervise the field's doctoral students.

Prospective challenges include:

- Making the necessary efforts to maintain a strong disciplinary identity, both in research units and in training programmes (research master's degrees in English Studies). This will prevent the multiplication of units solely devoted to “languages” or “letters and languages” which remain the systematic options in intercultural projects.
- Strengthening necessary co-operations, on the one hand, with the historical disciplines – a crucial challenge, notably for civilisation specialists – and, on the other, with the sectors of law and sciences in order to develop truly interdisciplinary works. If such collaborations already exist, notably in linguistics, by crossing subjects with, for example literature, medicine or neuroscience, they are worth encouraging.

4.2 Structuration and CFPs

Recurring funding admittedly comes in various forms, but research directors do not spontaneously mention the lack of financial means when they manage the regular activities of their units (seminars, study days, colloquia) and when they pay for the missions of researchers and teacher-researchers. Conversely, most insist on the need to answer CFPs in an efficient way and they identify the structural hindering factors which prevent hosting teams, notably, from doing so in a systematic way.

As regards the lack of time, the question, if posed on its own, could appear irrelevant when most research unit directors agree that they have to look for funds and contracts in their operational contexts. As a matter of fact, the question is correlated with several other factors, notably with the failure rate of projects and the difficulty to see how rejected projects may eventually gain in structuring power for the units when they clash chronologically with the structural project of the team which is driven by other logical factors. In other words, lack of time is not, in itself, the primary cause of concern for most teacher-researchers. More preoccupying factors include:

- the ratio between the time devoted to building projects and the odds for success. For the time being, this ratio is deemed “unreasonable”;
- the feeling that it is not immediately feasible to breathe new life into rejected projects in the context of another perimeter;
- the way research units are structured: their upstream structuration does not always facilitate efficient applications to CFPs.

As regards the latter point, responses reveal that some directors make it clear they deny on principle that CFPs have any structuring effect. They are inclined to favour models which stem from the units themselves. As they see it, only these “in-house” models can durably preserve the diversity and variety of research in English Studies.

Apparently, it is easier to integrate CFPs of university communities (COMUE) or of regions into units since they do not reshuffle existing perimeters. On the other hand, reinvesting external CFPs seem to pose greater difficulties.

Directors have listed a certain number of difficulties, notably linked with the lisibility of actions and CFPs:

- Teacher-researchers sometimes find it challenging to distinguish between the different levels of structuration and the proposed supporting schemes. As a result, they struggle to identify among upstream phases which CFPs are more likely to meet their projects’ needs. The CFPs of university communities (COMUE), of IDEX schemes, of foundations, of centres for human sciences and of local authorities are numerous and they add extra layers of projects on top of national and European CFPs. There is no coordination between respective perimeters and information is scant in that respect, all of which is highlighted as a potential source of confusion.
- The efficiency and reliability of support units helping to build project applications have already been mentioned, but the kind of assistance they provide is sometimes considered too general (e.g. plenary information meetings on various CFPs), or too technical (e.g. budget building). So, their help is only regarded as valuable when projects are in their downstream conceptualisation phases. The lack of project engineers and of personalised assistance in hosting teams are hindering factors in the upstream phases of project file building.
- Although some literature and language projects have been accepted, there is a persisting feeling that these subjects are not totally welcome in the H2020 European programme which has been taken over by the ANR at the national level and through the “Domains of Strategic Activity” (*Domaines d’Activité Stratégique*) at the regional level. So

projects devoid of direct European (notably French) and interdisciplinary dimensions are seen as lacking in success potential and thematic calls do not seem to be particularly open to the sectors of letters and languages.

Besides, teacher-researchers in English Studies are often involved in foreign projects, particularly in Great Britain, within programmes which are funded, for example, by the *Arts and Humanities Research Council*. Yet, they cannot act as the principal carriers of these programmes (nor even as co-carriers in some cases). Their commitment in these projects is often of major importance – at times they may have conceptualised and built them – but they still face obstacles when they want to gain recognition for these partnerships because they are not managed by French research units acting as their main carriers.

The low rate of CFP application filings is also linked to the shortage of sabbaticals and of delegations for teacher-researchers in English Studies since there are few mixed research units in the field. It is a double-edged difficulty in language research because scholars in English Studies, even though they enjoy increasing access to digitalised data, frequently have to spend time abroad to conduct personal research on corpora and to meet international partners to file common applications for CFPs

Teacher-researchers enjoy scant opportunities to benefit from workload reductions (notably they may use no recurring schemes as many of their foreign colleagues do). As a result, they too often depend on local calls that favour foreign visiting researchers (international relations calls, campaigns for visiting professors, workshops that are financed by some units, etc.). Besides, no director of a Section 11 unit has mentioned he/she has filed a MRSEI project (*Montage de Réseaux Scientifiques Européens ou Internationaux*/Building European or international scientific networks) with the ANR. The launch of the “Fund it” platform (<http://www.fundit.fr/fr/>), which identifies all calls for research stays in France, will facilitate access to information on various funding opportunities.

Conclusion

CFP application filing is a matter of vigilance for scholars in English Studies. In spite of an increasing number of winning projects, 95% of unit directors point to numerous factors hindering project filing and external fund collecting. Prioritised obstacles include the complexity of application files, the lack of administrative support, the imbalance between the amount of devoted time and the low rates of success, and teacher-researchers' overwork. Equally worrying are the inadequate sizes of units and the discrepancy between CFPs and the subjects of units which are structured differently.

Support services that assist in filing applications operate in practically all institutions, and the unit directors who use them declare they are efficient in providing help for already mature projects. However, this assistance is still considered of little practical value in the upstream phases of project building. Respondents generally wish for more comprehensive support at all stages of project conceptualisation.

The lack of personalised assistance and the shortage of sabbaticals and of delegations are burdens weighing on a research environment which is generally perceived as unfavourable. They act as handicaps on the whole community.

Potential solutions to generate a more powerful momentum include a dual movement of simplification, local assistance and follow-up on, the one hand, and a significant increase in the number of sabbaticals on the other.

The involvement of English Studies researchers and teacher-researchers in funded foreign teams should be taken into consideration in a more systematic way, even if these colleagues are not main carriers or co-carriers.

4.3 Research environment

Filing responses to CFPs and the success of projects are issues which are linked to the more general question of building a research environment. It should include a whole panel of actors and should be favourable to the emergence of innovative projects and to the development of international partnerships.

Just like learned societies, research units have developed voluntaristic policies for the benefit of master's and doctoral students. Today, these students are offered a whole range of actions in their research domains. They fully take an active part in the work of researchers and teacher-researchers and in the organisation of scientific events.

Even if the number of doctoral students is stable or has been increasing over the last three years, the scarcity of doctoral contracts (except for projects financed by national and European agencies) is an obstacle that affects the whole community. Beyond the doctorate, providing guidance to doctors proves problematic because of the shortage of available positions in some of the field's domains. Of note, in contrast to other sectors, the number of postdoc contract holders is extremely limited. As there is no national status for doctors, institutions adopt widely different systems and they do not always provide clear statutory frameworks when doctors have no contracts with them. Units are urged to provide solutions because they generate a collective driving force, because institutional links play a major part in accreditation files, and also because belonging to a team is of major importance for professional integration on the workplace. As a consequence, units promote the activities of their young doctors and sometimes keep them as unit members over various periods of time, as a rule from one to four years after completing their doctorates.

A high proportion of unit directors mention the increasing problem of overtime caused by staff shortages in English Studies and applied foreign languages teaching programmes. They see it as one of the major factors preventing the elaboration of ambitious research strategies and policies. Balancing the periods of time devoted to administrative tasks, to training and to research is proving increasingly unfeasible and research is on the losing end as a result. Yet, on the other hand, the recognition of research activities seems to be given priority status when the careers of teacher-researchers are assessed.

Academics in English Studies are also in charge of preparing students for the recruitment competitive exams of CAPES and *agrégation*. As regards, notably, the *agrégation* programmes, data suggest that research units are caught in a double-bind logic. On the one hand, publishing on the subject and for the study days organised around the *agrégation* programme's literary works or notions is considered necessary; on the other hand, papers devoted to these subjects are not always presented as "research work" despite the amount of time they require. The issue was pinpointed by previous reports on the domain of English Studies as early as 2001, but it has not provided genuine food for thought since.

Supervising personnel provide support to research (but also to teaching so as to avoid the multiplication of administrative tasks), but it is considered woefully inadequate. The consequence is that research directors and axes managers can seldom take charge of their full missions as pilots of research. Research and study engineers are sorely needed whether to manage the use of platforms and software, to assist in project application filing or for journals and digital resources.

Conclusion

Ensuring wide recognition for research units in English Studies also depends on the integrating potential of the research environment. It should include researchers and teacher-researchers, administrative and technical staff, master's, doctoral and postdoc students, because they all create common synergies and dynamism. Among hosting teams, in particular, teacher-researchers are currently aware that this environment suffers from disruptions that often hinder their efforts to carry out all their tasks with the same level of efficiency, notably filing applications for CFPs and disseminating research. The issues linked to staff adequacy and to the recruitment competitive exams for secondary education are major challenges that clearly impact the conditions where research in English Studies is conducted.

4.4 Publications, research products and dissemination

One of the driving forces of English Studies clearly lies in the increasing internationalisation of publications. Researchers and teacher-researchers appear as authors in the catalogues of major Anglo-American publishing houses, notably thanks to monographies and collective works, and they contribute to the recognition of French research through their works.

Titles published abroad are reinforced by international publishing – often under the form of journals – backed by learned societies and research units. In the French context, these booming developments are largely due to the *revues.org* platform. It hosts both previously printed journals and digital journals that were hitherto hosted on independent sites. Today, gaining acceptance through the scientific committee of *revues.org* is regarded as evidence of a journal's scientific excellence. Many journals have revisited their operational and organisational processes to conform to the best editorial practices endorsed by *revues.org*.

While journals and books remain key factors in the internationalisation of English Studies research, other vehicles of research dissemination are developing, especially digital ones:

- The websites of units and learned societies are performing much better than in the past and are increasingly interactive. They are likely to welcome works, videos and podcasts which are efficient dissemination tools for parts of units' and societies' activities.
- More informal networks and research groups have developed independent dissemination supports thanks to the greater accessibility of Content Management Systems (CMSs) such as Wordpress. They are fed by researchers and doctoral students.
- Research blogs are multiplying via the hypotheses.org scientific blogging platform in English and in French. Alongside their internet sites which are more specifically devoted to institutional information, some units have one or several blogs to promote the works resulting from certain axes or seminars, or transversal works, or again the works of young researchers. When blogs are integrated into the hypotheses.org catalogue and receive an ISSN, they may be regarded as genuine publication series.

Among future challenges, the development of self-archiving may be mentioned. Only a part of the responses of research unit directors were processed due to some persisting misunderstandings (and apprehensions) on the nature, the operational modes and purposes of open archives, HAL in particular, and on the status and the scientific validation of deposited documents on these sites.

Now, it is crucial for English Studies scholars to come to a better understanding of these systems, notably in the international publishing context which characterises their domain. Over the last few years, the SAES has attracted the attention of its members on the evolving public policies in Britain following the Finch and Crossick reports. Depositing a publication on an open archive site has become compulsory for it to secure inclusion in the next assessment phase (*Research Excellence Framework*).⁷

Conclusion

The recognition of English Studies is carried out by a mesh of publication supports. Individual and collective publications are serviced, in particular, by university presses. National or international publications are backed by the journals of research units and learned societies. Other supports include publishing abroad in English and research blogs that experiment with new modes of writing and knowledge dissemination.

Thus, English Studies researchers enjoy the full benefits of a high level of recognition. Yet, their editorial context is largely influenced by Anglo-American models, and, to maintain and develop their assets, they should keep the following points in mind:

- submitting papers to the domain's flagship publications should be encouraged. Most publications abroad come as books (monographic studies, collective works, conference proceedings). Submitting papers to the domain's major international journals is proportionally less common than in other disciplines;
- focus on the way journals are funded. Hosting teams cannot count on editorial secretaries to provide assistance to journals; most units (and learned societies) elect or nominate editorial committees from their own members. These colleagues share tasks and collectively manage the editorial process; these duties are a heavy burden on teacher-researchers' individual productions. Even when funding is granted by units and even when some journals benefit from sources of income generated by the revues.org-based Freemium model, these resources are inadequate to challenge international journals;

⁷ See <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/oa/>.

- co-authored papers should be encouraged because they are indicators of research internationalisation;
- the perimeters of emerging journals should be carefully thought out. Existing journals of research units and learned societies are so numerous that some form of saturation is to be feared. However, as has already been mentioned, learned societies maintain publications on targeted subjects, alongside more generalist or interdisciplinary journals, and thus they can keep investigative reflection focused on dedicated disciplinary fields;
- the challenges linked to the development of free access should be targeted better, especially in the context of North American, British and European policies on the subject and of the bill “For a Digital Republic”.

CONCLUSION

This White Paper is the first document published in this format. Its purpose is to provide a cartography of present research in English Studies starting from data directly collected from the directors of learned societies and research units. Of course, it is to be improved, fine-tuned and made more accurate. Still, it represents the first overall attempt to analyse the scientific, structural and institutional disruptions that have shaped the field over the last fifteen years. That is the reason why it is organised following structuring elements (research entities, learned societies) rather than through disciplinary sectors.

As such, the White Paper meets the need expressed by the community of researchers and teacher-researchers of having a reliable overview of their domain. The Société des Anglicistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur was in the strategic position to carry out the survey because it is a professional association which regroups the great majority of French scholars in English Studies. For the first time in this context, investigative work has been conducted in direct collaboration with two scientific delegates of HCERES, the president and the first vice-president of the CNU's 11th Section, together with 27 chairs of specialised learned societies and the vice-president for research of the French association of American Studies (AFEA).

If we compare this White Paper with previous reports published in 2001, some of the risks that were identified some fifteen years ago can still be observed today: lack of funds to finance doctoral research and sabbaticals, crowded classes and staff shortages. The CAPES and *agrégation* competitive exams impose heavy duties for the preparation of dedicated events and publications. These fundamental issues were raised by the authors of previous reports, but they are still in need of adequate and satisfactory solutions.

In other respects, many evolutions come as obvious. Even though access to sources still poses problems in some sectors and even if institutions do not offer similar access conditions, the issue is no longer a major obstacle to the development of research in our discipline. This is due to the expansion of data bases and digitalised resources, to the creation in 2009 of a CADIST⁸ dedicated to the “languages, literatures and civilisations of the anglophone worlds” and of the SAES holdings, and to the development of revues.org.

The dissemination of research has intensified, here again, thanks to digital developments and to the multiplication of scientific blogging sites and of professional networks. Journals backed by Section 11 research units and specialised learned societies have gone through profound changes and have been assisted by revues.org in their digital transitions. Other journals started as digital from scratch and have enjoyed unprecedented dissemination success as a result. Research work in English Studies can now boast unequalled international recognition. Besides, the survey indicates that the missions carried out by learned societies and research units are covering a wider range of activities. They have multiplied collaborations with libraries, cultural institutions and the media. They have initiated non-textual research such as the production of films, software, raw or enriched corpora, platforms, etc. Finally, scholars in English Studies operate in a context where disciplinary silos tend to fade away. It includes doctoral students, but also young doctors, master's students, administrative and technical staff, and all of them take active part in the work of research units.

The main disruptions were naturally caused by the mutations experienced by the scientific, cultural and professional institutions of higher education (EPSCP) in France and by the

⁸ CADIST (centre d'acquisition et de diffusion de l'information scientifique et technique) are centres of acquisition and dissemination of scientific and technical information. These documentary networks are sponsored by French institutional libraries. (Translator's note)

European funding policies regarding research. Certain institutions have joined forces or merged, the IDEX scheme was launched and renewed. CFPs have multiplied and public policies have had a large impact on open access. All these factors have generated a deep and durable sea change in the nature and structuration of research in English Studies. As a consequence, it no longer made relevant sense to present the White Paper as a mere recapitulation of disciplinary sectors or cultural areas within the same field. Today, research in English Studies is conducted through a wide range of collaborations and in direct contact with international partners. Everywhere in the document, many material, practical and institutional difficulties have been mentioned and they include shortages in research support staff, which suggests that better rates of CFP applications could be achieved. Still, over the last fifteen years, scholars in English Studies have managed to carve out a place for themselves in international projects and publishing houses.

The authors of the White Paper have been struck by the disparities in responses to questions and by the diversity of operating modes. This has made synthetic analysis more difficult since it was *a priori* challenging to compare the functioning of large interdisciplinary mixed research units with that of hosting teams which sometimes have smaller sizes and more modest means. Now, the general impression that prevails after reading the answers to the questionnaire is that of an extremely agile adaptability to contexts and local environments. Each unit makes the most of its particular ecosystem and develops its scientific strategy and innovative initiatives in its own perimeter depending on existing forces and means. Besides, projects, subjects and collaborations are extremely numerous which is evidence of the units' determined territorial rooting. It also shows that academic research is keen to open up to the social community and to societal issues, particularly in relation with the regional and territorial mesh. This open-mindedness also makes sense within the current debate on open access to works and data produced by public research.

Thus, the widespread recognition of English Studies also finds its way through a variety of models and structures. "Niche ventures" launched by a few specialists operate alongside Europe-wide projects. Configurative diversity has to inspire respect but it also has to be encouraged. Research directors have expressed concern about being forced to adopt normative models while disciplinary substance is on the wane.

English Studies actors have aptly seized the opportunities offered by contractual rationales, especially outside the field, but only in situations where keeping a strong disciplinary identity was not in danger. One of the risks identified in the questionnaire points to the potential dissolution of this identity in forms of interdisciplinarity or interculturality imposed by structural fiat instead of being conceptualised by the community itself. Finally, data suggest that what social and human sciences may contribute to CFP subjects, notably European ones, does not inspire much thinking among respondents, even as regards the "letters and languages" sector.

A decline of sorts of the learned society format might have been expected in the context of current models: after all, the oldest societies are more than forty years old and at the same time durable or semi-durable subject-based research networks are developing with the assistance of fast-adapting digital tools. However, data point the other way. Societies are enjoying increased vibrancy despite their often limited financial resources. They act as driving and structuring forces in various subject fields as they help in supervising young researchers and in disseminating scientific results. Valuable specialised work is being carried out in societies which take active part in methodological and conceptual evolutions. Their work can then feed back into the research of entities, institutions and networks which have highly different perimeters. The resulting effect is to build a strong disciplinary identity without which the emergence of transdisciplines would be doomed to failure.

This White Book reveals the novel convergence patterns which are currently structuring the various levels of English Studies. Thanks to this approach, it attempts to measure the way all the domain's actors are tackling the challenges of a fast-moving national and international research environment and are playing forefront roles as interlocutors of scientific communities in the English-speaking world. A whole range of indicators leads us to think that, beyond obstacles and occasionally contrary conditions, English Studies research will demonstrate its capacity to maintain and increase excellence in research and visibility.

APPENDIX 1

Members of the SAES Research Commission (2016)

***Ex-officio* members**

1. SAES President: Pierre Lurbe (Paris-Sorbonne)
2. SAES Vice-President for Research: Anne Dunan-Page (Aix-Marseille)
3. SAES Vice-President for Scientific Affairs: Martine Yvernault (Limoges)
4. AFEA Vice-President for Research: Sylvie Bauer (Rennes 2)

Permanent guest invitees

1. President and First Vice-President of the CNU's 11th Section: Jean Viviès (Aix-Marseille) and Agnès Celle (Paris Diderot)
2. Scientific delegates of HCERES (Department for the Evaluation of Research): Martine Schuwer (Rennes 2) and Laurence Talairach-Vielmas (Toulouse Jean Jaurès)

Nominated members

1. Christian Auer (Prof., Strasbourg)
2. Catherine Bernard (Prof., Paris Diderot)
3. Susan Finding (Prof., Poitiers)
4. Laure Gardelle (Senior Lect., ENS Lyon)
5. Manuel Jobert (Prof., Lyon 3)
6. Guyone Leduc (Prof., Charles de Gaulle Lille 3)
7. Clément Oudart (Senior Lect., Paris-Sorbonne)
8. Mathilde Rogez (Senior Lect., Toulouse Jean Jaurès)
9. Michel Van der Yeught (Prof., Aix-Marseille)

APPENDIX 2

Questionnaire addressed to the chairs of SAES-affiliated learned societies



General information

Name of society (please, specify if name or scope have changed in society's history)

Research domains

Chair/President

Foundation date

Number of members

Number of members outside France

Legal status (Act of 1901 association or other status)

Email address

1- Your society acts as partner of:

Organisations, networks, research groups

National societies

International societies

Other

Please, specify the nature of partnerships when possible.

2- Your society is open to non-academic members.

Yes

No

3- Detail the organisation mode of your scientific work.

Annual conferences/colloquia

Colloquia/workshops in other conferences

Seminars

Other

4- If your society participates financially in events organised by members in their institutions, specify nature and average amount of participations.

5- Your society offers:

Master's awards

Thesis awards

No master's or thesis awards

6- Your society awards a prize for research.

Yes

No

7- Your society offers:

Grants for master's degrees. Please, specify type (support to publication, research stays, presentations in conferences in France or abroad...).

Thesis grants (specify type)

The society offers no grants.

8- Indicate the ways doctoral students are involved in the activities of your society.

9- If your society has its own journal, please, indicate title, format (paper/digital) and date of creation. Specify journal's main publishing language.

10- Detail how journal is financed.

11- Indicate if journal's main purpose is to publish members' papers or if it follows another editorial policy.

12- The journal has:

A reviewing committee

A national scientific committee

An international scientific committee

13- Indicate society's policy regarding open access.

14- Specify other means used by your society to publish its works.

Website

Research blog

Publisher's series

Other (please, detail)

15- Other observations. Thank you for any further comments indicating how learned societies contribute to national research in the domain of English Studies.

APPENDIX 3

Questionnaire addressed to the directors of research units



SAES White Paper, research units

1. General information

Name of unit

Status (UMR, E.A. ...)

Identification number

Institution

Email address

SAES White Paper, research units 2. Structuration and content of research

1- Your unit is:

Composed of members of Section 11 (please, specify disciplines: literature, civilisation, linguistics ...)

Pluridisciplinary (please, specify disciplines)

2- Your scientific project comprises:

Internal teams/poles/axes (please, specify)

A general theme (please, specify)

Transversal programmes (please, specify.)

3- The most frequently organised events in your unit include:

Seminars, regular meetings of unit's teacher-researchers: every month, two months, three months (please, specify % in relation to annual programming)

Study days over 1 or 2 days, fewer than 20 paper presenters (%)

Workshops (%). When applicable, please specify difference with seminars

Colloquia or conferences, over 20 paper presenters (%)

Other (please, specify)

4- If your project has been thought out in relation to an institutional strategy aiming at the development of interdisciplinarity, please specify which disciplines are involved.

5- Detail how external entities influence your scientific project (doctoral schools, university communities, Centres for Human Sciences, Centres for Research, federative structures, research groups, scientific interest groups ...)

6- Detail how your scientific project is determined or influenced by:

Local and national CFPs (e.g. National Agency for Research/ANR)

International CFPs (e.g. European Research Commission/ERC)

Does your unit benefit from LABEX/IDEX/EQUIPEX funding?
(If yes, please specify)

In your view, which factors are likely to hinder the filing of national or international projects?

7- Is your institution equipped with project filing support services? If yes, how do you rate the assistance they provide?

8- Detail how your scientific project is determined or influenced by CNRS delegations? IUF delegations?

Please, in both cases, specify the number of beneficiaries among English Studies researchers in your unit (in 2013, 2014, 2015).

SAES White Paper, research units
3. Funding and means

9- What is the share of the various funding resources in your unit?

Recurring funding (please, enter amount or %)

Non-recurring funds, e.g. research quality bonuses (please, enter amount or %)

Funding provided by various local, national, international projects (please, enter amount or %)

10- How many English Studies researchers benefited from sabbaticals (in 2013, 2014 and 2015)?

When applicable, please, specify:

Sabbaticals granted by institution

Sabbaticals granted by CNU

11- Enter the sum devoted to each of your unit's permanent teacher-researchers to carry out their research (divide your recurring financial allocation by number of permanent teacher-researchers).

12- Enter the number of administrative staff working in your unit.

Dedicated to unit only

On a shared basis

13- Detail the unit director's perks (bonus or workload reductions?)

SAES White Paper, research units

4. Training programmes and doctoral students (only since 2013)

14- Detail the connection between the scientific project and the research and professional master' degrees. Is the project influenced by national recruitment competitive exams?

15- Enter the current number of doctoral students in your unit. Please, specify increase or decrease since 2013.

16- Enter number of English Studies doctoral students under cotutelle supervision (since 2013). Please, specify countries involved.

17- Enter number of English Studies doctoral students co-supervised by professors (or senior lecturers with habilitations) and senior lecturers (since 2013).

18- Enter number of English Studies doctoral students who benefited from:

Institutional doctoral contracts (2013, 2014 and 2015)

Doctoral contracts within CFPs (2013, 2014, 2015)

SAES White Paper, research units
5. Publications and dissemination of research

19- Detail the average share of foreign publications as part of the production of your unit's English Studies teacher-researchers.

Fewer than 25%

Between 25% and 50%

Over 50%

Please, list most frequently mentioned foreign publishing houses/journals.

20- Detail how your scientific project is determined or influenced by partnerships with cultural institutions (museums, libraries and archives, theatres, festivals, etc.) and, more generally, by the social and economic sector.

21- Is your unit associated with a journal? Please, specify title, format (paper/digital) and date of creation.

22- Detail your unit's policy as regards co-financing works published by English Studies scholars (purchase of reproduction and translation rights, copy editing, subsidising publications ...).

23- Do the university presses of your institution publish one or several series dedicated to English Studies? If yes, please detail.

24- Does your unit promote the publication of works and data through the following?

Research blogs

Expert blogs

Data bases

Other

25- Does your unit host a series on HAL-SHS? Does it implement an incentive policy regarding open access?

APPENDIX 4

Responding SAES-affiliated learned societies

1. **AFEC**: Association Française d'Études Canadiennes (Hélène Harter), <http://www.afec33.asso.fr>
2. **ALAES**: Association des Linguistes Anglicistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur (Lionel Dufaye), <https://alaesfrance.wordpress.com>
3. **ALOES**: Association des anglicistes pour les études de Langue Orale dans l'Enseignement Supérieur, secondaire et élémentaire (Nicolas Ballier)
4. **AMAES**: Association des Médiévistes Anglicistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur (Leo Carruthers), <http://amaes.org>
5. **ARDAA**: Association pour la Recherche en Didactique de l'Anglais et en Acquisition (Anne-Marie Voise), <http://www.ardaa.fr>
6. **CRECIB**: Centre de Recherches et d'Études en Civilisation Britannique (Gilles Leydier), <http://www.crecib.fr>
7. **FATHOM**: French Association for Thomas Hardy Studies (Annie Ramel), <http://fathomhardy.fr>
8. **GERAS**: Groupe d'Étude et de Recherche en Anglais de Spécialité (Michel Van der Yeught), <http://www.geras.fr/welcome/index.php>
9. **RADAC**: Recherche sur les Arts Dramatiques Anglophones Contemporains (Susan Blattès), <http://www.radac.fr>
10. **SAGEF**: Société d'Études Anglophones sur les Femmes, le Sexe et le Genre (Florence Binard), <http://sagef-gender.blogspot.fr>
11. **SAIT**: Société Angliciste: Arts, Images, Textes (Isabelle Gadoin), <http://sait-france.org>
12. **SDHL**: Société D. H. Lawrence (Ginette Roy)
13. **SEAA XVII-XVIII**: Société d'Études Anglo-Américaines des XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles (Guyonne Leduc), <http://1718.fr>
14. **SEAC**: Société d'Études Anglaises Contemporaines (Catherine Bernard), <http://www.laseac.fr>
15. **SEC**: Société d'Études Conradiennes (Véronique Pauly)
16. **SELVA**: Société d'Étude de la Littérature de Voyage du monde Anglophone (Françoise Besson), <http://sites.univ-provence.fr/SELVA/>
17. **SEM**: Société d'Études Modernistes (Hélène Aji), <https://sem-france.u-paris10.fr>

18. **SEPC:** Société d'Études des Pays du Commonwealth (Claire Omhovère), <http://www.univ-paris3.fr/commonwealth-essays-and-studies-16669.kjsp?RH=1226586296353>
19. **SEPTET:** Société d'Études des Pratiques et Théories en Traduction (Florence Lautel-Ribstein), <http://www.septet-traductologie.com>
20. **SERA:** Société d'Études du Romantisme Anglais (Caroline Bertonèche), <http://serafranceblog.wordpress.com/society-2/>
21. **SERCIA:** Société d'Études et de Recherches sur le Cinéma Anglo-saxon (Jean-François Baillon), <http://www.sercia.net/index.php/fr/>
22. **SEW:** Société d'Études Woolfiennes (Claire Davison), <http://etudes-woolfiennes.org>
23. **SFEEd:** Société Française d'Études Écossaises (Jean Berton), <http://sfee.univ-tours.fr/France/Indexfr.htm>
24. **SFEVE:** Société Française d'Études Victoriennes et Édouardiennes (Sara Thorton), <http://sfeve.hypotheses.org>
25. **SFS:** Société Française Shakespeare (Sarah Hatchuel), <http://shakespeare.revues.org>
26. **SOFEIR:** Société Française d'Études Irlandaises (Anne Goarzin), <http://www.sofeir.fr/index.php?lang=fr>
27. **SSA:** Société de Stylistique Anglaise (Sandrine Sorlin), <http://stylistique-anglaise.org/presentation/>
28. [**Société de Biographie/The Biography Society:** (Joanny Moulin), affiliated after questionnaire was addressed, <http://biographysociety.org>]

APPENDIX 5

Responding research units

| <i>Acronym</i> | <i>Unit</i> | <i>Institution/ organisation</i> | <i>Status</i> | <i>Director</i> |
|--------------------|---|--|---------------|--|
| 1. ACE | Anglophonie: Communautés Écritures | Rennes 2 | EA | Sylvie Bauer |
| 2. AGORA | | Cergy-Pontoise | EA | Isabelle Prat |
| 3. CAS | Cultures Anglo-Saxonnes | Toulouse Jean- Jaurès | EA | Philippe Birgy |
| 4. CECILLE | Centre d'Études en Civilisations, Langues et Littératures Étrangères | Charles de Gaulle Lille 3 | EA | Thomas Dutoit |
| 5. CELISO | Centre de Linguistique en Sorbonne | Paris-Sorbonne | EA | Wilfrid Rotgé |
| 6. CEMA | Centre d'Études Médiévales Anglaises | Paris-Sorbonne | EA | Leo Carruthers |
| 7. CESCO | Centre d'Études Supérieures de Civilisation Médiévales | CNRS, Poitiers | UMR | Cécile Treffort |
| 8. CIRLEP | Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherches sur les Langues et la Pensée | Reims | EA | Thomas Nicklas |
| 9. CLILLAC- ARP | Centre de Linguistique Inter- langues, de Lexicologie, de Linguistique Anglaise et de Corpus - Atelier de Recherche sur la Parole | Paris Diderot | EA | Natalie Kübler |
| 10. CLIMAS | Cultures et Littératures des Mondes Anglophones | Bordeaux | EA | Nathalie Jaëck |
| 11. CORPUS | | Rouen et Amiens | EA | Pierre Sicard |
| 12. CRBC | Centre de Recherche Bretonne et Celtique | Brest (UBO) et Rennes 2 | EA | Anne Goarzin (Rennes 2) et Philippe Jarnoux (UBO) |
| 13. CREA | Centre de Recherche Anglophone | Paris-Ouest Nanterre-La Défense | EA | Cornelius Crowley |
| 14. CREW | Center for Research on the English-speaking World | Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3 | EA | Romain Garbaye |
| 15. CRILA | Centre de Recherche Interdisciplinaire en Langue Anglaise | Angers | EA | Emmanuel Vernadakis |
| 16. DIRE | Déplacements, Identités, Regards, Écritures | La Réunion | EA | Eileen Williams- Wanquet |
| 17. EHC | Espaces Humains et Interactions Culturelles | Blaise-Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand et Limoges | EA | Timothy Whitton |

| | | | | |
|-------------|--|---------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|
| 18. EMMA | Études Montpelliéraines du Monde Anglophone | Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3 | EA | Christine Reynier |
| 19. ERIBIA | Équipe de Recherche Interdisciplinaire sur La Grande-Bretagne, l'Irlande et l'Amérique du Nord | Caen | EA | Anca Cristofovici |
| 20. GRIC | Groupe de Recherche Identités et Cultures | Le Havre | EA | Sarah Hatchuel |
| 21. HCTI | Héritages et Constructions dans le Texte et l'Image | Brest et Lorient (UBO et UBS) | EA | Alain Kerhervé |
| 22. HDEA | Histoire et Dynamiques des Espaces Anglophones | Paris-Sorbonne | EA | Andrew Diamond |
| 23. ICAR | Interactions, Corpus, Apprentissages, Représentations | CNRS, ENS Lyon, Lyon 2 | UMR | Sandra Teston-Bonnard |
| 24. ICD | Interactions Culturelles et Discursives | Tours | EA | Monica Zapata |
| 25. ICT | Identités, Cultures, Territoires | Paris Diderot | EA | Charlotte de Castelnaud |
| 26. ICTT | Identité Culturelle, Textes et Théâtralité | Avignon | EA | Madelena Gonzalez |
| 27. IDEA | Interdisciplinarité dans les Études Anglophones | Lorraine | EA | John Bak |
| 28. ILCEA4 | Institut des Langues et Cultures d'Europe, Amérique, Afrique, Asie et Australie | Grenoble Stendhal | EA | Almudena Delgado Larios |
| 29. IRCL | Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, l'âge Classique et les Lumières | CNRS, Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3 | UMR | Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin |
| 30. LAIRDIL | LABoratoire Inter-universitaire de Recherche en DIDactique du LANSAD | Toulouse Paul Sabatier | EA | Françoise Raby |
| 31. LARCA | Laboratoire de Recherches sur les Cultures Anglophones | CNRS, Paris Diderot | UMR | François Brunet |
| 32. LCE | Langues et Cultures Européennes | Lyon 2 | EA | Ralf Zschachlitz |
| 33. LDI | Lexique, Dictionnaire, Informatique | CNRS, Paris 13 | UMR | Gabrielle Le Tannec |
| 34. LERMA | Laboratoire d'Études et de Recherche sur le Monde Anglophone | Aix-Marseille | EA | Anne Dunan-Page |
| 35. LIDILE | Linguistique - Ingénierie - Didactique des Langues | Rennes 2 | EA | Marie-Claude Le Bot |
| 36. LPL | Laboratoire Parole et Langage | CNRS, Aix-Marseille | UMR | Noël Nguyen |
| 37. MIMMOC | Mémoire Identité et Marginalité dans le Monde Occidental Contemporain | Poitiers | EA | Susan Finding |
| 38. Pléiade | | Paris 13 | EA | Frédéric Alexandre |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|
| 39. PRISMES | Langues, Textes, Arts et Cultures du Monde Anglophone | Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3 | EA | Line Cottagnies |
| 40. SEARCH | Savoirs dans l'Espace Anglophone: Représentations, Culture, Histoire | Strasbourg | EA | Anne Bandry-Scubbi |
| 41. Transferts | Transferts Critiques et Dynamique des Savoirs | Paris 8 | EA | Rémy Bethmont |
| 42. Textes et Cultures | | Artois | EA | Claudine Nédelec |
| 43. TIL | Centre Interlangues: Texte, Image, Langage | Bourgogne | EA | Agnès Alexandre-Collier |
| 44. Triangle | Action, Discours, Pensée Politique et Economique | CNRS, ENS Lyon, IEP Lyon, Lyon 2 | UMR | Renaud Payre |
| 45. VALE | Voix Anglophones: Littérature et Esthétique | Paris-Sorbonne | EA | Élisabeth Angel-Perez |

APPENDIX 6

Journals associated with responding learned societies

| | Society | Journal | URL | Observations |
|--------|--|---|---|--|
| AFEC | Association Française d'Études Canadiennes | <i>Études canadiennes-Canadian Studies</i> | http://eccs.revues.org | Paper version matched in 2016 by digital version hosted on revues.org. French and English |
| ALAES | Association des Linguistes Anglicistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur | <i>French Review of English Linguistics (FREL)</i> | http://frel.edel.univ-poitiers.fr/index.php?id=91 | Digital journal in English – in partnership with ALOES |
| ALOES | Association des Anglicistes pour les Études de Langue Orale dans l'Enseignement Supérieur, Secondaire et Élémentaire | <i>French Review of English Linguistics (FREL)</i> | http://frel.edel.univ-poitiers.fr/index.php?id=91 | Digital journal in English – in partnership with ALAES |
| AMAES | Association des Médiévistes Anglicistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur | <i>Bulletin des Anglicistes Médiévistes (BAM)</i> | | Biannual, summer/winter. Paper format. French and English. Additional book every year |
| ARDAA | Association pour la Recherche en Didactique de l'Anglais et en Acquisition | <i>Recherche et Pratique pédagogiques en langues de spécialité-Cahiers de l'APLIUT</i> | http://apliut.revues.org | In partnership with RANACLES (Rassemblement National des Centres de Langues de l'Enseignement Supérieur) |
| CRECIB | Centre de Recherches et d'Études en Civilisation Britannique | <i>Revue Française de Civilisation Britannique (RFCB)/French Journal of British Studies</i> | https://rfcb.revues.org | Paper and digital formats. French and English |
| FATHOM | French Association for Thomas Hardy Studies | <i>French e-journal of Thomas Hardy Studies</i> | http://fathom.revues.org/ | English. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|---|--|
| GERAS | Groupe d'Étude et de Recherche en Anglais de Spécialité | <i>ASp.</i> | https://asp.revues.org | Paper and digital formats. |
| RADAC | Recherches sur les Arts Dramatiques Anglophones Contemporains | <i>Coup de Théâtre</i> | | Paper format. French and English |
| SAIT | Société Angliciste : Arts, Images, Textes | <i>Polysèmes</i> | http://sait-france.org/la-revue-polysemes/ | Paper format. Forthcoming on revues.org. |
| SDHL | Société D.H. Lawrence | <i>Études lawrenciennes</i> | http://lawrence.revues.org | Paper and digital formats. English |
| SEAA XVII-XVIII | Société d'Études Anglo-Américaines des XVIIe et XVIIIe Siècles | <i>RSEAA XVII-XVIII</i> | http://www.persee.fr/collection/xvii | Paper format and online version hosted on Persée with 2-year embargo. Forthcoming on revues.org. French and English |
| SEAC | Société d'Études Anglaises Contemporaines | <i>Études britanniques contemporaines (EBC)</i> | http://ebc.revues.org | Back issues published by Presses de la Méditerranée (Montpellier 3). Main language: English |
| SEC | Société d'Études Conradiennes | <i>L'Époque conradienne</i> | | Paper format. Presses Universitaires de Limoges. Will turn digital shortly. French and English |
| SEPC | Société d'Étude des Pays du Commonwealth | <i>Commonwealth Essays & Studies</i> <i>Cultures of the Commonwealth</i> | | Paper format. Will turn digital shortly. English only. Paper format. English only |
| SEPTET | Société d'Études des Pratiques et Théories en Traduction | <i>Des mots aux actes</i> | | Paper format. from 2008 to 2014 published by Éditions Anagrammes; from 2015 by Éditions Classiques Garnier. Main language: |

| | | | | |
|--------|---|--|---|---|
| | | | | French |
| SERCIA | Société d'Études et de Recherches sur le Cinéma Anglo-saxon | <i>Film Journal</i> | http://filmjournal.org | English |
| SFEVE | Société Française d'Études Victoriennes et Édouardiennes | <i>Les Cahiers victoriens et édouardiens (CVE)</i> | https://cve.revues.org | Back issues published by Presses de la Méditerranée (Montpellier 3) |
| SFS | Société Française Shakespeare | <i>Revue de la Société Française Shakespeare</i> | http://shakespeare.revues.org | French and English |
| SOFEIR | Société Française d'Études Irlandaises | <i>Études Irlandaises</i> | http://etudesirlandaises.revues.org | Paper and digital formats. Presses Universitaires de Rennes |
| SSA | Société de Stylistique Anglaise | <i>Études de Stylistique Anglaise</i> | | Forthcoming on revues.org. French and English |

APPENDIX 7

Journals associated with responding research units (units in alphabetical order)

| Unit | | Journal(s) | URL |
|--|--|--|---|
| ACE (Rennes 2) | Anglophonie: Communautés Écritures | <i>LISA/LISA e-journal</i> | http://lisa.revues.org/ |
| CAS (Toulouse Jean-Jaurès) | Cultures Anglo- Saxonnes | <i>Sigma/Anglophonia</i> | http://anglophonia.revues.org/ |
| | | <i>Caliban</i> | http://caliban.revues.org/ |
| | | <i>Miranda</i> | http://miranda.revues.org/ |
| CECILLE (Charles de Gaulle - Lille 3) | Centre d'Études en Civilisations, Langues et Littératures Étrangères | <i>Atlante</i> | http://cecille.recherche.univ-lille3.fr/revues/atlante/ |
| | | <i>Recherches Britanniques</i> | http://cecille.recherche.univ-lille3.fr/revues/recherches-britanniques/ |
| CESCM (Poitiers) | Centre d'Études Supérieures de Civilisation Médiévales | <i>Cahiers de civilisation médiévale</i> | http://www.persee.fr/collection/ccmed |
| CIRLEP (Reims) | Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherches sur les Langues et la Pensée | <i>Imaginaire(s)</i> | http://www.univ-reims.fr/site/editions-et-presses-universitaires-de-reims/catalogue/revues/revue-imaginaires.9049,17043.html |
| | | <i>Savoirs en Prisme</i> | https://savoirsenprisme.com/ |
| CLIMAS (Bordeaux Montaigne) | Cultures et Littératures des Mondes Anglophones | <i>Leaves</i> | http://climas.u-bordeaux3.fr/leaves |
| CORPUS (Rouen et Amiens) | | <i>Cercles</i> | http://www.cercles.com/ |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| CREA (Paris-Ouest Nanterre-La Défense) | Centre de Recherche Anglophone | <i>Études lawrenciennes</i> | http://lawrence.revues.org/ |
| | | <i>Revue du CiClaHO</i> | |
| | | <i>Revue FAAAM</i> | |
| | | <i>L'Atelier</i> | http://ojs.u- paris10.fr/index.php/latelier |
| CREW (Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3) | Center for Research on the English- speaking World | <i>Inmédia</i> | http://inmedia.revues.org/ |
| CRILA (Angers) | Centre de Recherche Interdisciplinaire en Langue Anglaise | <i>Journal of the Short Story in English</i> | http://jsse.revues.org/ |
| DIRE (La Réunion) | Déplacements, Identités, Regards, Écritures | <i>TrOPICS</i> | http://tropics.univ-reunion.fr/ |
| EHIC (Clermont- Ferrand et Limoges) | Espaces Humains et Interactions Culturelles | <i>Les cahiers de l'EHIC</i> | |
| EMMA (Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3) | Études Montpelliéraines du Monde Anglophone | <i>Cahiers Victoriens et Édouardiens</i> | http://cve.revues.org/ |
| | | <i>Études britanniques contemporaines</i> | http://ebc.revues.org/ |
| GRIC (Le Havre) | Groupe de Recherche Identités et Cultures | <i>EOLLE</i> | https://gric.univ- lehavre.fr/spip.php?rubrique66 |
| | | <i>TV/Series</i> | http://tvseries.revues.org/ |
| HCTI (UBO et UBS) | Héritages et Constructions dans le Texte et l'Image | <i>Ridiculosa</i> | http://www.eiris.eu/index.php?opt ion=com_content&view=category &layout=blog&id=27&Itemid=50 |
| | | <i>Cahiers du Ceima</i> | http://www.univ- brest.fr/FSceima/menu/PUBLICA TIONS/Les Cahiers du Ceima |
| ICAR (CNRS, ENS Lyon, Lyon 2) | Interactions, Corpus, Apprentissages, Représentations | <i>Mots. Les langages du politique</i> | http://mots.revues.org/ |
| ICD (Tours) | Interactions Culturelles et Discursives | <i>GRAAT On-line</i> | http://www.graat.fr/ |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| ICTT (Avignon) | Identité Culturelle, Textes et Théâtralité | <i>Sphères</i> | http://icct.univ-avignon.fr/spheres/ |
| ILCEA4 (Grenoble Stendhal) | Institut des Langues et Cultures d'Europe, Amérique, Afrique, Asie et Australie | <i>Représentations</i> | http://representations.u-grenoble3.fr/ |
| | | <i>Études Écossaises</i> | http://etudeseccossaises.revues.org/ |
| IRCL (Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3) | Institut de Recherche sur la Renaissance, l'âge Classique et les Lumières | <i>Cahiers Élisabéthains</i> | http://cae.sagepub.com/ |
| | | <i>ASF (Arrêt sur Scène/Scene Focus)</i> | http://www.ircl.cnrs.fr/francais/arret_scene/arret_scene_focus_accueil.htm |
| LAIRDIL (Toulouse Paul-Sabatier) | Laboratoire Inter- universitaire de Recherche en Didactique du LANSAD | <i>EDL</i> | http://www.lairdil.fr/revues-edl-et-cahiers-pedagogiques-290.html |
| LARCA (Paris Diderot) | Laboratoire de Recherches sur les Cultures Anglophones | <i>Interfaces Image Texte Langage</i> En partenariat avec l'Université de Bourgogne et The College of the Holy Cross (Massachusetts) | http://college.holycross.edu/interfaces/history.html |
| | | <i>Arts of War and Peace</i> | http://www.awpreview.univ-paris-diderot.fr/ |
| LCE (Lyon 2) | Langues et Cultures Européennes | <i>Collection Textures</i> | |
| | | <i>Cahiers d'Études Germaniques</i> | Prochainement sur revues.org |
| LDI (Paris 13) | Lexique, Dictionnaire, Informatique | <i>Postcolonial Text</i> | http://postcolonial.org/index.php/pct |
| LERMA (Aix- Marseille) | Laboratoire d'Études et de Recherche sur le Monde Anglophone | <i>E-rea</i> | http://erea.revues.org/ |
| LPL (Aix- Marseille) | Laboratoire Parole et Langage | <i>Les Travaux Interdisciplinaires sur la Parole et le Langage</i> | http://tipa.revues.org |
| MIMMOC (Poitiers) | Mémoire Identité et Marginalité dans le Monde Occidental Contemporain | <i>Mémoire(s), identité(s), marginalité(s) dans le monde occidental contemporain Cahiers du MIMMOC</i> | http://mimmoc.revues.org |
| Pléiade (Paris 13) | | <i>Itinéraires</i> | http://itineraires.revues.org/ |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| PRISMES (Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3) | Langues, Textes, Arts et Cultures du Monde Anglophone | <i>Palimpsestes</i> | http://palimpsestes.revues.org/ |
| | | <i>Études Épistémè</i> (Revue du séminaire Épistémè, Association Loi 1901) | http://episteme.revues.org/ |
| SEARCH (Strasbourg) | Savoirs dans l'Espace Anglophone: Représentations, Culture, Histoire | <i>RANAM</i> | http://pus.unistra.fr/fr/revues/ranam |
| Textes et Cultures (Artois) | | <i>Cahiers Robinson</i> <i>Cahiers Henri Bosco</i> | http://lescahiersrobinson.univ-artois.fr/ http://apu.univ-artois.fr/Collections/Cahiers-Henri-Bosco |
| | | <i>Graphè</i> | http://www.univ-artois.fr/graphe/graphe_revue.html |
| TIL (Bourgogne) | Centre Interlangues: Texte, Image, Langage | <i>Textes et Contextes</i> | https://revuesshs.u-bourgogne.fr/textes&contextes/ |
| VALE (Paris- Sorbonne) | Voix Anglophones: Littérature et Esthétique | <i>Sillages Critiques</i> | http://sillagescritiques.revues.org/ |

APPENDIX 8

Journals associated with responding research units (journals in alphabetical order)

| Journal(s) | URL | Unit | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---|
| <i>Arts of War and Peace</i> | http://www.awpreview.univ-paris-diderot.fr/ | LARCA | Laboratoire de Recherches sur les Cultures Anglophones (Paris Diderot) |
| <i>ASF (Arrêt sur Scène/Scene Focus)</i> | http://www.ircl.cnrs.fr/francais/arr-et-scene/arret-scene-focus-accueil.htm | IRCL | Institut de recherche sur la Renaissance, l'âge Classique et les Lumières (Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3) |
| <i>Atlante</i> | http://cecille.recherche.univ-lille3.fr/revues/atlante/ | CECILLE | Centre d'Études en Civilisations, Langues et Littératures Étrangères (Charles de Gaulle Lille 3) |
| <i>Cahiers de civilisation médiévale</i> | http://www.persee.fr/collection/ccmed | CESCM | Centre d'Études Supérieures de Civilisation Médiévale (Poitiers) |
| <i>Les Cahiers de l'EHIC</i> | | EHIC | Espaces Humains et Interactions Culturelles (Blaise-Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand et Limoges) |
| <i>Cahiers d'Études Germaniques</i> | prochainement disponible sur revues.org | LCE | Langues et Cultures Européennes (Lyon 2) |
| <i>Cahiers du Ceima</i> | http://www.univ-brest.fr/FSceima/menu/PUBLICATIONS/Les_Cahiers_du_Ceima | HCTI | Héritages et Constructions dans le Texte et l'Image (UBO et UBS) |
| <i>Cahiers Élisabéthains</i> | http://cae.sagepub.com/ | IRCL | Institut de recherche sur la Renaissance, l'âge Classique et les Lumières (Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3) |
| <i>Cahiers Henri Bosco</i> | http://apu.univ-artois.fr/Collections/Cahiers-Henri-Bosco | Textes et Cultures (Artois) | |
| <i>Cahiers Robinson</i> | http://lescahiersrobinson.univ-artois.fr/ | Textes et Cultures (Artois) | |
| <i>Cahiers Victoriens et Édouardiens</i> | http://cve.revues.org/ | EMMA | Études Montpelliéraines du Monde Anglophone (Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3) |
| <i>Caliban</i> | http://caliban.revues.org/ | CAS | Cultures Anglo- |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Saxonnès (Toulouse Jean-Jaurès) |
| <i>Cercles</i> | http://www.cercles.com/ | CORPUS | Rouen et Amiens |
| <i>Collection Textures</i> | | LCE | Langues et Cultures Européennes (Lyon 2) |
| <i>EDL</i> | http://www.lairdil.fr/revues-edl-et-cahiers-pedagogiques-290.html | LAIRDIL | Laboratoire Inter-universitaire de Recherche en Didactique du LANSAD (Toulouse Paul-Sabatier) |
| <i>EOLLE</i> | https://gric.univ-lehavre.fr/spip.php?rubrique66 | GRIC | Groupe de Recherche Identités et Cultures (Le Havre) |
| <i>E-rea</i> | http://erec.revues.org/ | LERMA | Laboratoire d'Études et de Recherche sur le Monde Anglophone (Aix-Marseille) |
| <i>Études britanniques contemporaines</i> | http://ebc.revues.org/ | EMMA | Études Montpelliéraines du Monde Anglophone (Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3) |
| <i>Études écossaises</i> | http://etudeseccossaises.revues.org/ | ILCEA4 | Institut des Langues et Cultures d'Europe, Amérique, Afrique, Asie et Australie (Grenoble Stendhal) |
| <i>Études Épistémè</i> | http://episteme.revues.org/ | PRISMES (Revue du séminaire Épistémè, Association Loi 1901) | Langues, Textes, Arts et Cultures du Monde Anglophone (Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3) |
| <i>Études lawrenciennes</i> | http://lawrence.revues.org/ | CREA | Centre de Recherche Anglophone (Paris-Ouest-Nanterre-la Défense) |
| <i>GRAAT On-line</i> | http://www.graat.fr/ | ICD | Interactions Culturelles et Discursives (Tours) |
| <i>Graphè</i> | http://www.univ-artois.fr/graphe/graphe_revue.html | Textes et Cultures (Artois) | |
| <i>Imaginaire(s)</i> | http://www.univ-reims.fr/site/editions-et-presses-universitaires-de-reims/catalogue/revues/revue-imaginaires.9049.17043.html | CIRLEP | Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherches sur les Langues et la Pensée (Reims) |
| <i>Inmédia</i> | http://inmedia.revues.org/ | CREW | Center for Research on the English-speaking World (Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3) |
| <i>Interfaces Image Texte Langage</i> | http://college.holycross.edu/interfaces/history.html | LARCA En partenariat avec l'Université de Bourgogne et | Laboratoire de Recherches sur les Cultures Anglophones (Paris Diderot) |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | The College of the Holy Cross (Massachusetts) | |
| <i>Itinéraires</i> | http://itineraires.revues.org/ | Pléiade | |
| <i>Journal of the Short Story in English</i> | http://jsse.revues.org/ | CRILA | Centre de Recherche Interdisciplinaire en Langue Anglaise (Angers) |
| <i>L'Atelier</i> | http://ojs.u-paris10.fr/index.php/latelier | CREA | Centre de Recherche Anglophone (Paris-Ouest-Nanterre-la Défense) |
| <i>Leaves</i> | http://climas.u-bordeaux3.fr/leaves | CLIMAS | Cultures et Littératures des Mondes Anglophones (Bordeaux) |
| <i>Les Travaux Interdisciplinaires sur la Parole et le Langage</i> | http://tipa.revues.org | LPL | Laboratoire Parole et Langage (Aix-Marseille) |
| <i>Mémoire(s), identité(s), marginalité(s) dans le monde occidental contemporain Cahiers du MIMMOC</i> | http://mimmoc.revues.org | MIMMOC | Mémoire Identité et Marginalité dans le Monde Occidental Contemporain (Poitiers) |
| <i>Miranda</i> | http://miranda.revues.org/ | CAS | Cultures Anglo-Saxonnes (Toulouse Jean-Jaurès) |
| <i>Mots. Les langages du politique</i> | http://mots.revues.org/ | ICAR | Interactions, Corpus, Apprentissages, Représentations (CNRS, ENS Lyon, Lyon 2) |
| <i>Palimpsestes</i> | http://palimpsestes.revues.org/ | PRISMES | Langues, Textes, Arts et Cultures du Monde Anglophone (Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3) |
| <i>Postcolonial Text</i> | http://postcolonial.org/index.php/pct | LDI | Lexique, Dictionnaire, Informatique (Paris 13) |
| <i>RANAM</i> | http://pus.unistra.fr/fr/revues/ranam/ | SEARCH | Savoirs dans l'Espace Anglophone: Représentations, Culture, Histoire (Strasbourg) |
| <i>Recherches Britanniques</i> | http://cecille.recherche.univ-lille3.fr/revues/recherches-britanniques/ | CECILLE | Centre d'Études en Civilisations, Langues et Littératures Étrangères (Charles de Gaulle Lille 3) |
| <i>Représentations</i> | http://representations.u-grenoble3.fr/ | ILCEA4 | Institut des Langues et Cultures d'Europe, Amérique, Afrique, Asie et Australie (Grenoble Stendhal) |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--------|--|
| <i>Revue du CiClaHO</i> | | CREA | Centre de Recherche Anglophone (Paris-Ouest-Nanterre-la Défense) |
| <i>Revue FAAAM</i> | | CREA | Centre de Recherche Anglophone (Paris-Ouest-Nanterre-la Défense) |
| <i>Revue LISA/LISA e-journal</i> | http://lisa.revues.org/ | ACE | Anglophonie: Communautés Écritures (Rennes 2) |
| <i>Ridiculosa</i> | http://www.eiris.eu/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=27&Itemid=50 | HCTI | Héritages et Constructions dans le Texte et l'Image (UBO et UBS) |
| <i>Savoirs en Prisme</i> | https://savoirsenprisme.com/ | CIRLEP | Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherches sur les Langues et la Pensée (Reims) |
| <i>Sigma/Anglophonia</i> | http://anglophonia.revues.org/ | CAS | Cultures Anglo-Saxonnes (Toulouse Jean-Jaurès) |
| <i>Sillages Critiques</i> | http://sillagescritiques.revues.org/ | VALE | Voix Anglophones: Littérature et Esthétique (Paris-Sorbonne) |
| <i>Sphères</i> | http://ictt.univ-avignon.fr/spheres/ | ICTT | Identité Culturelle, Textes et Théâtralité (Avignon) |
| <i>Textes et Contextes</i> | https://revuesshs.u-bourgogne.fr/textes&contextes/ | TIL | Centre Interlangues: Texte, Image, Langage (Bourgogne) |
| <i>TrOPICS</i> | http://tropics.univ-reunion.fr/ | DIRE | Déplacements, Identités, Regards, Écritures (La Réunion) |