

Periodic Assessment of Research, Development, Artistic and Other Creative Activities VER 2026

Final Report of the Sociology and Social Anthropology Sub-panel

The Sub-panel for the field of research “**Sociology and Social Anthropology**” stated that research in this field, as presented in the applications for periodic evaluation, focuses primarily on Slovakia and the surrounding regions in the context of post-socialism. Methodologically the field is dominated by quantitative studies, however, there is also a significant group of scholars working with ethnographic methods with some excellent products.

Statistical techniques displayed were relatively basic, demonstrating competence, but not excellence. For those scholars using quantitative methods, we advise some intensive training on statistical techniques, as this will make the papers much more attractive internationally. Much more attention should be paid to global issues as statistical data sites for a wide variety of issues are fairly accessible with a global scope. While there is somewhat too much output on the transition from communism, a focus on Czech and Slovak paths (and intra-Slovakian) comparisons remains useful.

As in previous years, more attention should be paid to non-regional questions, or at least a broader theoretical angle may be used with reference to regional cases. Overall, the thematic emphasis appears to be on cultural issues with relatively little attention to policy questions (or the intersection between the two). An expansion of theoretical horizons would be a great step. Stronger outputs were often those associated with external, international funding. For the field to develop exchange with international scholars could enhance the field through engaging with theoretical and methodological innovations within the discipline. Empirical studies while robust tended to rely on traditional approaches.

Overall, Interdisciplinary outputs appeared superior, suggesting that more of this work could be encouraged. Interdisciplinary funding would produce improved results.

The following logic was followed reading the scoring categories:

- 1: World leading and groundbreaking, demonstrating excellence in scholarship, methodological rigor and theoretical acumen.
- 2: International excellence, methodologically robust, and with theoretical development.
- 3: Internationally recognized with competence in methods and theory.
- 4: Nationally recognized and relevant, and competent scholarship.
- 5: Below nationally recognized work.

Sub-panel members

Miguel Centeno, Princeton University (Sub-panel Chair)

Sarah Joan Nettleton, University of York

Noel B. Salazar, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven