

THE ETHOS OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE PROJECTS OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE CENTER (NARODOWE CENTRUM NAUKI)

Tomasz CZAKON^{1*}, Danuta ŚLĘCZEK-CZAKON²

¹ University of Silesia, Katowice; tomacz.czakon@us.edu.pl, ORCID: 0000-0001-5697-3651

² University of Silesia, Katowice; Danuta.sleczeck-czakov@us.edu.pl, ORCID: 0000-0001-6231-3449

* Correspondence author

Purpose: The article presents an analysis of the results of winning projects raising fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality, implemented within the National Science Center (NSC) in Poland. The research goal is to check whether these projects meet the expectations set out in the Act on the National Science Center and whether they support the development of philosophical research.

Design/methodology/approach: The research is based on the quantitative content analysis of 596 projects completed between 2011 and 2023. We are essentially interested in the following aspects:

- what is the position of the fundamental questions about the human nature and the surrounding reality in the structure of the NSC investigated research projects (HS1 position in the NSC projects structure, project managers affiliations, their sex and position in the scientific hierarchy),
- what problems are favoured in grants (preferred by the collective subject, i.e. authors and reviewers),
- whether one can assess the ideological preferences of the collective subject behind the winning projects and how this can be done.

For the purpose of comparison we juxtapose the grants' content with the data on philosophy available on Google scholar and The National Library catalogue.

Findings: The analysis enabled us to state that the analysed grants do not undertake problems which are of key importance for philosophy, in particular they do not tackle the contemporary philosophical challenges. The reason of such a situation is the ethos of philosophy held by both the projects' authors and their reviewers. Such ethos constitutes a barrier preventing philosophers from pursuing the socially important problems. In this way, the study contributes to the analysis of research management in Poland.

Social implications: The conclusions formulated in this article might trigger a debate on the content of philosophical ethos in Poland.

Originality/value: The research shown in the article is innovative and important for the development of philosophy and its management. Until now, such research has not been conducted yet.

Keywords: ethos of science, ethos of philosophy, scientific research management in Poland.

Category of the paper: Research article.

1. The subject and research aim

The subject of analysis consists of the projects submitted and accepted for implementation in the panel The Fundamental Questions about The Human Nature and the Surrounding Reality (HS1) within the National Science Centre. The winning research projects completed between 2011 and 2013 were taken into account (the data was acquired in March 2023 and March 2024). We analysed the effects of fifteen types of contests¹. We also accessed information of special interest to us in other panels, especially in the human and social sciences. Tackling the mentioned grants' analysis stems from the role played by the contests organised by the National Science Centre. The act 'Law on Higher Education and Science'² encourages awarding the beneficiaries of the NSC contests by exemption from the participation in the recruitment process for academic teacher position (article 110, paragraph 2, subparagraph 2). The NSC act specifies expectations for the contests organised by this institution. In the application verification process one needs to take the following into consideration: the scientific level of the research, innovative character of the scientific problem, the influence of project realization on the development of the scientific area³. In many institutions of higher education the task of application preparation for a specific NSC contest is considered to be one of important criteria required for the periodic assessment of employees. The panel Fundamental questions about the human nature and the surrounding reality: Philosophy, cognitive sciences, religious studies, theology basically contains research projects substantially related to philosophy and as such, even in its name, implies expectations for the projects. The panel's name is exceptional, it points to the plethora of expectations towards the applicants. Other panels have considerably simplistic names – they indicate the areas' names.

The conditions applicants are faced with in the NSC contests let us formulate the thesis that according to the creators of NSC act and the vast number of scientists these are the organisers, applicants and contest beneficiaries who delineate what is important in their discipline because they are preoccupied with the most significant matters, they describe the current and future state of science, including philosophy. One may assume that the philosophical projects done within the NSC are most ambitious, creative, tackling the most pressing problems of philosophy and showing the philosophical aspects of modernity. We decided to verify whether this is the case. To do this we took a few points of reference. On one hand, the National Library catalogue contents referring to the problems present in the

¹ These are the following contest types: Beethoven, Etiuda, Fuga, Grieg, Harmonia, Maestro, Opus, Opus LAP, Polonez Bis, Preludium, Preludium Bis, Sonata, Sonata Bis, Sonatina, Uwertura.

² Law on Higher Education and Science, Act of 20 July 2018. Law on Higher Education and Science (uw.edu.pl), 30.07.2023.

³ National Science Center Act, Official Gazette 2010, No. 96, item. 617 unified on the basis 2023, item 153, <https://isap.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/download.xsp/WDU20100960617/U/D20100617Lj.pdf>, 30.07.2023.

analysed panel is such a point of reference – the library has collected texts for a long period of time, that is why we call it “a collection of long duration”.

On the other hand, another point of reference includes similar texts gathered in Google scholar – they have been collected for a relatively short period of time, that is why we call it “a collection of short duration”. The third point of reference is the contents of the panel *fundamental questions on the human nature and the surrounding reality* (HS1) within the National Science Centre. We assumed that the comparison of the contents of these three data sets will show whether, and to what extent, the preferences present in grants, the ones in the National Library catalogue and Google scholar are similar.

Our research aim is to reconstruct the ethos of contemporary Polish philosophers⁴. We assumed that the applicants’ and the winning projects reviewers’ preferences clearly show the way of understanding philosophy and fundamental problems of this area, which one might refer to as the ethos of contemporary Polish philosophers. There are more and more statements claiming that there is a philosophy crisis, its ethos being blurred. The article by Paweł Pieniążek (Pieniążek, 2015, pp. 11-30) as well as other texts collected in the book support that claim (Soin, Parszutowicz, 2015). Our research aims to verify whether this is the case. We understand ethos in a similar way to M. Ossowska as “some culture orientation, its accepted hierarchy of values formulated either *explicite*, or indicated by human behaviour” (Ossowska, 1986, p. 5). In such an approach the ethos of philosophy is designated by the preferences of the investigated panel users (*fundamental questions*), i.e. the selection of specific research problems in the area of philosophy (e.g. history of philosophy, ontology, aesthetics or philosophical analyses of modern civilisation problems).

Investigation of research preferences of Polish philosophers will enable us, as assumed, to reveal the scope and specificity of understanding fundamental philosophical problems – diversity of addressed problems or the tendency to focus on the limited issues, undertaking, at the same time, universal topics pertaining to the world, societies, people and also the more particular ones, limited to the selected timeless or contemporary issues.

To reconstruct the philosophers’ ethos, one needs to answer the question: What do the key panel terms “fundamental questions” and “fundamental problems” mean? The panel authors explain these terms in two ways. In the panel description they vaguely show that these are the fundamental questions about the human nature and the surrounding reality.

⁴ Ethos is known to be held by the humans, yet for the purpose of title simplification we use the term Ethos of philosophy. By means of justification let us remind you that many authors use the term ethos of science (e.g. Grzesiak, 2017, pp. 64-76), and the term ethos of philosophy is also used by other authors (i.a. Pieniążek, 2015, pp. 11-30).

On the lower level, when depicting descriptors, they enumerate sixteen problems with an extensive list of subproblems, basically identical with the division of philosophy into the main areas⁵. The subject of investigated ethos primarily comprises grants' authors and their reviewers. They are the ones who decide that certain problems are significant enough to be dealt with and assessed. The reviewers, in turn, are guided by their own preconceptions of what matters in science, what ways of project development are justified and whether they abide by the adopted criteria and on that basis they give their final acceptance. There are also other, less outstanding groups of decision-makers, yet their role in the assessment process cannot be underestimated. Such groups include: decision makers accepting/rejecting specified sums which are to be distributed among project authors, application authors, decision-makers who accept the research application form (Szubka, 2015, p. 21) filled in by reviewers. Each of these group members holds certain convictions referring to the significance of some issues and therefore they co-decide about the shape of philosophy. The research projects' preparatory and assessment process is a social phenomenon where the ethos of scientific area members is being revealed. At the same time the process is a type of self-organisation and the management of a scientific area.

One can assume that the list of the above-mentioned problems present in the analysed panel is, to a large extent, a materialisation of the so called fundamental philosophical issues, mentioned in many coursebooks or introductions to philosophy. Even though each coursebook covers a slightly different set, there are certain groups of "basic philosophical problems" which keep reappearing frequently⁶. The list of fundamental problems of philosophy is usually more developed, sometimes it is more unassuming. Generally these are the problems which belong to philosophy areas: ontology (metaphysics), the theory of cognition, ethics, aesthetics, political philosophy, philosophy of man, logic, methodology. History of philosophy is not usually evidenced in such lists. Amongst the descriptors (i.e. main problems) mentioned by the analysed panel related to philosophy, one can find the issues concerning religion. The analysis of the projects' contents showed the mutual connections of the "philosophical" and "religious" parts and the difficulty in their separation, that is why we do not separate them.

We address both problem groups collectively. Because the problems traditionally related to philosophy are predominant in the panel, that is why in the title as well as in many places in our text we use the term philosophy. Such an approach to the problem reinforces the fact that for some philosophers the problem of God is one of the fundamental problems in philosophy.

⁵ These are the following problems described as descriptors on the platform: history of philosophy, ontology and metaphysics, specific ontologies, epistemology logic, science methodology, philosophy of science, philosophy of man, theories of a person, philosophy of culture, social philosophy, nature of human mind, normative and descriptive ethics, theory of morality, bioethics, occupational ethics, aesthetics, theories of religion, history of religion, religious studies, religion and its determinants: anthropological, cultural, socio-psychological, language of religion, sacrum, myth, religious symbolism, world religion, fundamental theology, dogmatic theology, biblical theology, patristics, moral theology, pastoral theology, liturgy, other related issues.

⁶ For example: Ajdukiewicz, 1983; Anzenbacher, 1987; Galarowicz, 1992; Popkin at Stroll, 1994; Stępień, 2007; Krąpiec, 2003.

2. The Method

In the research we use the method of quantitative content analysis which is the research technique used for systematic and quantitative description of a message (Babbie 2008, pp. 358-370; Sztumski, 1979, pp. 182-191). We think that our research can be contained within the method called digital humanities (Przastek-Samokowa, 2016, pp. 82-93). We do not underestimate the relevance of more traditional methods, yet we think that quantitative methods might yield information which is overlooked when the older method is applied. In this particular case it is all about investigation of the chosen data characteristic for the winning research projects in the HS1 panel. Generally we are interested in the following aspects:

- what is the position of fundamental questions about the human nature and the surrounding reality in the NSC research projects' structure (HS1 position in NSC project structure, project managers' affiliations, their sex and position in scientific hierarchy),
- what problems are favoured in grants (grants preferred by the collective subject, i.e. authors and reviewers),
- whether one can assess ideological preferences of collective subject behind the winning projects and how this can be done.

We search for the answers to question one and two on the NSC website, while the answer to question three will be obtained thanks to the juxtaposition of grants' analysis with the National Library catalogue and Google scholar contents. In Google scholar we also look for the citations' frequency of texts combined with grants. The point of reference in assessment preferences in grants also refers to the presence of answers to philosophical challenges of the modern era in said grants. To achieve this we created the list of over eighty terms important for the philosophical challenges of modernity.

The structure of programs implemented within NSC is complex and it is important to bear in mind, for the purposes of further analysis, that each project is implemented within science areas, and below there are panels comprising specific research areas. The lowest position is occupied by descriptors (subpanels). On the level of science areas one can distinguish:

- Humanities, social and artistic sciences (HS⁷).
- Life sciences (NZ).
- Science and technology (ST).

In humanities, social and artistic sciences (HS) there are eight panels:

- Fundamental questions about the human nature and the surrounding reality (HS1), alongside philosophy, cognitive science, religious studies, theology.
- Culture and cultural production (HS2).
- Knowledge about the past (HS3).

⁷ Abbreviations used on NSC platform.

- Individual, markets and institutions (HS4).
- Law, political sciences, public politics (HS5).
- Man and social life (HS5).

Panel HS1 and its sixteen constituent parts will be the subject matter of further analysis (from HS1_1 to HS1_16) where the distinguished problems are included into philosophy, religious studies and theology. These parts are called descriptors by NSC. In HS1 panel called “the fundamental questions about the human nature and the surrounding reality”, with the majority of philosophical issues, the following descriptors have been singled out:

- history of philosophy (ancient era, the Middle Ages, modern and contemporary era) and history of ideas;
- ontology and metaphysics, particulars ontology;
- epistemology, (i. a. sources of cognition, criteria of truth, philosophy of language);
- logic, science methodology, philosophy of science;
- philosophy of man, theories of a person, philosophy of culture, social philosophy;
- nature of human mind (including the evolution of mind, bio-psychological conditions of cognition, Artificial Intelligence);
- normative and descriptive ethics, theory of morality, bioethics, occupational ethics;
- aesthetics (including theories of beauty, language of art);
- theories of religion, history of religion, religious studies;
- religion and its determinants: anthropological, cultural, socio-psychological;
- language of religion, sacrum, myth, religious symbolism;
- world religions;
- fundamental theory;
- dogmatic theology, Biblical theology, patristics;
- moral theology, pastoral theology, liturgy;
- other related issues.

This division is significant because each project manager is obliged to place their project in the group of areas along with the attribution of at least one descriptor which enables us to count what philosophical problems are undertaken in the winning projects. Each project manager has the possibility to indicate up to three descriptors. By doing this they provide information on the project affiliation both within the main research area and additional ones. A person submitting their project to HS1, can additionally ascribe it to HS1_4, HS5_1, ST6_3 which means that their project generally belongs to the fundamental questions about the human nature and the surrounding reality, at the same time it belongs to logic, science methodology and mathematics. In this way one can distinguish three levels of descriptors. And while the first level is basically chosen by all project managers, the other ones are not frequently selected. Therefore we only take the first level descriptors into consideration. Apart from differentiation according to descriptors, the majority of authors also provide key terms, which, in turn, allow us to seek

further fundamental problems present in the analysed projects on the lower level than descriptors.

With the analysis commencement we asked ourselves the following research questions:

- What philosophical problems are the object of interest for researchers and reviewers and what is the hierarchy?
- To what extent do the winning projects remain open to other, different than philosophy, research areas?
- Are there differences between the ideological preferences within the entire scope of grants and the preferences of single and multiple beneficiaries?
- Are there differences between ideological preferences present in grants and the hierarchy of problems regarding philosophy in the National Library catalogue and Google scholar?
- Which texts, out of the ones published as a result of grant research, are most frequently cited?

The research questions correspond to the following hypotheses:

- The most important philosophical problems should be present in grants (in compliance with expectations) as in such a way they contribute to the significance of philosophy, its development and they meet the most important philosophical challenges of the modern era.
- Universalism is the characteristic feature of philosophy and as such it should remain open to other research areas.
- There should be preference differences between single and multiple contest beneficiaries. The multiple winners' research projects should meet expectations described in the previous hypothesis to a greater degree.
- The hierarchy of philosophical problems present in grants and the National Library catalogue should be different, yet it should be similar between grants and Google scholar contents because the National Library gathers collections from other time periods, and in Google scholar the data are current.
- The citations of texts published as a result of research within the winning projects should demonstrate the dominance of problems significant for the philosophical challenges of modernity.

3. The analysis of the panel content The place of fundamental questions about the human nature and the surrounding reality (philosophy, cognitive sciences, religious studies, theology)

3.1. The place of the panel in the structure of NSC projects

According to data available on the NSC⁸ 23902 grants were provided in the years 2011-2023. By the end of 2023 the biggest number of grants (40,48 %) were provided in the science and technology group, slightly fewer (31,39%) went to life sciences and humanities and social and artistic sciences got the fewest number of grants. Philosophy and related branches belong to this particular group.

In humanities and social and artistic sciences the vast majority of grants (23.05%) were provided to the group of problems referred to as: individual, institutions, markets. The group also comprised economy, finances, management, demography, social-economic geography, urban planning. The fewest (8,52%) were granted to the science group called: *the fundamental questions about the human nature and the surrounding reality*, comprising broadly understood philosophy.

3.2. Grant managers' sex

Men constitute the majority of grant beneficiaries (56,30%). The most vivid dominance of men (68,81%) is observed in sciences and technology. Women constitute the majority only in life sciences (55,60%). In humanities, social and artistic sciences men prevail (53,22%). It is worth mentioning that not all beneficiaries reveal their gender.

In humanities, social and artistic sciences male dominance (63,87%) is observed among the broadly understood philosophy beneficiaries. Women dominate (56,31%) in literature studies, linguistics, art science and architecture. A similar situation is observed in psychology, pedagogy and sociology (55,15%).

3.3. Academic degrees and titles of grant managers

In all science groups doctors constitute the biggest group of beneficiaries (32,46%), they are followed by associate professors (23,69%), and then professors (18,92%).

In the humanities, social and artistic sciences the proportion between the group of doctors (37,89%), associate professors (26,40%) and professors (17,23%) is similar. The lowest number of professors is associated with the beneficiaries in the group of fundamental questions about the human nature and the surrounding reality (9,94%).

⁸ https://projekty.ncn.gov.pl/index.php?jednostka=&jednostka_miasto=&jednostka_wojewodztwo=&kierownik=&kierownik_plec=&kierownik_tytul=&status=&projekt=&kwotaprzyznanaod=&kwotaprzyznanao=&typkonkursu=&konkurs=&grupa=&panel=&slowokluczowe=&aparatura

3.4. Types of contests included in the panel the fundamental problems of human nature and the surrounding reality

In the analysed collection belonging to the panel *the fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality* 15 types of contests were taken into account. The biggest number of grants were provided to Opus contests (42,93%), then the Preludium ones (28,26%) and Sonata (11,80% projects).

3.5. The degree of repeatability in the grant obtainment process

The vast majority of project managers (464) won in one contest, they constitute 83,00% of beneficiaries, 18 people are the beneficiaries of at least 3 contests. They are the authors of 60 grants. One person won 5 contests.

3.6. Project managers' affiliations

The biggest number of grants were obtained by the managers affiliated with the University of Warsaw (116 grants), then the Jagiellonian University (106 grants) and the Catholic University of Lublin (51 grants). 51,50% of the analysed grants have been affiliated with these three universities. At least 10 grants are ascribed to 13 universities. Apart from the above mentioned, these are Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Nicolas Copernicus University in Toruń, John Paul II University, the Silesian University, University of Łódź, the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Wrocław University, the University of Cardinal Wyszyński in Warsaw, University of Gdańsk. Their projects account for 86,79 % of the total number.

3.7. The structure of problems in the panel the fundamental questions about the human nature and the surrounding reality (philosophy, cognitive sciences, religious studies, theology)

Project authors can select a few descriptors when depicting their project. Yet one is predominantly indicated. Fewer and fewer authors indicate other ones. The first one, picked by the majority, is called the first row descriptor. And we pay special attention to this particular one when describing what problems are the subject of interest of a given project. Almost 100% of the authors who were responsible for the projects within the panel *the fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality* inform, on the first descriptor level, that their project belongs to the group of *fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality* even though they could have also indicated other problems.

Only fewer than five percent of projects are comprised within other than fundamental questions research disciplines. One might say that the proposed projects are closed to other disciplines. The authors-project applicants and the reviewers of the panel *the fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality*, contrary to the popular belief related to the openness of philosophy, assume an hermetic attitude, unwilling to embrace other

disciplines. Only 4,92% of the projects remain open to other disciplines. What is also interesting is the fact that the vast number of external inspirations (21 projects) belong to the humanities, social and artistic sciences, namely the disciplines which are related to the fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality, yet several (7 projects) pertain to mathematics, information technology and life sciences. Another fact is also of interest – none of the projects refers to the markets and institutions panel which means that economy, finances, management, demographics, social-economic geography, urban planning are not the source of inspiration for philosophers.

Table 1.

Presence of other sciences in the projects fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality on the level of first row descriptors

Panel symbol	Panel contents	Number of projects	%
HS1	Fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality (philosophy, cognitive sciences, religious studies, theology)	541	95,07
HS2	Culture and cultural production (literary studies, linguistics, art sciences, architecture)	4	0,70
HS3	Knowledge of the past	5	0,87
HS4	Individual, institutions, markets (economy, finances, management, demographics, social-economic geography, urban planning)	0	0,00
HS5	Law, political sciences, public politics	6	1,05
HS6	Man and social life (psychology, pedagogy, sociology)	6	1,05
ST1	Mathematical studies	5	0,87
ST6	Computer science and information technologies	1	0,17
NZ9	Fundamentals of applied life sciences	1	0,17
Other than HS1		28	4,92

Source: own research, as of March 2023, N = 569.

Within the *fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality* panel scope there are sixteen problem groups delineated by subsequent descriptors. If the descriptor choice was random, then the descriptors should group 6,25% projects each. Actually it is the other way round. It is the history of philosophy (20,73%) which constitutes the subject matter of projects within *the fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality*, it is followed by logic, methodology of science (14,23%) and epistemology (11,77%). It definitely highlights the significant prevalence of this group of problems. Together they account for 46,73% of projects. For the widely understood group of project authors and their reviewers philosophy basically stands for the history of philosophy, logic, science methodology and epistemology. The remaining branches (philosophy of man, the nature of human mind, ontology, metaphysics, normative and descriptive ethics) are of marginal importance. These five groups of problems considered to be fundamental for philosophy collectively make up 32,49% of grants. The least number of grants (1.75%) deal with aesthetics. Ethical problems which are vital for contemporary societies account for only 6.85% grants. In comparison, the projects that deal with the broadly understood philosophy (history of philosophy, logic, science methodology, epistemology, philosophy of man, the nature of human mind, ontology,

metaphysics, normative ethics and aesthetics) make up 79.22% of the group. Religious studies and theological disciplines constitute the remaining part. That is why the panel fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality can be legitimately referred to as philosophical. What is also visible in this juxtaposition is the degree of universality of the panel *fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality* for project authors and reviewers, when taking different inspirations into account and the relevance to standard problems. It turns out that the projects rarely go beyond standard problems. Problems pertaining to non-philosophical inspirations are marginal, they form 4.92% of the analysed projects' group.

Table 2.

The inner problem structure of fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality panel on the level of first descriptor

Number	Descriptor symbol	descriptor	Number of grants	%
1	Hs1_1	History of philosophy	118	20,73
2	Hs1_4	Logic, science methodology	81	14,23
3	Hs1_3	Epistemology	67	11,77
4	Hs1_5	Philosophy of man	51	8,96
5	Hs1_6	Nature of human mind	44	7,73
6	Hs1_2	Ontology and metaphysics	41	7,20
7	Hs1_7	Normative and descriptive ethics	39	6,85
8	Hs1_10	Religion and its determinants	37	6,50
9	Hs1_14	Dogmatic theology	26	4,56
10	Hs1_8	Aesthetics	10	1,75
11	Hs1_9	Theories of religion	9	1,58
12	Hs1_11	Language of religion	6	1,05
13	Hs1_15	Moral theology	6	1,05
14	Hs1_12	Religions of the world	2	0,35
15	Hs1_13	Fundamental theology	2	0,35
16	Hs1_16	Other remaining issues	2	0,35
		Combined HS1	541	95,07
		Other than HS1	28	4,92

Source: own research, as of March 2023, N = 569.

3.8. Ideological preferences of beneficiaries of at least three grants

We are interested whether ideological preferences of the authors who are beneficiaries of several grants are similar or different from the dominant ones in the whole of the analysed projects' group. We take beneficiaries of at least three grants into consideration. There are 60 such projects (i.e. 10.54% out of 569 projects, as of march 2023) and 18 project managers.

Table 3.

Ideological preferences of beneficiaries of at least three projects according to the first row descriptor

Number	Descriptor's name	Number of grants 60	%
1	History of philosophy	12	20.00
2	Logic, science methodology	8	13.33
3	Religion and its determinants	8	13.33
4	Ontology and metaphysics	7	11.66

Cont. table 3.

5	Normative ethics	7	11.66
6	Nature of human mind	6	10.00
7	Epistemology	5	8.33
8	Theories of religion	3	5.00
9	Dogmatic theology	2	3.33
10	Moral theology	1	1.66
11	Philosophy of man	1	1.66

Source: own research, as of March 2023, N = 60.

Also in this case history of philosophy is ranked first (20.00% of projects). Logic, science methodology and religion and its determinants occupy the second and third position (13.33% of projects each). The remaining problems occupy other places in the hierarchy, when compared with the entire collection. Hence, one can say that history of philosophy, logic and science methodology occupy the highest position among the beneficiaries of at least three grants. Ethics is placed slightly higher, aesthetics, in turn, is not present.

3.9. In the research projects the lack of response to philosophical challenges of the modern era

The choice of descriptors clearly indicates that either in the entire collection of projects or among beneficiaries of at least three grants there is a vivid dominance of history of philosophy. That is why we are interested whether and to what extent the projects comprise problems which might be referred to as the contemporary philosophical challenges. These are the problems which stem from social, technological, cultural and economic transformations. In order to find these problems we search for the first level key words⁹ in the projects' titles and also, in total, any indicators which signal the presence of contemporary philosophical challenges. We look for over 80 words-indicators¹⁰ in the collection of key words.

In 569 projects, within the scope of first-row key words collection (as indicated by the project authors in the first place), only 7.20% of them belong to the demanded indicators signalling the presence of contemporary philosophical problems. In the collection of the first,

⁹ First row key words are the ones which authors point at in the first place. We assume that they are of utmost importance to them. The authors usually enumerate several key words. They form the collection which we also take into consideration.

¹⁰ Words-indicators of the contemporary philosophical challenges: Anthropocene, autonomic (combat robot, cars, weapons systems), national security, bioethics, biopolitics, biotechnology, Christianity, digital philosophy of science, deliberation, democracy, disinformation, positive disintegration, emancipation, feminist epistemology, feminist aesthetics, ethical aspects of reproductive and palliative medicine, research ethics, clinical studies ethics, scientific research ethics, business ethics, economic ethics, medical ethics, environmental ethics, ethics of technology, war ethics, contemporary ethics, euthanasia, feminism, philosophy of: man, culture, politics, technology, contemporary and political philosophy, fundamentalism, gender, globalisation, internet, Islam, capitalism, capitalocene, conscience clause, climate, commercialisation of science, body commodification, condition of Polish family, consumerism, consumptionism, crisis, climate crisis, media, new media, space missions, electronic surveillance, netiquette, disability, social inequality, modernity, responsibility, responsibility for the future, participation, sex, posthumanism, postmodernity, human rights, animal rights, social enterprise, social transformations, social development, sustainable development, equality, egalitarianism, sexuality, information society, contemporary society, social responsibility of business, justice, autonomous systems, learning, integrated, Artificial Intelligence, terminal sedation, health care learning systems, acknowledgement, multiculturalism, war (war ethics, theory of just war), freedom, exclusion, health.

second, third and fourth row key words collection consisting of 2276 words, there are potentially (potentially because not all authors use this possibility) 5.97% of the sought after indicators. The most frequently demanded indicators are comprised within project titles, they appear in 10.72% of the titles. One can assume that the presence of words belonging to the indicators of contemporary philosophical challenges is marginal (and, let us emphasise the fact that there are over eighty words). The collection of key words indicated by the authors is highly diversified.

What is commonly observed is the fact that the words-indicators which we consider to be of importance for the contemporary philosophical challenges, rarely appear in titles' collection or in key terms chosen by the authors. Only in 31 titles, out of 556, there is at least one word-indicator. "Islam" is the most frequently appearing one (7 times), then there are terms referring to autonomous combat robots (cars and weapons systems) and bioethics (four times each). Then, there are such terms as Christianity, globalisation, crisis – used three times. Anthropocene, biopolitics, deliberation, research ethics, disability, participation, posthumanism appear twice.

The use of key words, trend names and contemporary philosophy directions confirm the presence of problems pertaining to the contemporary philosophical challenges.

In the collection (potentially¹¹ 2276) of key words, the terms related to the contemporary philosophy directions appear 59 times (2.59%), while in the collection of titles they appear 41 times (7.20%). In the collection of titles it is phenomenology which appears most frequently (16 times), then hermeneutics (8 times), analytical philosophy (5 times) as well as Kantianism, neo-Kantianism (4 times) and utilitarianism (two times). The remaining names of modern philosophy directions (feminism, consequentialism, liberalism, pragmatism, Lviv-Warsaw School, Thomism) appear singly. In the collection of key words (potentially 2276) the following terms referring to contemporary philosophy can be found: phenomenology (19 times), pragmatism (8 times), analytical philosophy (4 times), Kantianism, neo-Kantianism (4 times), Thomism (3 times), Marxism (3 times), utilitarianism (2 times), Lviv-Warsaw School (2 times), feminism (2 times), liberalism (2 times), structuralism (2 times). The terms which appear singly comprise: hermeneutics, consequentialism, neo-Friesian School, psychoanalysis, existentialism, Catholic social science, Frankfurt School. The data confirm the former view that the problems considered as philosophical challenges of modernity occupy the marginal position of the analysed projects when taking the examined indicators into consideration.

¹¹ Provided the authors of each grant wrote four key words, yet this is not the case, that is why we write about the potentially key words (569 grants multiplied by 4).

3.10. The structure of fundamental problems of philosophy in the National Library catalogue and Google scholar

Now we will compare the structure of problems present in the panel *the fundamental questions about man and the surrounding reality* with the contents of the National Library catalogue and the data in Google scholar.

The National Library owns collections from old and contemporary times, one can say that these are the collections of “long lasting”. In comparison, Google scholar collection is recent, it is the collection of “short lasting”. We are interested in the degree of similarity and difference in the problems considered to be fundamental in philosophy within the collection of examined projects, The National Library and Google scholar. The classification of problems in the National Library catalogue and Google scholar is different than in the collection of the analysed projects, therefore we will make use of approximate, not the same, classification. We hope that possible similarities and differences will be clear. In the national Library catalogue we use the option “in the whole description”.

In the National Library catalogue, the biggest number of records refers to religion (51.09% per 624469 records), then, considerably fewer, ethics (18.74%), and theology in third place (13.76%). The successive places are occupied by: aesthetics (2.64%), philosophy of man (2.10%), history of philosophy (2.04%), logic (1.70%), epistemology (1.70%), theory of cognition (1.33%), science methodology (1.15%). Religion, theology, religious studies take up 65.3% of records, that is why 34.7% of records remain for the broadly understood philosophy. History of philosophy occupies the further, sixth position, fewer records relate to the history of contemporary philosophy (0.07%). In the analysed NSC projects, in turn, history of philosophy definitely takes the lead 20% of projects both in total and among multiple beneficiaries).

In the Polish version of Google scholar it is history of philosophy which is in first place (14.38% per 841210 records), other places are occupied by particular histories of philosophy accounting for from 2.42% to 2.18% of records. Philosophy of man is in second position (13.43%), then theory of cognition (11.04%) and ethics (8.66%). In Google scholar there are 15400 responses to the search entry “philosophical challenges of modernity”. If one continues the counting, it would be a far, sixteenth place.

By means of comparison we also examined the presence of fundamental problems of philosophy in the English, French and German version to verify the level of similarity between research priorities of Polish philosophers and others. In the English version it is science methodology which is in first place, philosophy of man comes second, history of philosophy comes third and ethics occupies the fourth position. In the French version logic takes the lead, then history of philosophy, religious studies and aesthetics. On German webpages religion comes first, then theology, history of philosophy and aesthetics. As it can be seen, research preferences are diverse, yet only in the Polish version history of philosophy occupies the first position.

3.11. The structure of fundamental problems' citations in texts combined with grants (their attractiveness)

In the majority of analysed projects there is information on texts written as a result of grant implementation. For simplicity we refer to such publications as texts assigned to grant. The publications have diverse forms (books, articles, post-conference presentations). Many people are the texts' authors because grant participants often comprise a few. We examined to what extent these texts are attractive to other philosophers. For the matter of analysis simplification we checked the citations of texts attributed to multiple contest beneficiaries (three or more). There are sixty such grants managed by eighteen people. For the purpose of comparison we randomly picked sixty-one projects from one-time beneficiaries. In both cases we checked to which problem groups the cited texts belong, i.e. what problems are most attractive and whether there are differences in citations' indicators between the analysed researchers' groups.

The most frequently cited texts among the publications resulting from grant implementation by multiple beneficiaries (three at least) were the ones related to descriptive and normative ethics. Let us emphasize the fact that grants the subject of which pertained to normative and descriptive ethics, occupy only the seventh place in the collection of analysed projects (6.85% grants). In the period considered, grant beneficiaries published 24 texts which were cited 476 times, and it means that approximately one text was cited 19.89 times. History of philosophy grant beneficiaries (20.0% of grants), in turn, published 54 texts which were cited 88 times, hence approximately 1.62 times.

We checked whether there is any difference in citations of texts ascribed to one-time beneficiaries. As there are 60 projects among at least three-times contest beneficiaries, we randomly picked 61 projects of one-time beneficiaries.

The texts on the nature of human mind were most frequently cited among the one-time beneficiaries – eight citations per one text. In the group of multiple beneficiaries these problems occupy the second position with the comparable, yet lower citation indicator (7.17 citations per one text). Problems related to the history of philosophy are in a distant place with the approximate citation of 0.22 times per text. The average citation of one text in the one-time beneficiaries is 3.5 times lower than in case of the group of multiple beneficiaries.

When the texts assigned to either one-time or multiple beneficiaries were summed up, the results are as follow:

Table 4.

Joint estimation. Citations of texts assigned to one-time and multiple grant beneficiaries

Number	Descriptor	Number of publications in descriptor	Number of citations	Average number of citations per one publication
1	Normative and descriptive ethics	34	480	14,11
2	Nature of human mind	19	138	7,26
3	Logic and methodology	59	395	6,69
4	Theories of religion	7	28	4,00
5	Dogmatic theory	16	60	3,75
6	Religion and its determinants	26	94	3,61
7	Fundamental theology	3	8	2,66
8	Ontology	41	82	2,00
9	Epistemology	21	32	1,52
10	Moral theology	4	6	1,50
11	Philosophy of man	67	89	1,32
12	History of philosophy	94	97	1,03
13	Aesthetics	7	4	0,57
14	Language of religion	0	0	0,00
15	World religions	0	0	0,00
	combined	401	1515	3,77

Source: own research, N = 121 grants; as of March, 2023.

The average citation indicator of text ascribed to 121 grants of one-time and multiple beneficiaries is 3.77. There are four groups of problems beyond this average: normative and descriptive ethics, nature of human mind, logic and methodology, theories of religion. Yet the texts referring to normative and descriptive ethics are cited (on average) more frequently than 3.5 times in comparison to the average of the entire examined group. History of philosophy problems, in turn, are in the far place – this problem group text is cited approximately 3.5 less frequently than the average of the whole group of projects.

4. Conclusions

4.1. Social features of philosophy ethos subject

Humanities, social and artistic sciences to which the *fundamental questions about the nature of man and the surrounding reality* belong, are characterised by the lowest percentage of grants among all science groups in NSC (28.11%).

In humanities, social and artistic sciences the panel *fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality* has the lowest percentage of grants, only 8.52%. All remaining panels have more than 15.19% of grants, which is almost twice as much as the fundamental questions. The panel: individual, markets and institutions has the greatest number of grants (23.05%).

Among all projects' managers listed on NSC webpage men take the leading position, they are the beneficiaries of 56.30 % of grants. Women dominate in life sciences group where they account for 55.60% of beneficiaries. Not everybody indicated their sex.

Also in humanities, social and artistic sciences men dominate, making up 53.36% of beneficiaries. Women dominate in the beneficiaries group of the culture and cultural production where they constitute 56.31%. Men dominate significantly in the panel *fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality* (HS1) where they make up 63.87% of panel beneficiaries.

People with PhD title (32.46%) vividly prevail among beneficiaries of all science groups, then there are associate professors (23.69%) and professors (18.92%). In some grants there is no information on academic titles and degrees.

In the analysed panel one-project beneficiaries definitely dominate; they are the authors of 464 projects (18,92%). 18 people are the beneficiaries of three and more grants, they are the managers of 60 projects (10.73%).

People affiliated with three universities: Warsaw, Jagiellonian and Catholic university are the beneficiaries of more than 50% of HS1 grants (273). 444 grants (almost 87%) were obtained by the people affiliated with 13 universities. Their colleagues obtained more than 10 grants for their institutions.

4.2. Ethos content

In the years 2011-2013 there were 569 winning projects in the panel *fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality* and their authors could qualify their projects for 16 problem groups (descriptors). If the authors' choices had statistical character, there would be 6.25% of projects in each group. It is definitely not the case. They most often classified their research as pertaining to history of philosophy (20.73% of projects). Logic and science methodology are not that popular (14.23%) and epistemology is the least popular (11.77%). All these combined constitute 46.73% of projects. Hence, one can assume that history of philosophy, logic, methodology and epistemology are the fundamental problems of philosophy for the projects' authors and reviewers. Only in 10.72% of project titles there are terms demonstrating interest in philosophical challenges of modernity. The terms referring to contemporary directions of philosophy are in only 7.2% project titles. The largest number relate to phenomenology (16 times) and hermeneutics (8 times).

Through the choice of descriptor a project applicant could indicate its connection with different science groups. In the vast majority of cases (95.07% of projects) the fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality were indicated primarily. In only few cases (4.92% of projects) other possibilities were selected, basically the ones pertaining to humanities, social and artistic sciences, exceptionally also to sciences, technical sciences and life sciences. Because of this aspect one can hardly consider these projects as the ones which comply with the model of universal research.

There are slight differences in ideological preferences hierarchy among beneficiaries of at least three grants and the preferences in the whole collection entity. Just like in the entire collection, also among beneficiaries of at least three grants history of philosophy is the main point of interest (20.0% of projects). Logic and methodology as well as religion and its determinants come second (13.33% of projects each). And while logic and science methodology occupy a similar position as in the whole collection, the position of religion and its determinants is quite different. Epistemology comes third in the entire collection (11.77% of projects). Religion and its determinants, in turn, occupy the eighth place (6.5% of projects).

There are similarities and differences between ideological preferences in philosophy grants and the hierarchy of philosophy problems in the National Library catalogue and the Polish version of Google scholar. In Google scholar, just like in the entirety of analysed grants, history of philosophy takes the lead (14.38% of records). The third position, just like in the whole analysed grants' collection, is occupied by the theory of cognition (11.04% of records). There is a significant difference in the second place. In Google scholar it is the philosophy of man (13.43% of records), while in the examined grants it is logic and science methodology. In Google scholar, science methodology comes sixth (7.07% of records).

One can assume that there is a close correlation of problem hierarchy between the analysed grants and Google scholar.

Striking differences refer to the hierarchy of problems present in the analysed grants and the National Library catalogue contents. Religion comes first in the catalogue (51.09% of grants), ethics comes second (18.74% of records) and theology comes third (13.76% of records). Let us stress the fact that the order in the examined grants is as follows: history of philosophy, logic, science methodology and epistemology.

We observed a high compatibility of philosophy problems hierarchy between the analysed grants and the Polish version of Google scholar contents and a significant discrepancy between problems' hierarchy present in grants and in the National Library catalogue. We think that these differences stem from the diversity of texts' collections in the National Library catalogue and Google scholar. The National Library is the "long-lasting" collection; it collects texts from many epochs. Google scholar, in turn, is a "short-lasting" collection; it collects modern texts and as such it reflects the present vision of what problems are important to philosophy.

We assume that citations of texts written as a result of research pertaining to grant implementation are one of the most important indicators showing which philosophy problems are currently really important, fundamental. With such an assumption the problems related to normative and descriptive ethics are of utmost importance. The texts referring to this problem, shown as a result of research project work, have the average citation rate (14.11 times per text). They are followed by the problems concerning the nature of human mind (on average 6.69 times per text). History of philosophy problems, the most frequently chosen research subject by the grant authors, occupy the far 12th place, with the citation indicator of 1.03 citation per one text. Multiple grant beneficiaries' texts have the higher citation indicators.

History of philosophy is the most common subject interest within the unanimous choice of grant authors and their reviewers in the analysed projects. The grants are centred round the inner problems of philosophy. They hardly show any interest in the problems outside philosophy. They are barely interested in the research concerning the responses to the philosophical challenges of modernity. The hierarchy of ideological preferences in grants is very similar to the structure of philosophy problems in Google scholar, and different from the one in The National Library catalogue.

The citation hierarchy of texts written as a result of implementation of the analysed research projects is totally different from the hierarchy of problems making up the subject interest of grant authors. The texts pertaining to ethics are most frequently cited. The texts concerning history of philosophy problems are over a dozen times less frequently cited.

In the light of these findings we formulate the thesis that, contrary to official expectations, grants' implementation research in the panel *fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality* does not tackle the most important philosophical challenges of modernity, it does not facilitate development of the research discipline.

Such a way of science management, at least the areas related to the fundamental questions about human nature and the surrounding reality does not meet the desired expectations, it does not foster their development, does not make one willing to seek answers to the philosophical challenges of modernity, and the conclusions are not attractive to other researchers.

References

1. Ajdukiewicz, K.(1983). *Zagadnienia i kierunki filozofii. Teoria poznania. Metafizyka.* Warszawa: Czytelnik.
2. Anzenbacher, A. (1987). *Wprowadzenie do filozofii.* Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne.
3. Babbie, E. (2008). *Podstawy badań społecznych.* Warszawa: PWN, pp. 358-370.
4. Galarowicz, J. (1992). *Na ścieżkach prawdy. Wprowadzenie do filozofii.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Papieskiej Akademii Teologicznej.
5. Grzesiak, K. (2017). *Etos nauki – między klerkowskim a eksperckim modelem nauki. Zeszyty Naukowe. Zbliżenia Cywilizacyjne, XIII, 4,* pp. 64-76.
6. Krąpiec, M.A. (2003). *Wprowadzenie do filozofii.* Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL.
7. Narodowe Centrum Nauki, https://projekty.ncn.gov.pl/index.php?jednostka=&jednostka_miasto=&jednostka_województwo=&kierownik=&kierownik_plec=&kierownik_tytul=&status=&projekt=&kwotaprzyznanaod=&kwotaprzyznanado=&typkonkursu=&konkurs=&grupa=&panel=&slowokluczowe=&aparatura=, 4.04.2024.
8. Ossowska, M. (1986). *Etos rycerski i jego odmiany.* Warszawa: PWN.

9. Pieniążek, P. (2015). Etos filozofii i prawo rzeczywistości. In: M. Soin, P. Parszutowicz (eds.), *Filozofia 2.0. Paradygmaty i instytucje*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN.
10. Popkin, R.H., Stroll, A. (1994). *Filozofia*. Poznań: Zysk i S-ka.
11. Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym i nauce. Ustawa z dnia 20 lipca 2018 r. Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym i nauce (uw.edu.pl), 30.07.2023.
12. Przystek-Samokowa, M. (2016). *Czym jest humanistyka cyfrowa? Pole semantyczne, pojęcia (zarys). Zagadnienia Informatyki Naukowej – Studia Informacyjne*, 2(108), pp. 82-93.
13. Soin, M., Parszutowicz, P. (eds.) (2015). *Filozofia 2.0. Paradygmaty i instytucje*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN.
14. Soin, M., Parszutowicz, P. (eds.) (2016). *Filozofia 2.0. Diagnozy i strategie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN.
15. Stępień, A.B. (2007). *Wstęp do filozofii*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II.
16. Sztumski, J. (1979). *Wstęp do metod i technik badań społecznych*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, pp. 182-191.
17. Szubka, T. (2015). Filozofia w dobie projektów badawczych. In: M. Soin, P. Parszutowicz (eds.), *Filozofia 2.0. Paradygmaty i instytucje* (p. 216). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN.
18. Ustawa o Narodowym Centrum Naukowym, Dz.U. 2010, nr 96, poz. 617, ujednoliconą na podstawie Dz.U. z 2023, poz. 153, <https://isap.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/download.xsp/WDU20100960617/U/D20100617Lj.pdf>, 30.07.2023.