

NATALIIA D. TRISHCHENKO

PhD in Philology,
Senior researcher of Faculty of Journalism,
Lomonosov Moscow State University,
Moscow, Russia;

Senior researcher of Open Science Research Department,
State Public Scientific and Technological Library
of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
Novosibirsk, Russia;
e-mail: trishchenkond@my.msu.ru



Changing Modes of Scholarly Communication in Social Sciences and Humanities: A Literature Review

УДК: 070:001

DOI: 10.24412/2079-0910-2026-2-140-153

The article delves into the recent transformations in scholarly communication practices within the social sciences and humanities (SSH). It draws from a comprehensive synthesis of bibliometric analyses, survey studies, and qualitative interviews to identify key trends. The identified trends include a surge in ‘journalization,’ uneven adoption of alternative metrics and platform-based visibility, and persistent international and disciplinary disparities. The review highlights striking disciplinary contrasts. While fields like economics and psychology readily embrace co-authorship, rapid journal cycles, and metric-based evaluation, others, such as history and philosophy, remain centered on monographs and nationally embedded outlets. Adoption of digitally mediated communication remains uneven and stratified: it varies systematically by discipline, national evaluation regimes, and career stage. Early-career scholars tend to face stronger pressures to demonstrate visibility and productivity, while senior scholars more often sustain genre-diverse and locally embedded dissemination strategies. A brief Russia-focused note situates these trends in a national policy and infrastructure context, showing how evaluation regimes shape communication choices. Significant gaps remain in the literature: humanities disciplines — especially core fields — are still underrepresented; mixed-method integration is limited; informal communication practices are insufficiently studied; and qualitative materials are rarely reused for secondary analysis, constraining cumulative insight.

Keywords: scholarly communication, social sciences and humanities, digital platforms, altmetrics, sociology of science, institutional change, research evaluation.

Introduction

In recent decades, the landscape of scholarly communication in the social sciences and humanities (SSH) has undergone profound transformations. Driven by the diffusion of digital infrastructures, evolving institutional demands, and the rise of new visibility metrics, the modes by which researchers disseminate, evaluate, and engage with academic knowledge are rapidly shifting. From the growing prominence of online repositories, collaborative platforms, and altmetrics, to the reconfiguration of publication formats and peer-review practices, SSH disciplines are witnessing both convergence with and divergence from patterns observed in STEM (Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) fields [Gingras, 2016].

While much attention has been paid to digital transitions in scientific communication, SSH fields exhibit distinctive dynamics due to their diverse epistemologies, linguistic heterogeneity, and enduring reliance on books, essays, and locally anchored outlets. The balance between tradition and innovation, between national academic cultures and globalizing pressures, renders SSH communication practices especially sensitive to systemic change.

This article examines how communication practices among SSH researchers are changing in the digital age. It seeks to: 1) map key trends in scholarly communication across different researcher groups and national contexts; 2) identify variations in practices based on discipline, academic age, and institutional setting; and 3) explore emerging gaps and data limitations. By synthesizing insights from bibliometric, interview-based, and survey-based studies, we aim to offer a critical overview of how SSH scholars negotiate their professional identities and knowledge-sharing practices under the evolving digital regime.

While previous literature, including narrative and bibliometric reviews, has provided valuable insights into specific aspects of scholarly communication in SSH (e. g.: [Sugimoto *et al.*, 2016; González-Valiente *et al.*, 2016]), these often offer a partial view as they tend to focus on specific indicators (e. g., altmetrics), disciplines, or regions, and rarely address interpretive frameworks or heterogeneous researcher experiences. Also, large-scale quantitative studies or systematic reviews may not always deeply engage with the subjective experiences of researchers or the diverse interpretive frameworks that shape their responses to the evolving digital regime and evaluation systems. This article aims to address that gap by offering a critical integrative review that foregrounds both empirical diversity and theoretical interpretation.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative synthesis approach to examine changing scholarly communication practices in the SSH under conditions of digital transformation. Rather than generating new primary data, the article integrates findings from three major strands of empirical literature: bibliometric and scientometric analyses, interview-based studies, and survey-based research. This triangulated strategy enables a cross-methodological perspective that brings together structural patterns, reported practices, and lived experiences.

The corpus was assembled through a structured literature search complemented by manual screening and snowballing. We used a specialized scholarly literature discovery platform with relevance-ranked retrieval over the Semantic Scholar corpus to compile an initial pool of potentially relevant publications. The search was intentionally broad and targeted

scholarship on scholarly communication in the social sciences and humanities (SSH) under conditions of digital transformation, without predefining the specific trends discussed later. To ensure coverage of different empirical traditions, search and screening were organized around three methodological strands: 1) bibliometric/scientometric studies, 2) survey-based research, and 3) interview-based qualitative studies. At the discovery stage, we used three broad thematic search formulations corresponding to these strands (e. g., “survey-based studies of social-science and humanities academics’ work, careers, routines”; “bibliometric, scientometric and altmetric analyses of SSH researchers’ work, careers and communication;” “interview-based studies of academics’ practices, careers, and perspectives”). All records were exported and screened manually against predefined eligibility criteria.

The initial retrieval prioritized results based on relevance and citation impact. The retrieved corpus was then subjected to manual screening to verify thematic fit and methodological rigor. Criteria for inclusion were: 1) publication in peer-reviewed international journals; 2) explicit focus on social sciences and humanities; and 3) relevance to digital transformation.

To mitigate potential omissions — especially in qualitative literatures with heterogeneous vocabularies — we complemented the initial corpus with backward and forward snowballing: we screened reference lists of the most central studies and traced key citations to identify additional relevant publications not surfaced in the initial discovery stage. Where relevant, key journals and highly cited papers were cross-checked against major bibliographic databases.

Thus, the analytical synthesis is based on three curated corpora of peer-reviewed studies, each corresponding to a distinct methodological approach. The bibliometric, scientometric, and altmetric group includes 52 studies, which provided quantitative mappings of publishing formats, citation patterns, co-authorship structures, and the uptake of open access and digital platforms across SSH disciplines. The survey-based corpus, comprising 37 articles, contributed insights into researchers’ time allocation, institutional pressures, and professional attitudes, often disaggregated by career stage, discipline, or region. Finally, the interview-based sample includes 41 qualitative studies, offering in-depth accounts of how scholars navigate competing expectations, define legitimate outputs, and construct academic identities in relation to digital infrastructures and evaluative regimes. This triadic empirical foundation enables a cross-methodological synthesis attentive to both structural transformations and lived academic experience. In the text of the article we cite only key relevant works and the most illustrative examples.

We initially searched literature published from 2005 to 2024 to capture the broader arc of digital transformation in SSH. However, during screening we found that pre-2010 publications rarely addressed the specific set of contemporary trends that constitute the focus of this review — platform-mediated visibility, altmetrics, open access as an institutionalized publishing model, and the restructuring of academic writing under metricized evaluation. As a result, the analytically central part of the corpus is concentrated in the late 2010s and early 2020s. We therefore treat the period 2005–2024 as the search window, while the synthesis primarily reflects the mature phase of the digital regime as documented in the post-2017 literature. The earliest highly relevant study in the final corpus dates to 2009, reflecting when empirically traceable platform- and metrics-related practices become visible in SSH research.

To contextualize the Russian case, we additionally screened *eLIBRARY / RSCI* and policy-analytic sources referenced in the international literature. As a result, a supplementa-

ry set of empirical studies addressing the transformation of Russian SSH under the ‘Project 5–100’ and ‘May Decrees’ initiatives was analyzed additionally. These sources allow for a critical assessment of center-periphery dynamics, specifically the role of ESCI as a segmented layer within *WoS* and the stratification of research communities. These sources were used for contextualization rather than to expand the main empirical corpora.

The analysis was interpretive and critical. Rather than aggregating data, we focused on identifying recurring tensions, explanatory gaps, and theoretical dissonances across studies. First, we developed an initial coding frame based on the review questions and recurring constructs in the sociology of science (e. g., evaluation regimes, legitimacy, academic capital, platform-mediated visibility). Second, we performed inductive coding to capture emergent themes (e.g., resistance and ‘slow scholarship’, visibility work under precarity). Codes were then aggregated into higher-order categories. This approach allowed us to trace both convergences (e. g., widespread journalization) and divergences (e. g., enduring monograph cultures) in scholarly communication, and to assess the extent to which existing sociological frameworks can account for such patterns.

This review is a critical integrative synthesis rather than a PRISMA-style systematic review. We deliberately prioritized interpretive depth and theoretical reflection over exhaustive coverage and statistical aggregation, in order to identify recurring tensions, mechanisms, and gaps in the existing literature. By integrating heterogeneous data sources and epistemological perspectives, this study aims to contribute not only to the mapping of communication practices but also to the theoretical rethinking of academic labor and legitimacy in the digital age.

Research Results

Researcher Groups and Communication Practices

We discuss academic age, national context, disciplinary affiliation, and career stage within a single section because the literature treats them as intersecting dimensions of stratification rather than independent variables. Together they shape researchers’ positionality within evaluative regimes and infrastructures of visibility (indexing, platform-mediated profiles, collaboration networks), thereby structuring which communication strategies are both feasible and legitimate. Keeping these dimensions in one block allows us to link micro-level practices (genre choices, language strategies, visibility work) with macro-level policy and infrastructural conditions, and to avoid overly linear explanations (e. g., “younger equals more digital”) that ignore discipline- and country-specific regimes.

Generational and Cohort Differences

Recent cohort analyses demonstrate that younger SSH researchers increasingly prioritize international visibility through journal publications in English, especially in indexed outlets. Guns, Eykens, and Engels [*Guns et al.*, 2019] show how early-career scholars in Flanders exhibit higher rates of journalization and alignment with *WoS* standards compared to older peers. While monographs remain prominent among senior researchers — particularly in the humanities — this shift signals a partial generational transition toward standardized publication regimes.

Similarly, academic age serves as a meaningful proxy for cohort differentiation. Sivertsen [*Sivertsen*, 2016] finds that younger academics are more embedded in transnational

publication networks, driven in part by evaluation criteria and institutional expectations. These developments occur within a broader context of changes in academic work, including increasing temporal pressures and a quickening pace. This changing environment, influenced by evaluation systems and the push for international visibility, shapes what academics prioritize [Ylijoki, 2011].

National and Institutional Contexts

Cross-country comparisons highlight that researchers in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) face specific challenges related to language, funding structures, and limited indexation. Kulczycki et al. [Kulczycki et al., 2018] in an eight-country analysis, highlight stark differences in SSH publication outputs, particularly between Poland and countries like Norway and Belgium, arguing that performance-based funding systems influence not only the volume of output but also the modes of communication adopted. These effects are even more pronounced in the Russian case (see *Russian National Context* below).

National databases such as CRISTin (Norway) and VABB-SHW (Belgium) strongly incentivize journal-based outputs and thus influence academic behavior. These incentives are not neutral: they reward specific communication formats, often privileging English-language publishing and disadvantaging locally oriented work, as discussed by McCulloch [McCulloch, 2017].

Disciplinary Cultures and Publication Norms

Disciplinary norms shape not just the medium of publication but its underlying epistemic value. Malcolm and Zukas [Malcolm, Zukas, 2009] describe how education scholars experience tensions between disciplinary expectations and institutional output metrics, official narratives and actual academic work. This confirms broader trends identified by Lea and Stierer [Lea, Stierer, 2011], who argue that academic writing practices are embedded in discipline-specific regimes of value.

Disciplines such as economics or psychology tend to embrace co-authorship, metrics-based evaluation, and rapid publication cycles. In contrast, history and philosophy remain oriented toward single authorship, longer forms, and nationally specific outlets. These distinctions are not only cultural but structurally reinforced through peer expectations and doctoral training. Tülübaş and Göktürk [Tülübaş, Göktürk, 2020] argue that disciplinary environments not only structure publishing expectations but also mediate how researchers internalize or resist neoliberal performativity.

Career Stage, Precarity, and Visibility Work

Early-career researchers — particularly those in precarious positions — are more likely to engage in what Bristow, Robinson, and Ratle [Bristow et al., 2019] call “academic arrhythmia,” a fragmented and strategically visible form of labor shaped by the pressures of the evaluation economy. This precarity intensifies the need to cultivate digital profiles, embrace altmetrics, and conform to output targets. These observations are echoed by Lea and Stierer [Lea, Stierer, 2011], who show how researchers negotiate tensions between personal values and institutional pressures in their writing and publishing practices, often developing hybrid strategies that combine compliance and quiet resistance.

Phillips et al. [Phillips et al., 2023] extend this analysis by showing how early-career women researchers in Australia adopt different modes of response to the pressures of academia, which authors conceptualize as distinct subject positions: The Compliant Woman, The Strategic Woman, and The Rebellious Woman. These responses are linked to negoti-

ating expectations shaped by neoliberal and patriarchal discourses. Authors note that regardless of their approach, these early-career women felt “damned” in their experience, highlighting feelings of unsafety and insecurity. The study also indicates strong gender imbalances in academia, where women are significantly underrepresented in senior positions compared to their numbers at the PhD and early-career stages, particularly in STEM.

Pifer and Baker [Pifer, Baker, 2016] explore the concept of identity in academic careers. They introduce and examine the idea of relational identity, which is rooted in close relationships with specific others and involves defining the self-based on these key relationships. Their study, which included prospective and current faculty members, highlights how these relational identities, such as family roles and responsibilities, friendships and community outside of academe, and interactions with colleagues, influence academics’ lived experiences. Specifically, they found that these factors shaped participants’ work commitments, challenges, goals, and perceptions within their careers.

Thus, disciplinary, generational, national, and career-stage factors operate as intersecting dimensions of stratification that shape researchers’ positioning vis-à-vis digital change. Rather than merely moderating how trends are perceived, these dimensions actively structure which communication strategies become feasible and legitimate. In the next section, we outline the main trends identified in the literature and indicate how they are unevenly distributed across these groups.

Emerging Trends and Their Distribution

The digitalization of academic life has transformed the modalities, rhythms, and politics of scholarly communication in the social sciences and humanities (SSH). Yet these transformations are heterogeneous, contingent, and often contested. Moving from stratifying factors to substantive transformations, we identify five interrelated trends: journalization, internationalization, new visibility regimes (the rise of altmetrics and open access), platformization, and the restructuring of academic writing. Each trend is marked by substantial heterogeneity, much of which can be accounted for by the differences outlined in the previous section.

Journalization and the Revaluation of Genres

One of the notable trends in SSH disciplines is the growing prominence of peer-reviewed journal articles, particularly in the context of research evaluation systems. Academics in SSH are increasingly pushed to publish more journal articles due to evaluation criteria [Gingras, 2016]. This trend is linked to the internationalization of research, which involves an increased use of specialized journals for publishing. These articles are often published in journals indexed in global databases like *Web of Science* and *Scopus*, and there is an increasing use of English language in these publications [Sanz-Casado et al., 2016].

However, this shift in academic practices is significantly institutional and policy-driven [Gingras, 2016]. Research evaluation systems are identified as systematically favoring certain publication genres over others, creating a “genre regime” [Tusting, 2018]. Different authors discuss how this regime impacts humanities fields, particularly highlighting the tension between publishing journal articles (often seen as the “main currency” for evaluation) and producing monographs, which are traditionally highly valued in history. Despite these pressures, books, particularly monographs, remain central to disciplinary identity and are considered the “primary type of scholarly book publication” and still important in social sciences and humanities [Kulczycki, Korytkowski, 2020]. For example, in history, the mono-

graph is seen as the “gold standard” and a “core part of the discipline”. Disciplinary identity in history is closely coupled to writing conventions, including the monograph, which helps establish an historian’s contribution and reputation within their discipline. Books also constitute a large proportion of references in humanities articles.

Internationalization and Transnational Collaboration

Parallel to journalization is a rise in international co-authorship and cross-border collaboration [Zhang *et al.*, 2020], though it remains more modest than in STEM disciplines where multi-authorship is more common. Research, including work by Sivertsen [Sivertsen, 2016], documents how national funding schemes and performance indicators increasingly use publications indexed in international databases like *Scopus* or *Web of Science* as criteria for research evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities. Countries such as Norway, which was among the first to establish a performance-based funding system promoting international publishing, the Czech Republic, which explicitly rewards WoS/Scopus journals, Finland [Kulczycki *et al.*, 2018], and China [Zhang *et al.*, 2020] provide examples of policies that create strong incentives for scholars to publish internationally and seek co-authors abroad.

De Filippo and Sanz-Casado [De Filippo, Sanz-Casado, 2018], analyzing three SSH domains in Spain, confirm that internationally co-authored publications are more frequently cited. However, Stoica [Stoica, 2018] warns that the benefits of international collaboration are unevenly distributed. For scholars in Central and Eastern Europe, linguistic and infra-structural barriers still limit access to elite networks. Moreover, as Richardson [Richardson, 2009] notes, geographic mobility — a common pathway to collaboration — can introduce personal and professional precarity.

New Regimes of Visibility

With the expansion of digital tracking tools, new forms of visibility and reputation have emerged. Mendeley readership counts, *Twitter* mentions, blog citations, and *Wikipedia* links are now tracked alongside citation metrics. While these indicators remain weakly correlated with academic impact in many SSH fields, they increasingly shape perceptions of visibility and influence.

Open access publication is widely recognized for its potential to significantly increase research impact, most notably leading to higher citation counts and enhancing online visibility and attention across various platforms. Providing specific evidence within the social sciences and humanities, De Filippo and Sanz-Casado [De Filippo, Sanz-Casado, 2018] found that open access publications in these fields were significantly more likely to receive mentions on social media, indicating a clear link between accessibility and online presence [Holmberg *et al.*, 2020]. This growing emphasis on online visibility, alongside traditional metrics, reflects a broader shift in how research impact is understood and measured in the digital age.

Altmetrics remain a controversial topic within academia [De Filippo, Sanz-Casado, 2018]. Discussions surrounding these metrics often highlight a tension between traditional academic values and the increasing pressure for online visibility and engagement. Many scholars view digital promotion, such as engaging on social media, with skepticism [Tusting *et al.*, 2019]. These tensions are particularly salient under evaluation pressure (group differences are discussed in the *Researcher Groups and Communication Practices* section).

Platformization and the Rise of Academic Visibility Work

Digital platforms such as *ResearchGate*, *Academia.edu*, *Google Scholar*, and *ORCID* have transformed the infrastructure of academic self-presentation. Engaging with these platforms requires academics to undertake the ongoing curation of their profiles, upload their work, and attend to analytics [Thelwall, Kousha, 2015]. Such activities introduce new demands and contribute to the academic workload, potentially encompassing tasks that may not always conform to traditional institutional expectations about what is considered ‘legitimate’ academic work.

Moreover, platforms and evaluation systems shape academic behavior and writing practices, influencing genres and rhythms and creating pressure for output linked to metrics and targets. As Tusting [Tusting, 2018] notes, the institutionalization of platform-mediated genres introduces new contradictions between accountability and autonomy.

Unevenness and Resistance

Despite broad structural trends, adoption of digital communication practices remains uneven. Disciplinary norms, national policy regimes, and individual preferences all mediate uptake. Kulczycki et al. [Kulczycki et al., 2018] found that scholars in the social sciences and humanities in countries such as Poland still publish primarily in national journals, often in local languages, due to low institutional pressure for internationalization.

Harris et al. [Harris et al., 2023] describe similar dynamics among marginalized academic groups, showing how contract researchers often lack access to institutional resources necessary for digital visibility. In such contexts, the promise of openness and connectivity is tempered by structural exclusion.

Resistance also persists in academia. Academics actively navigate and push back against pressures from evaluation systems and the drive for productivity and visibility. Many scholars articulate values associated with “slow scholarship,” valuing depth and reflection over rapid output and metrics driven by dominant evaluation regimes. Qualitative studies, such as the narrative-based research by Cutajar [Cutajar, 2024] involving Maltese academics, shed light on how scholars experience and navigate these tensions and challenges in their everyday professional lives.

Russian National Context

A distinct configuration of these challenges is observed in the Russian context, where digital transformation has been driven by top-down state policies. Following the launch of the ‘Project 5–100’ and the ‘May Decrees’ in 2012, Russian SSH faced immense administrative pressure to increase visibility in global databases. While these initiatives succeeded in boosting the sheer volume of publications [Moed et al., 2018], researchers argue that this growth was largely achieved through adaptive strategies rather than genuine integration.

Scholars have identified a specific mechanism of “imitative internationalization” facilitated by the inclusion of domestically oriented local journals into the Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI). Moskaleva and Pislyakov [Moskaleva, Pislyakov, 2017] demonstrated that a significant share of Russian SSH papers indexed in *Web of Science* are published in domestic journals that remain invisible to the global community. This created what some authors describe as a “voluntary academic ghetto” where researchers meet formal KPIs without leaving their linguistic and cultural comfort zone [Trishchenko et al., 2025].

Importantly, this platform- and index-enabled pattern builds on earlier, well-documented constraints: long before ESCI expansion, Russian SSH already faced structural barriers that limited international integration. Kirchik et al. [Kirchik et al., 2012] highlight that despite the push for internationalization, the language barrier continues to stratify the community, separating a small elite of globally integrated scholars from the majority oriented towards national outlets. Furthermore, citation practices in this segment often perform a “normative” rather than navigational function, where references are used to simulate academic context rather than to engage with actual debates [Makeenko, 2017]. Consequently, as noted by Sterligov [Sterligov, 2021] and Guba [Guba, 2022], the rigid application of bibliometric indicators in an unprepared academic environment has incentivized “gaming the metrics” and the proliferation of unethical publication practices.

Synthesizing the Russian experience, three distinct trends characterize the local digital transformation.

The Russian literature suggests that indicator-driven internationalization can produce a structurally polarized communication ecology. A relatively small group of globally integrated scholars publishes under the standards of top-quartile journals, whereas a much larger domestically oriented segment relies on nationally anchored journals indexed in RSCI or on ESCI (as a segmented layer within *WoS*) to satisfy formal criteria without necessarily changing epistemic and communicative routines.

Within this environment, digital metrics may incentivize instrumental adaptation rather than transparency. Studies describe forms of mimicry and gaming — such as salami-slicing, coercive citation practices, and occasional engagement with predatory outlets — as survival strategies under KPI pressure. These dynamics, in turn, can reinforce peripherality: language barriers and self-referential citation circuits limit the circulation of locally produced knowledge, meaning that even formally ‘internationalized’ outputs may remain weakly coupled to global debates.

Gaps and Data Limitations

While the study of scholarly communication in SSH has grown significantly in recent years, this body of research remains uneven and fragmented. Both the empirical scope and the conceptual reach of existing studies reveal persistent blind spots, which constrain our ability to develop a nuanced understanding of how communication practices evolve under digital conditions.

Disciplinary and Subfield Silences

Existing research is disproportionately concentrated in fields that already exhibit strong alignment with journal-based publication and international indexing — such as economics, education, and psychology. These fields are often more compatible with bibliometric analysis and survey instruments, which partly explains their overrepresentation.

By contrast, core humanities disciplines such as philosophy, history, literary studies, and art history are frequently marginalized. Their reliance on long-form genres, national languages, and locally embedded publication outlets renders them less visible in dominant infrastructures. Pike [Pike, 2023] highlights how scholars in the humanities perceive a systematic institutional devaluation of their work under current evaluation regimes. This disciplinary asymmetry leads to a conceptual narrowing: communication in SSH becomes

equated with article production, while context-bound or genre-diverse practices remain under-theorized.

Methodological Overreliance on Cross-sectional Data

Most quantitative studies in this area rely on cross-sectional data — single-time surveys or bibliometric snapshots. While useful for static mapping, such approaches are limited in capturing how scholars adapt over time to shifting policy regimes, technologies, or career stages.

Without more longitudinal or cohort-based data, we risk mistaking contingent behavior for stable practice. For example, Smith [*Smith*, 2010], in a longitudinal study of probationary academics, shows that identity development and scholarly positioning shift significantly during early-career transitions — an effect that cannot be captured through static instruments.

Weak Integration of Mixed Methods and Limited Reuse of Qualitative Data

Quantitative and qualitative approaches often remain siloed. Surveys document behaviors but rarely motivations or values; interviews reveal depth but lack breadth. For example, Mihăilă [*Mihăilă*, 2018], in a study of the impact of transnational co-authorship on the scientific quality of academic research, calls for stronger integration between statistical and qualitative data for a more complex image. Moreover, existing qualitative data — such as interview transcripts or diaries — are rarely reused for secondary analysis. This reflects both ethical concerns and infrastructural deficits but also highlights a missed opportunity for richer longitudinal inquiry.

Geographic and Linguistic Biases

Empirical work remains strongly biased toward Anglophone and Western European contexts. SSH scholars from Eastern Europe, Latin America, Africa, and Asia are under-represented in both the data and the discourse [*Gingras*, 2016]. Countries that have recently joined the global science system, particularly post-communist countries in the EU and other poorer countries, have become massively visible in *Scopus* or *Web of Science* journals relatively recently, contrasting with Western countries which have operated on a large scale since the outset [*Kwiek, Roszka*, 2022]. This delayed entry affects the representativeness of data for these regions.

Without attention to linguistic diversity and regional knowledge systems, scholarship on academic communication risks reinforcing epistemic hierarchies rather than interrogating them.

Conclusion and Discussion

Across the three evidence strands, the most robust pattern is uneven digital transformation: journal- and index-centered evaluation expands, yet genre diversity persists and platform-based visibility adds new layers of academic labor. Disciplinary cultures, national systems, career stages, and infrastructural access all influence how scholars engage with digital opportunities.

We also identified significant limitations in the current research. These include disciplinary and geographic gaps, and methodological imbalances. These gaps perpetuate existing asymmetries in academic knowledge production and circulation. Future research should adopt more inclusive, longitudinal, and methodologically integrated approaches. Greater

attention should be paid to marginal disciplines, regions, and voices, both in empirical data and in the theories used to understand them.

Overall, the reviewed literature suggests that digital transformation in SSH does not produce simple convergence toward a single ‘digital’ model of scholarly communication. Instead, it reinforces a stratified ecology of co-existing value regimes: journal- and index-oriented evaluation increasingly structures careers and incentives, while genre-diverse and locally embedded forms (notably monographs and national outlets) remain central to disciplinary identity, especially in the humanities. Internationalization is likewise uneven: growth in indexed output does not automatically translate into substantive integration into international conversations, which remains strongly associated with collaboration networks and publication venues. This is particularly evident in national cases such as Russia, where an elite global circuit coexists with a mass domestic circuit of scholarly communication.

A second robust pattern concerns infrastructures of visibility. Platformization adds a new layer of academic work — profile curation, trace production, and indicator monitoring — thereby shifting the boundaries of what counts as legitimate scholarly work. Altmetrics and open access further diversify the visibility landscape: they do not replace citation-based impact but constitute a partially autonomous regime of attention whose effects vary systematically by discipline and evaluation context. Finally, evaluative and digital infrastructures reshape academic writing itself, producing genre pressures, acceleration, and fragmented work rhythms that are particularly salient under precarity.

Theoretically, these patterns support an interpretation of contemporary SSH communication as an ecology of valuation regimes rather than a unified market of ‘impact’. Infrastructures such as indexes, platforms, and metrics should be treated as constitutive elements of the scholarly field that redistribute academic capital, normalize genres, and reproduce inequalities through differential access to resources, networks, and time. This perspective connects micro-level practices (writing, dissemination, visibility work) with macro-level evaluation policies and digital infrastructures, clarifying why ‘more visibility’ does not necessarily mean ‘more communication’ in the substantive sociological sense.

Furthermore, the increasing prominence of digital platforms and new forms of visibility raises profound questions about epistemic justice and the global dissemination of knowledge. As English-language journalization and platformization gain traction, there is a risk of further marginalizing locally rooted knowledge traditions, non-Anglophone scholarship, and forms of academic labor that resist easy quantification. To address these tendencies, future research and policy must prioritize diversity — of language, genre, method, and epistemology — while also developing integrative methodological approaches that better capture the lived experiences and collective challenges faced by SSH researchers globally.

References

- Bristow, A., Robinson, S., Ratle, O. (2019). Academic Arrhythmia: Disruption, Dissonance, and Conflict in Early-Career Rhythms of CMS Academics, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 18 (2), 241–260. DOI: 10.5465/AMLE.2017.0340.
- Cutajar, M. (2024). A Malta Experience of Being a University Academic, *Trends in Higher Education*, 3 (2), 408–422. DOI: 10.3390/higheredu3020024.
- De Filippo, D., Sanz-Casado, E. (2018). Bibliometric and Altmetric Analysis of Three Social Science Disciplines, *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 3 (34). DOI: 10.3389/frma.2018.00034.

Gingras, Y. (2016). *Bibliometrics and Research Evaluation: Uses and Abuses*, MIT Press.

González-Valiente, C.L., Pacheco-Mendoza, J., Arencibia-Jorge, R. (2016). A Review of Altmetrics as an Emerging Discipline for Research Evaluation, *Learned Publishing*, 29 (4), 229–238. DOI: 10.1002/leap.1043.

Guba, K.S. (2022). Scientometric Indicators in the Evaluation of Russian Universities: A Literature Review, *Universe of Russia*, 31 (1), 49–73. DOI: 10.17323/1811-038X-2022-31-1-49-73.

Guns, R., Eykens, J., Engels, T.C.E. (2019). To What Extent Do Successive Cohorts Adopt Different Publication Patterns? Peer Review, Language Use, and Publication Types in the Social Sciences and Humanities, *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 3 (38). DOI: 10.3389/frma.2018.00038.

Harris, J., Smithers, K., Spina, N., Heffernan, T. (2023). Disrupting Dominant Discourses of the Other: Examining Experiences of Contract Researchers in the Academy, *Studies in Higher Education*, 48 (1), 37–48. DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2022.2105831.

Holmberg, K., Hedman, J., Bowman, T.D., Didegah, F., Laakso, M. (2020). Do Articles in Open Access Journals Have More Frequent Altmetric Activity Than Articles in Subscription-Based Journals? An Investigation of the Research Output of Finnish Universities, *Scientometrics*, no. 122, 645–659. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-019-03301-x.

Kirchik, O., Gingras, Y., Larivière, V. (2012). Changes in Publication Languages and Citation Practices and Their Effect on the Scientific Impact of Russian Science (1993–2010), *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63 (7), 1411–1419. DOI: 10.1002/asi.22642.

Kulczycki, E., Engels, T.C.E., Pölonen, J., Bruun, K., Dušková, M., Guns, R., Nowotniak, R., Petr, M., Sivertsen, G., Istenič Starčič, A., Zuccala, A. (2018). Publication Patterns in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Evidence from Eight European Countries, *Scientometrics*, no. 116, 463–486. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-018-2711-0.

Kulczycki, E., Korytkowski, P. (2020). Researchers Publishing Monographs Are More Productive and More Local-Oriented, *Scientometrics*, no. 125, 1371–1387. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-020-03376-x.

Kwiek, M., Roszka, W. (2022). Academic vs. Biological Age in Research on Academic Careers: A Large-Scale Study with Implications for Scientifically Developing Systems, *Scientometrics*, no. 127, 3543–3575. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-022-04363-0.

Lea, M.R., Stierer, B. (2011). Changing Academic Identities in Changing Academic Workplaces: Learning from Academics' Everyday Professional Writing Practices, *Teaching in Higher Education*, no. 16, 605–616. DOI: 10.1080/13562517.2011.560380.

Makeenko, M.I. (2017). Razvitiye teoriy media v rossiyskikh nauchnykh zhurnalakh v 2010-ye gg.: rezul'taty pervogo etapa issledovaniy [Elaboration of media theories in Russian academic journals in the 2010s: Results of the first stage of the research], *Vestnik Moskovskogo un-ta. Ser. 10: Zhurnalistika*, no. 6, 3–31 (in Russian).

Malcolm, J., Zukas, M. (2009). Making a Mess of Academic Work: Experience, Purpose and Identity, *Teaching in Higher Education*, no. 14, 495–506. DOI: 10.1080/13562510903186659.

McCulloch, S. (2017). Hobson's Choice: The Effects of Research Evaluation on Academics' Writing Practices in England, *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, 69 (5), 503–515. DOI: 10.1108/AJIM-12-2016-0216.

Mihäilă, B.E. (2018). The Impact of Transnational Co-Authorship on the Scientific Quality of Academic Researchers — Case Studies: Slovenia, Poland and Romania, *International Review of Social Research*, 8 (2), 129–142. DOI: 10.2478/irsr-2018-0015.

Moed, H.F., Markusova, V., Akoev, M. (2018). Trends in Russian Research Output Indexed in Scopus and Web of Science, *Scientometrics*, 116 (2), 1153–1180. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-018-2769-8.

Moskaleva, O.V., Pislyakov, V.V. (2017). Russian Journals in Emerging Sources Citation Index, in *World-Class Scientific Publication — 2017: Best Practices in Preparation and Promotion of Publications: Proceedings of the 6th International Scientific and Practical Conference* (pp. 78–81), Moscow. DOI: 10.24069/2017.978-5-7996-2227-5.13.

Phillips, M.J., Dzidic, P.L., Roberts, L.D., Castell, E.L. (2023). “Comply, Strategise, or Resist?": Exploring Early-Career Women's Academic Identities in Australian Higher Education

Using Foucauldian Discourse Analysis, *SN Social Sciences*, vol. 3, article no. 81. DOI: 10.1007/s43545-023-00668-w.

Pifer, M.J., Baker, V.L. (2016). Professional, Personal, and Relational: Exploring the Salience of Identity in Academic Careers, *Identity*, 69 (3), 190–205. DOI: 10.1080/15283488.2016.1190729.

Pike, D. (2023). The Humanities: What Future?, *Humanities*, 12 (4), 85. DOI: 10.3390/h12040085.

Richardson, J. (2009). Geographic Flexibility in Academia: A Cautionary Note, *British Journal of Management*, no. 20, S160–S170. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2008.00641.x.

Sanz-Casado, E., García-Zorita, C., Serrano-López, A.E., Filippo, D., Vanti, N. (2016). Desarrollo de indicadores para los nuevos hábitos de información y comunicación científica, *Educación Médica*, no. 17, 45–50 (in Spanish). Available at: <https://www.elsevier.es/es-revista-educacion-medica-71-articulo-desarrollo-indicadores-los-nuevos-habitos-X1575181316601166> (date accessed: 10.06.2025).

Sivertsen, G. (2016). Patterns of Internationalization and Criteria for Research Assessment in the Social Sciences and Humanities, *Scientometrics*, no. 107, 357–368. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-016-1845-1.

Smith, J. (2010). Forging Identities: The Experiences of Probationary Lecturers in the UK, *Studies in Higher Education*, 35 (5), 577–591. DOI: 10.1080/03075070903216650.

Sterligov, I. (2021). *Bibliometrics in University Assessment: World Experience*, Elsevier.

Stoica, A.-A. (2018). Homophily in Co-Authorship Networks, *International Review of Social Research*, 8 (2), 119–128. DOI: 10.2478/irsr-2018-0014.

Sugimoto, C.R., Work, S., Larivière, V., Haustein, S. (2016). Scholarly Use of Social Media and Altmetrics: A Review of the Literature, *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68 (9), 2037–2062. DOI: 10.1002/asi.23833.

Thelwall, M., Kousha, K. (2015). ResearchGate: Disseminating, Communicating, and Measuring Scholarship?, *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, no. 66, 876–889. DOI: 10.1002/asi.23236.

Trishchenko, N.D., Makeenko, M.I., Anisimov, I.V. (2025). Limits of Metrics-Led Internationalization: The Case of Russian Media Studies, *Quality & Quantity*. DOI: 10.1007/s11135-025-02472-5.

Tülübaşı, T., Göktürk, Ş. (2020). Neoliberal Governmentality and Performativity Culture in Higher Education: Reflections on Academic Identity, *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, 5 (1), 198–232. DOI: 10.30828/real/2020.1.6.

Tusting, K. (2018). The Genre Regime of Research Evaluation: Contradictory Systems of Value around Academics' Writing, *Language and Education*, 32 (6), 477–493. DOI: 10.1080/09500782.2018.1505905.

Tusting, K., McCulloch, S., Bhatt, I., Hamilton, M., Barton, D. (2019). *Academics Writing*, Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9780429197994.

Ylijoki, O.H. (2011). Boundary-Work between Work and Life in the High-Speed University, *Studies in Higher Education*, 38 (2), 242–255. DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2011.577524.

Zhang, L., Shang, Y., Huang, Y., Sivertsen, G. (2020). Toward Internationalization: A Bibliometric Analysis of the Social Sciences in Mainland China from 1979 to 2018, *Quantitative Science Studies*, 2 (1), 376–408. DOI: 10.1162/qss_a_00102.

Трансформация научной коммуникации в социальных и гуманитарных науках в цифровую эпоху: критический обзор

Наталья Дмитриевна Трищенко

МГУ имени М.В. Ломоносова,
Москва, Россия;
ГПНТБ СО РАН,
Новосибирск, Россия;
e-mail: trishchenkond@my.msu.ru

В статье описаны актуальные тенденции научной коммуникации в социальных и гуманитарных науках. Обзор основан на комбинации результатов трех групп исследований: использующих наукометрические методы, опросы, а также интервью. Среди основных трендов можно выделить приоритизацию журнальных публикаций, значительные различия в отношении к использованию альтернативных метрик, а также крайнюю географическую и дисциплинарную неоднородность практик. Особое внимание в обзоре уделяется дисциплинарным различиям: например, если в экономике и психологии закрепились практики коллективной работы и быстрой публикации в журналах, то в истории и философии сохраняется приоритет монографий и национальных издательских площадок. В то время как молодые исследователи и представители дисциплин, опирающихся преимущественно на количественные методы, быстрее адаптируются к цифровой коммуникационной среде, другие группы предпочитают более традиционные каналы и формы распространения информации. Для исследователей на начальных этапах карьеры цифровые инструменты и платформы становятся важным способом повышения видимости и обеспечения соответствия формальным показателям, тогда как старшие коллеги чаще опираются на устоявшиеся локальные формы коммуникации. При этом в современной научной литературе остаются значительные пробелы, в том числе можно отметить недостаточное внимание к гуманитарным дисциплинам, редкое использование смешанных методов и недооценку неформальных практик научной коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: научная коммуникация, социальные и гуманитарные науки, цифровые платформы, альтернативные метрики, социология науки, институциональные изменения, оценка исследований.